



Early Intervention Colorado
for Infants, Toddlers & Families

COLORADO

State Performance Plan

Federal IDEA, Part C Services

Submitted
February 2, 2009
Revised April 3, 2009

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

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2010

(February 2, 2009 Revision Based on the FFY 2005-2010 SPP and February 1, 2008 Revision)

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, develop targets for the performance indicators, and the selection of 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 State Performance Plan (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 supports and services (Part C) 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 early intervention 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 Colorado Department of Education 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)

The following document is a complete revised SPP using the OSEP template that addresses all 14 Indicators. DDD has revised the SPP for submission to OSEP on February 2, 2009 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 enhancements that reflect a focused effort on the part of DDD to ensure compliance with the priority areas set by OSEP through identifying any noncompliance and ensuring timely correction of such noncompliance. These changes have been shaped by input from key stakeholders and the CICC during the Fall 2008 annual planning meeting, the November quarterly meeting, and e-mail correspondence in December 2008. The February 2, 2009 submission also reflects changes made based on information from the following resources:

Colorado State

- Feedback from OSEP through Colorado's previous Annual Performance Reports (APR) and during a 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*;
- The OSEP *Frequently Asked Questions Regarding Identification and Correction of Noncompliance and Reporting on Correction in the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)*;
- Ruth Ryder's August 25, 2008 presentation, *Improving Results and Compliance through the SPP/APR* and August 26, 2008 presentation, *Improving Results: SPP/APRs at Work*;
- Mid-South Regional Resource Center's *State Systems Improvement Self-Assessment*; 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 2, 2009 in order to maintain the historical development of the SPP. The following modifications have been made to reflect current implementation:

- Deleting improvement activities that were not implemented by the former lead agency nor by DDD, as the new lead agency, because they no longer apply to the current early intervention system.
- Strategic selection of new improvement activities that are aligned with Colorado's priorities and reflect new efforts to address the root causes of noncompliance. **All new activities are shown in bold font**;
- Concluding improvement activities that are not proving to support improved performance. **Changes to timelines are shown in bold font**;
- Reordering of improvement activities to progress from the earliest and most narrow timelines to the improvement activities that cover the full span of the SPP (FFY 2005-2010); and
- Aligning the work of State staff and contractors with activities that will address the deficiencies noted in the Colorado FFY 2006 APR Response Table for Indicators 1, 7, and 8C that were identified in the June 2008 letter from OSEP.

The February 2, 2009 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 CCB Early Intervention 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 Community Centered Board (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 2005-2010

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 was conducted for this SPP within the programs funded through the Colorado Departments of Education (CDE), Human Services (CDHS/DDD) and Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) and guidance developed with the advisement of the Colorado Interagency Coordinating Council from September-November 2005.
- Discussions were held with local Part C coordinators, local CCB early intervention 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, 2008, and 2009 were based on data gathered from the former lead agency, stakeholder input from the CICC, CICC/MOU subcommittee and key stakeholders.

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 analysis revealed local programs may have identified only month/year for the initiation date and a complete baseline could not be established due to incomplete data at that time (see estimated baseline below that was set in the original SPP). Training and technical assistance has been necessary to systematize data collection.
- In 2005, the former lead agency, CDE, and Colorado's early intervention system through broad stakeholder input and child record review identified "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 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 Community Centered Boards (CCBs) that are designated annually by DDD to implement early intervention 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 agencies (i.e., Child Find teams) have the responsibility to conduct the multidisciplinary evaluation and assessment for infants and toddlers, in addition to children from 3-21 years of age. The CCB provides service coordination and contracts with private early intervention providers or have agency-based staff to deliver early intervention 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

**Colorado
State**

the service is initiated in greater 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 (LICCC) that provides the interagency collaboration necessary to effectively implement early intervention services.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004:

- 87% of services on IFSPs in the Part C database were estimated to have been initiated in the newly defined state definition of "timely" based upon analysis of 65% of current IFSPs. All current IFSPs in the database were not analyzed as some programs were documenting only the month/year.
- Based upon the telephone survey conducted by CDE in October 2005 of local early intervention programs and local direct service providers, approximately 90% of services began within 2-3 weeks of parent consent to services. For services that began beyond the newly defined 28-day timeline, local programs cited difficulty scheduling with private providers billing Medicaid and bilingual service providers.
- An accurate baseline was 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 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 new October 2007 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.

