

# Utah



Individuals with Disabilities Education Act 2004

## Part C Annual Performance Report

2005-2006

# Annual Performance Report Overview

Utah's Part C State 2005 Annual Performance Plan was developed in accordance with OSEP requirements. The initial development of the APR began with the review of the Utah's State Performance Plan, and the consideration of each component through the use of OSEP provided materials. Baby Watch Early Intervention (BWEI) staff members reviewed all indicators and determined an action plan.

Broad stakeholder involvement was sought for reporting on all indicators. A report and discussion on outcome measures for indicators 4,5 and 6 were presented to the Provider Consortium on September 15, 2006. BWEI staff presented an overview of the APR requirements and preliminary measures at the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) meeting and BWEI Provider Consortium meetings on November 17, 2005. ICC members, BWEI providers, parents and community partners were invited to join a work group for the 2005 APR. The committee met to discuss improvement strategies and/or setting measurable and rigorous targets for indicators 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. State staff drafted SPP/APR and sent it to the committee for revisions.

BWEI staff participated in monthly OSEP TA calls and utilized guidance documents and tools such as the indicator check list, ECO Center outcomes template and the NCSEAM calculator. A Part C state staff member attended the National Accountability Conference, September 18 – 19, 2006 in Denver, Colorado. During the conference, revisions to SPP/APR measurement requirements, and instructional materials were received.

A revised draft was sent to the ICC in advance of discussion and approval on January 19, 2007. The ICC will distribute the 2005 APR to its members, which include representatives from 11 public agencies. The 2005 APR will also be distributed to all early intervention provider agencies and state advocacy groups. The amended State Performance Plan, the 2005 Annual Performance Report have been posted to the BWEI website, [www.utahbabywatch.org](http://www.utahbabywatch.org) and local program profiles of indicators 1 – 8 will be posted to the BWEI website by March, 2007. The BWEI Program will work with the Department of Health, Public Information Officer to distribute the 2005 APR to the media as appropriate.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:

Refer to Overview of Annual Performance Plan preceding this document.

**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 times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	In 100% of files reviewed in 8* contracted early intervention programs, infants and toddlers with IFSPs will receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

\* SPP incorrectly reported the number of EI programs scheduled for file review in 2005-2006, based on 18-month monitoring cycle. The correct number is 8 programs, rather than 9.

**Actual Target Data for 2005:**

Data from file reviews: in 98% of files reviewed in 8\* contracted early intervention programs, infants and toddlers received the EI services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005:**

Data demonstrates improvement from baseline of 92% of files reviewed in FY 2004 to 98%.

**Improvement Activities Completed, contributing to progress:**

July 2005 – June 2006: BWEI completed file reviews in 8\* EI programs during this period.

Number of applicable files reviewed: 88

Number of files in compliance: 86

Percentage of files in compliance: 98%

Number of Programs in compliance: 8

October 2005: BWEI and EI program directors developed definition of Timely Services for Indicator 1 of SPP.

November 2005: BWEI trained local EI program directors on definition of Timely Services.

## APR Template – Part C (4)

UT  
State

December 2005: Timely Services indicator added to state file review protocol. Eight BWEI programs were monitored during FY 2005-2006, all found in compliance for this indicator.

July 2005 - January 2006: BTOTS data system installed in all EI programs. Programs began entering service visit data into BTOTS, IFSP Missed Services Report to capture all services not provided and reasons.

June 2006: BTOTS monitoring report for Timely Initial Services developed.

July 2005 – June 2006: IFSP training was provided for 50 early intervention providers.

### **Resolution of previously identified noncompliance:**

July 2005 – June 2006: State Performance Plan (SPP) reported that noncompliance was identified in 4 programs in 2004-2005. BWEI conducted technical assistance visits and/or BTOTS review in the 4 identified programs to follow up on Improvement Plans and determine if noncompliance identified in 2004-2005 was resolved.

In Program one, a follow up visit was conducted in April 2006. Of 15 files reviewed, 14 were timely with 1 delay due to family circumstances. Additional review of BTOTS data indicated a compliance rate of 98%. BWEI concludes noncompliance has been resolved.

Program two had an 86% compliance rate during a May 2005 file review and received a follow up TA visit on June 14, 2006. BTOTS Timely Services Report for 1/1/06 – 6/30/06: 87 initial services on IFSPs, 83 were timely, 4 not timely (95% in compliance). BWEI concludes noncompliance resolved.