**Colorado
State**

2010 (2010-2011)	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, 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	2008-2009	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 Early Intervention Workgroup, and CICC.
1.4	2008-2010	DDD will conduct a statewide fiscal study that includes analysis of average service levels, provider rates and average cost per child/ DDD staff.
1.5	2008-2010	Colorado will participate as a pilot state for the National Early Childhood Professional Development Enhancement Center in the use of early intervention professional development materials and methodology/ DDD staff and NECPDE staff.
1.6	2008-2010	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.
1.7	2008-2010	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 early intervention careers/ DDD staff, contract staff, and local early intervention programs.
1.8	2008-2010	A statewide database of early intervention 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.
1.9	2008-2010	Materials for families 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, and contract staff.
1.10	2008-2010	Training for direct service providers specific to supporting children with significant social/emotional concerns will be provided/ DDD staff, Training Cadre, Center for Social Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CSEFEL) State Leadership Team, and contract staff.
1.11	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, contract staff.

**Colorado
State**

1.12	2007-2010	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 noncompliance, and require POCs when noncompliance is identified/ DDD staff.
1.13	2007-2010	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.
1.14	2007-2010	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.
1.15	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.
1.16	2007-2010	A statewide curriculum and system for early intervention paraprofessional training will be developed and implemented, including training for supervisors/ DDD staff and contract staff.
1.17	2006-2010	An ongoing assessment and analysis of personnel needs will be conducted to identify where personnel shortage exists, in what area of expertise and focus recruitment activities to address shortages/ DDD staff, CICC, Office of Professional Development and higher education.
1.18	2006-2010	Training for service coordinators and providers on IFSP development with emphasis on services (timely delivery, documentation, funding hierarchy) will be continued/ DDD staff and Training Cadre.
1.19	2006-2010	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.
1.20	2005-2010	Statewide training and technical assistance will be provided on the transdisciplinary/primary service provider model/ DDD staff, Training Cadre and contract staff.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2010

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

- The original input was received from discussions held with the previous 32 local Part C coordinators, local CCB early intervention directors and public health team leaders at regularly scheduled events, September – November 2005.
- Direct service providers were surveyed on the targets via the statewide provider listserv and focus groups, October – November 2005.
- DDD revised this section with input from the CICC, CICC/MOU sub-committee, and other key statewide interagency partners in Fall 2006, Winter 2006, Fall 2007, and Fall 2008.

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 programs for typically developing children.

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children) 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, followed by ten communities establishing transdisciplinary teams in 2002, and another eight communities between 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 early intervention teams or individual service providers.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004:

87.5% of services were primarily delivered in family homes and community-based settings.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The Part C database documented the trend in the FFY 2002 to 2004 from 76% to 84% to 87.5% of providing increasingly more services in the home or community settings.

**Colorado
State**

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.

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, 2006-2007CICC, 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	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.
2.6	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.

**Colorado
State**

2.7	2008-2010	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.
2.8	2008-2010	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 Training Cadre.
2.9	2005-2008	Training for direct service providers specific to supporting children with significant social/emotional concerns will be provided and a statewide cadre of resources specialists (resource areas including working with families impacted by homelessness, child abuse and neglect and substance abuse or exposure) will be created/ DDD staff, Training Cadre, Center for Social Emotional Foundations for Early Learning (CSEFEL), CAPTA training team, and contract staff.
2.10	2007-2010	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.
2.11	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.
2.12	2005-2010	Statewide training and technical assistance will be provided on the transdisciplinary/primary service provider model/ DDD staff, Training Cadre and contract staff.
2.13	2005-2010	Training and technical assistance will be developed and disseminated through multiple methods (tiered training, establishment of cadre of regional consultants for ASD, resource banks) for direct service providers working with children on the autism spectrum/ DDD staff and contract staff.
2.14	2005-2010	The Service Coordination Core Competencies training and required training on IFSP development with emphasis on service locations will continue/ DDD staff, Training Cadre, and contract staff.
2.15	2005-2010	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, Training Cadre

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2010

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

- Broad stakeholder input has been a part of the approach in developing the Colorado 0-5 Child and Family Outcomes Measurement System, known as Results Matter. Since its inception in June 2004, Results Matter has 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 in early intervention, child care, preschool, preschool special education, mental health, health and social services, direct service providers and families. Electronic communication with the above groups has also provided for statewide input.
- The Results Matter Workgroup, which is 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.
- Revisions were made on March 30, 2007 to comply with requirements noted by OSEP in their response letter to the FFY 2005 APR.

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:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):

- 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 = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):

**Colorado
State**

- 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 = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- 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 = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

- Since 2002, the Colorado early intervention system has focused on authentic assessment practices, observation, and documentation methodologies. Beginning Fall 2003, the former lead agency, CDE, began tracking child outcome 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 adopt the child outcomes statements adopted by OSEP. The Colorado child outcome system, Results Matter, encompasses 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 meeting and electronic communications at state and local levels in various formats and venues (e.g.,

Colorado State

local early intervention administrator meetings, Consolidated Child Care Pilot meetings, Local Interagency Coordinating Council (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 resulted in no consensus as to the use of a statewide common assessment tool. The CDE team developed the Results Matter values, beliefs and policy for assessing very young children. Along with the national 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 are 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 are being devised with technical assistance from the ECO Center. All early intervention 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 (how it will be established, managed and reports will be issued) continues within the Results Matter Workgroup and 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. Work to design the state's web-based data system for Results Matter is in process.
- 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 early intervention services (Part C) 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 does not use a sampling for Indicator 3. Data that was gathered in FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 includes measurement of progress on all children who entered and exited the early intervention system on or after July 1, 2006 and who remained in services for a span of at least six months. Colorado has four approved assessment tools:
 - The Ounce;
 - High/Scope Child Observation Record;
 - Creative Curriculum Developmental Continuum; and
 - Assessment, Evaluation, and Programming System for Infants and Toddlers (AEPS).

One of the four approved tools is 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. Early intervention providers involved in delivering early intervention services to the child and family will be responsible to complete the assessment at each checkpoint. Each IFSP team will identify a primary provider to assume responsibility to ensure the assessment is completed accurately and timely. Individual service providers or local data entry personnel will enter data into the online system upon collection. State Early Intervention Colorado staff has access to the online data and will use point-in-time information to ensure that data is being reported annually.

- Each of the 20 local programs (CCBs) responsible for early intervention services has selected and implemented one of the four 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 is the most used tool for ongoing assessment and data collection for early intervention services. The number of children for whom data was collected using the AEPS was 2,085 (71%), 462 (16%) were assessed using Creative Curriculum, 201 (7%) were assessed using The Ounce Scale, and

Colorado State

169 (6%) were assessed using High Scope COR. All programs have subscribed to the online systems for these tools and are currently entering data. Finalization of data entry has been 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 the 90 days prior to the child's exit from early intervention services.

Data entry at the local level is being completed by the early intervention provider who completes the ongoing assessment or by administrative staff within the CCB based on written documentation provided by the early intervention provider completing the ongoing assessment.

- The following training and technical assistance are provided to administrators and service providers to support implementation of the system:
 - All service providers are 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 have established local trainers and the state continues to provide some trainings as well.
 - Administrators receive training and ongoing technical assistance for the online systems from the publishers of those systems.
 - Monthly Updates and Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) are distributed to answer questions and provide updates on issues within the system.
 - A technical assistance workgroup continues to develop and implement training curriculum to the state early childhood system. Topics include:
 - Assessment observation – completed and implemented;
 - Assessment documentation – completed and implemented;
 - Using Assessment Information for Intervention Planning – under development;
 - Using Data for program planning and evaluation – under development; and
 - Training-of-Trainers in the AEPS – completed and implemented.
- Multiple methods have been, or are currently being put into place, to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the outcome data in Colorado.
 - The use of online data systems for each of the four tools allows for real time monitoring of data. Checks are made to ensure that children entering the system have entry data within eight to ten weeks of services being initiated, as well as when a child exits the system to ensure that exit data is entered.
 - Initial and ongoing training on each of the four tools provided to the field supports the appropriate administration of the tools and use of the online system for data entry and finalization.
 - The state level Results Matter Workgroup will continue to collaborate 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. In addition, the actual reporting systems will continue to be refined to assure that automated reports reflect accurate information.

Colorado State

- Once reports from the online systems have been refined and determined reliable, these reports will be used ongoing to monitor the accuracy and completeness of data. These reports will include:
 - Progress data by local program;
 - Progress data by county;
 - Progress data by demographics;
 - Progress data by funding source and quality indicators; and
 - Comparison of Colorado data to other states.
- Reports will be used to identify weaknesses that may be leading to data collection errors, so that the Results Matter Workgroup can establish strategies to address those weaknesses, such as training, clarification documents, etc.
- The Results Matter Workgroup will continue to work with the publishers of the online data systems to ensure that the determination of progress for each child is accurate and reliable. Reports will be 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 will provide feedback to the field, to local programs and to early intervention providers to support increased quality of the data.
- Results Matter has established a provider listserv for early intervention providers in Colorado. This listserv will be 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 is working 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 can be sent to providers immediately upon identification of the issue.
- Data system elements for outcome data input and maintenance, and outcome data analysis:
 - Secure online systems created by the publishers of the four 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 is entered at the local level by the early intervention staff completing the assessment or by CCB administrative staff that enters data based on the early intervention staff paper assessment results.
 - State staff has the ability to review data at the child, program, community/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 will 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 early intervention 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 early intervention system.

Colorado State

- Each of the four tools available in Colorado 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 early intervention 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 include using 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.
- The criteria used to determine whether a child's functioning was "comparable to same aged peers". 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).

Baseline Data:

The data reported is not baseline data, and targets are not due until February 2010. The data reported is progress data for children who entered the early intervention system on or after July 1, 2006, remained in the system for at least six months and exited the system on or before June 30, 2008. The tables below reflect the progress data.