In a third program, BTOTS Timely Initial Services report for 1/1/06-6/30/06: 216 initial services on IFSPs, 214 were timely, 2 late (99% in compliance). BWEI concludes noncompliance resolved.

In the fourth program, of 7 files reviewed 5 were on time and 2 were late due to family circumstances. BWEI concludes noncompliance resolved.

Resolution of noncompliance identified during FFY 2003-2004: In the 2003-2004 Annual Performance Report (APR), BWEI reported that noncompliance with IFSP service delivery was identified in 9 of 15 programs monitored, and that nine programs developed and implemented Improvement Plans. At the time the 2003-2004 APR was submitted, 4 of the 9 programs had resolved compliance. Through file reviews and TA visits conducted in FY 2005, BWEI determined that noncompliance in this area was resolved in 3 additional programs. The remaining 2 programs demonstrated improvement, but not full compliance, and continued Improvement Planning efforts. File review of one program in August 2006 demonstrated resolution of the outstanding noncompliance. In the other program, files reviewed in September 2006 showed nearly full compliance. Follow up TA visit in January 2007 demonstrated resolution of noncompliance.

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006**

Activity	Timeline	Resources
1. BWEI will monitor programs for compliance with this indicator. When noncompliance is identified, BWEI TA staff will work with program to determine nature of noncompliance, develop and implement Improvement Plan or Corrective Action. (Based on	7/06 –6/07	BWEI Compliance Coordinator, TA staff, EI program managers and staff

## APR Template – Part C (4)

UT  
State

18-month monitoring cycle, 7 programs will be monitored for FY 2006).		
2. Continue development of BTOTS reports for this indicator.	Ongoing	BWEI staff

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Refer to Overview of Annual Performance Plan preceding this document.

**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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	75.5 percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.

**Actual Target Data for 2005:**

77.9% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs primarily received early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.

Source: Table 2: Report of Program Setting Where Early Intervention Services are Provided to Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities and Their Families in Accordance With Part C, December 1, 2005.

Number receiving services primarily in the home: 2033

Number receiving services primarily in a program for typically developing children: 56

Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs: 2682

$[(2033 + 56) / 2682] \times 100 = 77.9\%$

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005:**

**Explanation of progress:** Exceeded target (of 75.5%) for FY 2005. *(Also exceeded targets for FY 2006-2009.)* This may be attributed to provider training by the BWEI data manager (refer to activities completed and listed below), and a change in method for reporting the 618 data. In FFY 2005, the data were compiled using BTOTS, the new statewide Part C data system. BTOTS uses the IFSP service, settings, frequency, and duration data entered by providers to calculate primary setting. In previous years, providers determined the primary setting and reported this to the BWEI data manager. The 2005-2006 data may be more accurate than the previous data.

**Improvement Activities Completed, Contributing to Progress:**

June 2005 –July 2006: BWEI conducted file reviews for 8 programs during this period.

Number of files reviewed: 117

Number and percentage receiving all services in the home: 75 (64.1%)

Number and percentage receiving services in the home and EI center: 30 (25.6%)

Number and percentage receiving services in the home and parent training groups: 10 (8.6%)

Number and percentage receiving services in the home and community: 1 (0.9%)

Number receiving services in center only: 1 (0.9)

Number of Programs in compliance with regulations regarding Natural Environments: 7  
(compliance maintained in 4 programs and previously identified noncompliance was resolved in 3 programs).

Number of programs with newly identified noncompliance, developed Improvement Plan: 1.

Conclusion: in 99.1% of files reviewed, child receives part or all IFSP services in the home. Most of those receiving services in the center are 2-year-olds preparing for transition.

July 2005 – June 2006: All EI programs submitted applications with appropriate policies and procedures for serving children in the natural environment.

July 2005 – June 2006: BWEI works with EI providers individually to continue to identify appropriate community settings and programs for typically developing children in which to deliver EI services.

January 2006: BTOTS installed in all contracted programs.

July 2006 – March 2006: BWEI Research Analyst and TA staff trained staff in all contracted EI programs at the time of installation.

December 2005: BWEI Data Manager sent memo to providers clarifying setting definitions and requiring providers to verify accuracy of BTOTS data.

March 2006: BWEI provided training on settings definitions at BTOTS Users Group (BUG) meeting.

April 2006: 'Community' added to BTOTS as option for service location.