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):	Number of children	% of children
a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning.	5	2%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	24	9%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach.	3	1%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	5	2%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	227	86%
Total	N=264	100%

**Colorado
State**

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.	7	3%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	21	8%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach.	3	1%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	11	4%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	226	84%
Total	N=268	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.	1	0%
b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	16	6%
c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach.	5	2%
d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	8	3%
e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	251	89%
Total	N=281	100%

Discussion of Baseline Data: The data presented are progress data only. Baselines and targets will be established in FFY 2010.

This is the second year that Colorado has collected progress data on children receiving early intervention services. These data should be considered as preliminary data. Colorado has put steps in place to ensure that the quality of the data continues to improve over time.

- Representativeness of the Data:** Progress data reported for FFY 2007 is based on children who both entered and exited the program between July 1, 2006 and June 30, 2008. Some child outcomes records and some assessment items that are captured in Indicator 3A and B were excluded from reporting of a particular item due to improper coding upon entering the data thus resulting in variability of the total numbers of children assessed as compared to 3C. Written procedural guidelines have been distributed and further mentoring one-on-one with programs is planned for both providers and local administrators. Colorado continues to identify some challenges in the online database used to track children as they move across locations. Colorado is working on a resolution to these challenges, but data from the first two

**Colorado
State**

years includes a higher than expected rate of attrition. As a result, the data may not fully reflect the kinds of progress of all children participating in the state early intervention system.

- **Quality of Data Collection:** During the early stages of collecting outcomes data, Colorado has continued to learn how to improve the process of data collection. These early data reflect data collected using the initial guidelines. Colorado expects to see improvement in future data as additional training and one-on-one mentoring is provided for local programs. It is anticipated that as ongoing information is presented to local administrators and early intervention providers, they gain understanding of the use of data reports in monitoring and managing the online data entry, leading to more reliable collection and entry of the data.
- **Pattern of Data:** During the first two years of collecting and analyzing data, Colorado identified some challenges in the conversion of assessment scores to the OSEP reporting categories. This is consistent across all four tools being used in Colorado. As a result, data from the first two years reflect a higher than expected rate of children who present as maintaining functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers. Colorado continues to work closely with the publishers/developers of the tools on resolving this issue. Colorado is collaborating with the ECO Center and other states using these tools to determine the contributing factors to the issue.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	N/A at this time. Targets will be established in 2010.
2006 (2006-2007)	N/A at this time. Targets will be established in 2010.
2007 (2007-2008)	N/A at this time. Targets will be established in 2010.
2008 (2008-2009)	N/A at this time. Targets will be established in 2010.
2009 (2009-2010)	N/A at this time. Targets will be established in 2010.
2010 (2010-2011)	Targets will be established.

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.

**Colorado
State**

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 early intervention programs in Colorado)/ DDD staff, Results Matter staff, contract staff, and ECO Center staff.
3.5	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, Results Matter staff, contract staff, and ECO Center staff.
3.6	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, Results Matter staff, contract staff, and ECO Center staff.
3.7	2006-2010	Statewide training, mentoring and technical assistance will be provided for direct service providers and local early intervention staff on the four assessment systems / DDD staff, Results Matter staff, and contract staff.
3.8	2006-2010	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.
3.9	2006-2010	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; Results Matter staff; contract staff and ECO Center staff.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2010

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

- Broad stakeholder input has been a part of the approach in developing the Colorado 0-5 Child and Family Outcomes Measurement System, known as Results Matter. Since its inception in June 2004, Results Matter has included ongoing communications and meetings with state level administrators in multiple offices from CDE, CDHS, CICC, higher education, Early Childhood State Systems Team (Parent Engagement Task Force), local administrators in early intervention, child care, preschool, preschool special education, mental health, health and social services, direct service providers and families. Electronic communication with the above groups has also provided for statewide input.
- The Results Matter Workgroup, which is 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 encompasses a statewide distribution of the measurement.

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:

- The former lead agency, CDE, and the Results Matter team decided to use the same family outcomes statements adopted by the OSEP. 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

Colorado **State**

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 national 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 that will be used in the future 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-five year old survey form was used. In April 2008, DDD used the birth to three version of the survey as opposed to the general survey. (See Appendix A)
- DDD along with Results Matter Workgroup has devised methodologies to report the data from the family assessment tool at a local level and statewide.
- The early intervention system that is administered at the local level through 20 CCBs has a key role in the reliability of the data being collected. Local CCBS can more effectively provide training to their service coordinators and providers and directly inform parents receiving services through the early intervention system of the Results Matter family outcomes.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004-2005:

Data from the use of the CDE initial Family Survey Tool:

- A) 65% of families surveyed report that early intervention services have helped their family "a lot" in understanding their rights and 28% report that early intervention services have helped "some."
- B) Baseline was to be established in December 2006 using the statewide survey.
- C) 65% of families "strongly agree" that early intervention services have helped their child develop and learn and 32% "agree" that early intervention services helped.