### **Resolution of previously identified noncompliance:**

Noncompliance was identified in 4 programs in FFY 2003-2004. Monitoring from 2004-2005 demonstrated resolution of noncompliance in 3 programs. In the fourth, 2004-2005 monitoring demonstrated improvement, but not full compliance, for this indicator. Follow-up on-site review in September 2005 demonstrated full compliance for this indicator in this program.

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006**

Proposed targets for FFY 2006-2009 will not be revised upward because changes in the 618 settings data starting in FY 2006 will result in new baseline data and proposed targets will be revised based on that data.

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

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

Refer to Overview of State Performance Plan preceding this document.

<b>Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments</b>
---

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

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

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

<b>Measurement:</b>
---------------------

- |  |
|--|
| <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.</li> <li>b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.</li> <li>c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.</li> <li>d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.</li> <li>e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.</li> </ul> <p>If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.</li> <li>b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.</li> <li>c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.</li> <li>d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to</li> </ul> |
|--|



same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

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

A broad stakeholder committee was formed to focus on responding to the Part C SPP child outcomes indicator. The committee included all Part C staff, local early intervention providers, members of the ICC and parents. It was determined that Utah would report on all infants and toddlers rather than a sample. A baseline of entry-level data will be collected on a cohort of children entering the program from July 1, 2006 until October 30, 2006. Exit data will be reported in the February 2008 APR from this same cohort. After October 2006, all children coming into the program will be included in baseline entry data. Every subsequent year BWEI will report on entry and exit data for all children in the system.

Local early intervention providers will record age equivalent scores from assessments and evaluations in all developmental domains in connection with regularly occurring IFSP development times—the initial IFSP, the 6-month IFSP review, and annual IFSP. Data will be entered into the new Part C database, called the Baby and Toddler Online Tracking System (BTOTS). Entry and exit scores will be compared on children who have been enrolled in the program for at least 6 months. When the child exits early intervention services, the most recent age equivalent scores will be compared to entry scores to determine improvement of functioning for infants and toddlers served in early intervention for at least 6 months. Collecting data every six months assures that recent exit data is available for children who leave for various reasons before their IFSP is completed. If available, evaluations completed by Part B up to 1 month following transition at age three can be used for the exit data measurement.

Any norm referenced or criterion based assessment/evaluation used by the local early intervention provider will be acceptable if an age equivalent score by developmental domain is obtainable. Results

of testing in the Social Emotional domain will determine progress for Measurement A concerning social emotional skills. Results of testing in the Cognitive and Communication domains will determine progress for Measurement B concerning acquisition and use of knowledge and skills. Results of testing in Adaptive and Motor domains will determine progress for Measurement C concerning appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

When a test yields age ranges such as 11-14 months, the midpoint will be calculated, such as 12.5 months. Discussions about determining age equivalent scores using the Hawaii Early Learning Profile (HELP) resulted in a recommendation to provide guidelines to providers so that results would be consistently determined across the state. A guideline will be developed to assist providers using the HELP to gather age equivalency information.

The current state program eligibility definition, as applied for exiting a child from early intervention services,  $-1.0$  SD below the mean or better or the 16<sup>th</sup> percentile or above in all areas of development, will be the criteria used to compare the “Percent of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers”.

BTOTS, the Part C data system will be used to analyze the data regarding age equivalents from one time period to the next and determine percentage of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers, who improved functioning, and who did not improve functioning for those children who received early intervention services for at least 6 months.

July 2005 - January 2006: BTOTS, statewide data system, installed in all EI programs. Data and program staff in all programs received comprehensive training on the system by BWEI IT and Technical Assistance staff.

January – March 2006: BTOTS was enhanced to collect age equivalence data and be able to determine #1, 2, 3 in A, B, and C measurement areas for each child who received early intervention services.

March – June 2006: BTOTS 1.2 enhanced version was installed at all provider sites.

July – December 2006: Age equivalency data at enrollment was collected and entered into BTOTS for all children referred after June 30, 2006.

August – October 2006: Verification that local programs were entering the age equivalency data into BTOTS.

November – December 2006: Verification of accuracy of age equivalency data into BTOTS.

### **Baseline Data for FFY 2005:**

Status at entry data on each of the three outcome areas for 916 children that entered EI from 7/1/06 –10/31/06.