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 early intervention 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 was 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 have been revised to be 87.25% for FFY 2008, 87.5% for FFY 2009 and 88% for FFY 2010. These adjustments will better align the 4B targets with family outcome targets for 4A and 4C.

**Colorado
State**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	<p>A) 70% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
2006 (2006-2007)	<p>A) 73% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
2007 (2007-2008)	<p>A) 75% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>C) 75% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services helped the family help their children develop and learn.</p>
2008 (2008-2009)	<p>A) 80% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>C) 80% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services helped the family help their children develop and learn.</p>
2009 (2009-2010)	<p>A) 83% of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

**Colorado
State**

2010 (2010-2011)	<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>
---------------------	--

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	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.
4.5	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.
4.6	2005-2007	The Inspiring Futures publication will be revised and disseminated/ DDD staff.
4.7	2006- 2008	Parent training will be provided on a regional basis and materials disseminated statewide/ DDD staff, contract staff, and contract staff.
4.8	2007-2009	DDD will work with the Legal Center for People with Disabilities and Older People to provide regional training to early intervention staff and families regarding procedural safeguards/ DDD staff and Legal Center staff.
4.9	2008-2010	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.
4.10	2008-2010	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.
4.11	2005- 2008	The <i>ABCs of Parent Leadership</i> training will be provided annually/ DDD staff, and PEAK Parent Center staff.
4.12	2007-2010	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 and Results Matter staff.
4.13	2007-2010	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 and Results Matter team.

**Colorado
State**

4.14	2007-2010	Assistance will be provided to Spanish-speaking support groups to distribute and support completion of the survey among Spanish-speaking families/ DDD staff, Results Matter Team, and contract staff.
4.15	2005-2010	A statewide survey will be conducted of families currently receiving early intervention services and/or within one year of exiting early intervention services using family survey tool/ DDD staff and Results Matter team.
4.16	2005-2010	Required Service Coordination Core Competencies Training will continue to provide training on understanding and communicating parental rights, communication strategies for families/ DDD staff and Training Cadre.
4.17	2005-2010	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.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2010

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

- In 2005, the former lead agency, CDE, disseminated a survey to all local Part C coordinators, early intervention directors of the CCBs, Child Find coordinators in administrative units, 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 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.
- DDD 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, contracted 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:

- A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and,
- B. National data.

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

Measurement:

- A. 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 the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions.
- B. 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 – i.e., school districts or Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES), a.k.a. local administrative units) and CCBs, as the local early intervention services programs, 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 the 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

**Colorado
State**

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 puts into state statute the defined roles of DDD, CDE, CCBs and local administrative units for the screening and evaluation of infants and toddlers who have been referred to the early intervention system.
- The eligible population information has been tracked in the statewide early intervention 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 .54% of all children in the system were between birth to one year of age upon entry. On December 1, 2005, .74% of children birth to one year old in the general population had IFSPs in the Colorado public system of early intervention services on one day in time.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The baseline was .74% of the population birth to one-year old infants in the early intervention system (moderate eligibility definition) on one day in time compared to with the national average of .99%; and compared to like states, such as Minnesota with .67% and Missouri with .41% identified. Colorado ranked seventh out of thirteen (7/13) of the like-definition states.

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. Early intervention 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, and also a state system change of referral procedures requiring all children in hospital settings be identified as eligible through Child Find offices, 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 .74% in FFY 2006 compared to the national rate of .95% and the rate of .89% of other states with a moderate eligibility definition. Comparable states, Minnesota and Missouri, had rates of .46% and .71% respectively.

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%

Colorado

State

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 early intervention 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	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.
5.10	2005-2007	Training on systems collaboration will be developed for HCP and local early intervention programs through early involvement of PHS staff in the IFSP process/ DDD staff and state Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) staff.
5.11	2008- 2010	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 noncompliance, and require POCs when noncompliance is identified/ DDD staff.
5.12	2008-2010	Materials 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.
5.13	2006-2010	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.
5.14	2005-2010	Public awareness materials will be developed or updated for general public, specific populations, in multiple media formats/ DDD staff and contract staff.
5.15	2005-2010	NICU project service coordination liaison staff will support early referral and development of initial IFSP and family involvement in NICU settings statewide/ Contract staff.

Colorado
State

5.16	2005-2010	Technical assistance to Child Find and early intervention referral systems on best practices will be provided for outreach to all populations, including child care providers, 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, Division of Child Welfare state staff, and contract staff.
------	-----------	--

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2010

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

- In 2005, the former lead agency, CDE, disseminated a survey to all local Part C coordinators, early intervention directors of the CCBs, Child Find coordinators in administrative units, 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.
- DDD staff 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:

- A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and,
- B. National data.

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

Measurement:

- A. 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 the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions.
- B. 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:

1.7% of the 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 (birth-3) population is identified to the early intervention 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 early intervention 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 early intervention. 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 (migrant families, undocumented families, monolingual/non-English speaking populations, transitory populations). The large metro

**Colorado
State**

counties, where identification rates were in the lower quartile, were targeted for support resulting in enhanced child identification activities by both early intervention 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.

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%
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%

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, Early Intervention and Early Care and Education System and disseminate best practices data statewide/ former lead agency (CDE) staff, CDHS/Child Welfare staff, and local early intervention 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 early intervention 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 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.

**Colorado
State**

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	2008-2010	Materials 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.
6.11	2008- 2010	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 noncompliance, and require POCs when noncompliance is identified/ DDD staff.
6.12	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.
6.13	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.
6.14	2006-2010	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.
6.15	2005-2010	Technical assistance to Child Find and early intervention referral systems on best practices will be provided for outreach to all populations, including 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, CDE and Division of Child Welfare staff, and contract staff.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2010

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

- In 2005, the former lead agency, CDE, surveyed local Part C coordinators, early intervention 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.
- 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 eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

- IFSP timeline data has been collected in the Part C database since mid-1990s.
- All IFSP data is collected and reported by each of the 20 CCB early intervention services program.
- In Colorado, Administrative Units (AUs) (i.e., local education agencies) are responsible for Child Find screening and evaluation, birth to 21. This responsibility is monitored under the requirements of Part B federal 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. 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.

Colorado State

- 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.

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 timeline 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.

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	2008-2010	DDD will develop a process for funding CCBs to reimburse private providers for team consultation and attendance at IFSP meetings/ DDD staff.
7.6	2008-2010	DDD will provide training and technical assistance to CCBs on appropriate identification of family vs. system reasons for delays/ DDD staff.
7.7	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.
7.8	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.
7.9	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.
7.10	2008-2010	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.
7.11	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, Training Cadre, and contract staff.
7.12	2007-2010	The state Early Intervention rules will be revised to incorporate changes to the Child Find legislation (CRS 27-10.5-140)/ DDD staff.
7.13	2006-2010	CCBs will develop and implement interagency operating agreements with their local AUs to ensure timely evaluations and assessments and initial IFSPs/ DDD staff, CCBs, and LICCs members.
7.14	2005-2010	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 Training Cadre.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2010

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

- In June 2005, the early intervention system, including AUs and local education agencies (LEAs), completed compliance requirements under a federal compliance plan for timely transitions for children exiting out of early intervention services at age three. Local early childhood systems (the local Part C coordinator, early intervention CCB 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 plan to assure compliance with IDEA transition requirements by June 2005, including notification, IFSP planning and timelines.
- DDD 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 = # of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services divided by # of children exiting Part C times 100.
- B. Percent = # of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred divided by the # of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B times 100.
- C. Percent = # of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred divided by the # of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

- The early intervention 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 early intervention 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 early intervention services (Part C) who are potentially eligible for Part B services early enough to begin effective planning. CCB service coordinators are responsible for initiating transition planning, writing 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

Colorado State

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 early intervention services (Part C) 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 (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 early intervention 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 field beginning Dec. 2, 2005.

C. June 2005 – Ninety-five percent (95%) of all children exiting early intervention services (Part C), 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 (1%) were due to systems issues and four (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 of the 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 the June 2005 deadline, three communities were under a one year Continuous Improvement Plan for transition processes. There were seven of the 32 of the former early intervention programs that 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 training and technical assistance materials and provided training statewide. Specific plans to address the issues were developed locally, steps taken and corrections were made to address the compliance issues. The early intervention 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, as the former lead agency, notified all former early intervention 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
2005 (2005-2006)	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.

Colorado State

<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.</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>2008 (2008-2009)</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>2009 (2009-2010)</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>2010 (2010-2011)</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>

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>
<p>8.2</p>	<p>2005</p>	<p>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.</p>
<p>8.3</p>	<p>2005</p>	<p>Regional topical meetings with follow up technical assistance on transition</p>

		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 Community Contract and Management System (CCMS) 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	2007-2008	DDD staff will collaborate with CDE to identify administrative units or local education agencies and CCBs that need state level technical assistance to meet transition requirements/ DDD staff and CDE staff.
8.7	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 early intervention service coordinators, early interventionists and community partners throughout the state/ DDD Staff, Training Cadre.
8.8	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.
8.9	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.
8.10	2007-2009	A parent handbook on transition will be developed and disseminated/ DDD staff, CICC, and contractors.
8.11	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.
8.12	2008-2010	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 noncompliance is identified/ DDD staff.
8.13	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.
8.14	2007- 2010	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.
8.15	2006-2010	Training on transition requirements will be continued for service coordinators in required Service Coordination Core Competencies Training/ DDD staff and Training Cadre.
8.16	2006-2010	CCBs will develop and implement interagency operating agreements with their local education agencies to ensure timely transitions for children exiting early intervention services and entering preschool services at age three/ DDD staff, local CCBs, and Local Interagency Coordinating Councils (LICCs).

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2010

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

- The focused monitoring system approach under the former lead agency, CDE, was developed over the FFY 2004-2005 year and involved input specifically from the CICC/MOU sub-committee.
- After July 2006, DDD 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.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

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 early intervention 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 early intervention 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

Colorado State

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 have been made in the public reporting and determination process for local programs. These revisions include 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 Local Interagency Coordinating Councils (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 local early intervention service programs (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; and
- Coordination of fiscal monitoring activities with the DDD Finance and Program Quality Sections.

Enforcement

One way in which DDD monitors each CCB is through a biannual onsite monitoring cycle. DDD conducts the onsite monitoring with additional staff and/or interagency and community partners. Agency records are reviewed and interviews with staff are completed to identify any findings of systemic noncompliance, including the agency's general supervision procedures. The onsite monitoring results in a report summarizing the overall findings including strengths and areas for improvement, identifies team members and describes the monitoring process. If systemic noncompliance is identified, a Plan of Correction (POC) accompanies the report.

For each area of noncompliance, a POC will list 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 is provided to the agency to guide them in identifying specific strategies and activities that need to be accomplished in order to achieve compliance. DDD staff is available to provide technical assistance in the development of strategies to address the concerns in a POC. Agencies who have pervasive or serious systemic problems will be required to access technical assistance and training by state staff to generate the strategies necessary to reach the benchmarks on their POC.

A CCB has 30 days to provide DDD with the proposed plan describing strategies to achieve the benchmarks outlined on the POC. After DDD approves 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:

Colorado State

- 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;
- Corrected Deficiencies: After a deficiency has been corrected, the CCB is notified in writing that it has been released from the POC for that deficiency; and
- Enforcement Actions: If a CCB does not timely correct noncompliance, DDD will apply 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 early intervention 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 valid, reliable, and timely, if noncompliance from other sources is corrected, and any audit findings.

Status determinations are made using the following four categories:

- *Meets Requirements*;
- *Needs Assistance*;
- *Needs Intervention*; and
- *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 Early Intervention Colorado website, www.eicolorado.org and is made available in printed format to the public and key stakeholders.

Former lead agency, CDE, Baseline Data for FFY 2003 Measurement:

- 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:

Colorado State

- 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 1 year

Onsite technical assistance was provided to the early intervention 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.

During FFY 2003, the Colorado comprehensive monitoring system reviewed child identification rates compared to statewide averages. Three of the four early intervention 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/early intervention 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:

- a. FFY 2003 - no programs were named in a complaint in which noncompliance was identified
- b. FFY 2003 - no findings of noncompliance were made
- c. FFY 2003 - the Part C system had one complaint with no findings; there were no corrections needed.

Former lead agency, CDE, Baseline Data for FFY 2004 Measurement:

A. Percent of noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas and 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

In 48% of Priority Areas monitored through comprehensive monitoring, there were local findings of noncompliance in FFY 2004. Of the early intervention 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

Colorado State

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:

- a. FFY 2004 - one complaint resulted in four findings of noncompliance
- b. FFY 2004 - four findings of noncompliance were corrected in less than one year from identification

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The former lead agency, CDE, annually monitored the local grant applications for Part C funds and submission of the former early intervention 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 early intervention 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 early intervention 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.

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 Plans of Correction (POC).

Due to the change in lead agency in July 2006, these plans were not monitored by CDE. Only two of the 32 former early intervention 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 now monitors all 20 CCBs on Indicators 1-8, Part C related requirements, and state early intervention rules on a two-year cycle for onsite surveys and annual analysis of data collected through 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.

Colorado State

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.

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	2007-2009	Technical assistance on community self-assessment strategies will be developed and provided to CCBs / DDD staff and contract staff.
9.10	2008-2010	DDD will reassign state staff to lead technical assistance activities with CCBs as needed/ DDD staff.
9.11	2008-2010	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 noncompliance is identified/ DDD staff.
9.12	2008-2010	DDD will reassign state staff and create the position of Plan of Correction

Colorado State

		Coordinator who will be responsible for tracking correction of noncompliance / DDD staff.
9.13	2008-2010	DDD will develop data queries that CCBs can use for self-assessment to monitor their progress in correcting noncompliance/ DDD staff.
9.14	2007-2010	DDD will annually disseminate a list of possible state enforcement actions for noncompliance extending beyond one year and apply appropriate enforcement actions / DDD staff.
9.15	2006-2010	The CCMSweb database will be utilized to measure all required state and federal data reports/ DDD staff.
9.16	2006-2010	DDD will continue to provide annual database trainings and ongoing technical assistance for local data managers / DDD staff.
9.17	2006-2010	DDD will ensure CCBs develop POCs that meet state requirements for areas of noncompliance identified through any monitoring activity/ DDD staff.
9.18	2006-2010	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.
9.19	2006-2010	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.
9.20	2005-2010	DDD will monitor all communities on all SPP priority areas through statewide database and follow up investigation/ DDD staff.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2010

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:

- The former lead agency, 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, as the new lead agency beginning July 2006, was following the former policies for mediation and complaint processes, but now follows the revised policies in the 2008 Early Intervention 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 early intervention 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.

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 early intervention 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	2008-2010	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	2008-2010	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 early intervention system in the state and at each point notice of rights is required/ DDD staff.
10.8	2005-2010	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 Training Cadre.

Colorado State

10.9	2005-2010	All complaint investigations will be conducted within the timeline required and reports of findings as defined in IDEA will be issued/ DDD staff and complaint officer.
------	-----------	---

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2010

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:

- The former lead agency, 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, as the new lead agency beginning July 2006, was following the former policies for due process hearing requests, but now follows the revised policies in the 2008 Early Intervention 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 early intervention 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.

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	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.
11.4	2005-2007	The "Welcome Packet" will be provided to all families entering the early intervention system in the state that includes a copy of their rights under IDEA, including their right to due process/ DDD staff.
11.5	2006-2008	Provide parent training regionally and disseminate materials statewide/ DDD staff, Training Cadre, PEAK Parent Center, and contract staff.
11.6	2006-2008	Provide parent training regionally, including trainings in Spanish, and disseminate materials statewide/ DDD staff, PEAK Parent Center, and contract staff.
11.7	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.
11.8	2008-2010	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 early intervention system in the state and at each point notice of rights is required/ DDD staff.
11.9	2006-2010	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 the right to due process and follow-up by programs on their plans/strategies/ DDD staff.
11.10	2005-2010	The Service Coordination Core Competencies Training will continue to be provided

Colorado State

		two-three times annually, including service coordinator responsibilities for informing parents of their rights under IDEA, including the complaint process/ DDD staff and Training Cadre.
--	--	---

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2010

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:

- The former lead agency, 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, as the new lead agency beginning July 2006, was following the former policies for due process hearing requests, but now follows the revised policies in the 2008 Early Intervention 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)	
2007 (2007-2008)	
2008 (2008-2009)	
2009 (2009-2010)	

Colorado State

2010 (2010-2011)	
---------------------	--

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Not applicable.

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for FFY 2005-2010

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:

- The former lead agency, 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, as the new lead agency beginning July 2006, was following the former policies for mediation, but now follows the revised policies in the 2008 Early Intervention 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 early intervention 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)	

Colorado State

2007 (2007-2008)	
2008 (2008-2009)	
2009 (2009-20 10)	
2010 (2010-2011)	

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 2005-2010

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, including race and ethnicity, settings and November 1 for exiting and dispute resolution); and,
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring accuracy).

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 new Community Contract and Management System (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 has been 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. 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 will be documented and distributed to data providers and posted on the website by late Spring 2008.

Colorado State

- 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. DDD is developing reports that will electronically identify changes in count data of 10% or more for those programs whose numbers are large enough to make use of this percentage. When large variances are identified in local data submissions, the data provider for the area will be contacted to discuss the changes and determine whether the data is valid and reliable and not the result of data entry errors. 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 (small data set, etc.) are clearly explained on publicly reported documents.
- 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 go into 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 on-site 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 all year, 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 eleven 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 in February 2006, 2007, and 2008. 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 uses the Indicator 14 Rubric to report on all elements of this indicator.

Colorado State

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.

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	2008-2010	The CCMSweb Early Intervention Instruction Manual will be revised to include procedures for data entry, management, reporting timelines, confidentiality, validity and reliability, and back up safety/ DDD staff.
14.7	2007-2010	Annual CCMSweb database training on updates to the CCMSweb Early Intervention Instruction Manual will be conducted to assure local data managers have the most updated information for completing the database/ DDD staff.
14.8	2007-2010	DDD will participate with interagency partners in data mapping activities to coordinate data collection throughout the state/ DDD staff and interagency partners.

Colorado State

14.9	2007-2010	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.
14.10	2005-2010	DDD staff will participate in annual OSEP/DAC Part C data trainings and OSEP Annual Meetings on APR and SPP/ DDD staff.
14.11	2005-2010	DDD staff will utilize DAC website and listserv for updated information on Section 618 reporting requirements/ DDD staff.
14.12	2005-2010	DDD staff will review and/or revise and explain changes to Section 618 Tables as requested by DAC staff annually or as needed/ DDD staff.
14.13	2005-2010	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 and contract staff.
14.14	2005-2010	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.