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);  
72.53% of children (660) functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers and  
27.47% of children (250) functioning at a level below same-aged peers
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and  
18.56% of children (170) functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers, and  
81.44% of children (746) functioning at a level below same-aged peers
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.  
40.72% of children (373) functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers, and  
59.28% of children (543) functioning at a level below same-aged peers

### Discussion of Baseline Data:

To determine whether a child's functioning was comparable to same-aged peers for the FFY 2005 Baseline Data, the significance of delay associated with each developmental domain on the initial assessment was used. The total number of children for which child outcomes was calculated was based on the total number of children who entered early intervention services from 7/1/06 through 10/31/06. If a child had multiple assessments during this time period, whether it were due to a reactivation, inconclusive results during initial testing, etc., the most recent assessment results were selected to calculate the child's level of functioning at entry. A "not significant" delay corresponded to functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers, while "mild," "moderate," and "severe" delays were equated with functioning at a level below same-aged peers. Developmental domains were mapped as follows to the three child outcome Indicators: Indicator A, Social/Emotional domain; Indicator B, Cognitive, Expressive Language, and Receptive Language domains; and Indicator C, Adaptive, Gross Motor, Fine Motor domains. For Indicators B and C that included multiple domains, the child's level of functioning for the indicator equaled to the lowest level of functioning across the domains for that indicator. If the significance of delay could not be determined, then it was not used in the computation.

Issues Identified with Baseline Data. BWEI is currently in the process of exploring the viability of a mathematical model to respond to the 5 child outcome reporting categories in the next APR, due February 2008. The BWEI Research Analyst and Data Analyst, along with IT staff, have developed an approach to measure status at entry using age equivalent scores, as described in the "Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process." BWEI staff has also been evaluating the psychometric viability of the model. At this point, it appears likely that the methodology described in the Overview will not yield results as originally anticipated and that BWEI may need to consider an alternative strategy to measure child outcomes. A number of factors have contributed to this conclusion. First, the number of reporting categories has changed from 3 to 5 since BWEI proposed their measurement system in the SPP submitted December 2005. This increase has made the original algorithm to measure results on 3 levels defunct and invalid. Further, the change has necessitated the development of a new approach and algorithm, the complexity of which has increased significantly with the need to delineate between more reporting categories. Additionally, since hiring a Data Analyst in October 2006, BWEI has had additional technical expertise and skills on staff to investigate and evaluate a more in-depth manner the previously proposed measurement system. This scrutiny has brought to light the limitations of the initial approach that were not recognized in 2005.

These very recent findings suggest that BWEI will need to work again with its stakeholders to identify and adopt an alternate method for gathering meaningful data to measure and report child outcomes. One of the alternatives currently under consideration is the ECO Center's Child Outcome Summary Form (COSF), which is also being used with Utah's 619 programs. BWEI staff will be meeting with Part B staff to learn about their experiences with the COSF and explore ways of collaborating and sharing transition data. In addition, BWEI will be consulting with the BTOTS software engineer and local providers to ascertain the impact of changing measurement approaches on BTOTS and data collection.

# SPP Template – Part C (3)

UT  
State

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p><b>2005</b> (2005-2006)</p>	<p>Preparing to collect baseline data.</p>
<p><b>2006</b> (2006-2007)</p>	<p>Report baseline data for infants and toddlers entering Part C 7/1/06-10/31/06</p>
<p><b>2007</b> (2007-2008)</p>	<p>Analysis of baseline data to determine exit targets for the percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</li> <li>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and</li> <li>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</li> </ul> <p>Expand cohort to all children entering Part C.</p>
<p><b>2008</b> (2008-2009)</p>	<p>Make necessary adjustments.</p>
<p><b>2009</b> (2009-2010)</p>	<p>Make necessary adjustments.</p>
<p><b>2010</b> (2010-2011)</p>	<p>Make necessary adjustment.</p>

## SPP Template – Part C (3)

UT  
State

### Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activity	Timeline	Results
1. Develop guideline for determining age equivalency from HELP checklist.	ongoing	BWEI providers and staff
2. Update conversion chart.	6/07	BWEI providers
3. Install new Part C database (BTOTS) at all 15 provider sites.	11/05-2/06	IT contractor, BWEI staff
4. Enhance BTOTS to collect age equivalent data and be able to determine #1, 2, 3 in A, B, and C measurement areas for each child who received early intervention services for 6 months.	4/06	Completed 3/06 - IT contractor, BWEI staff
5. Install new version of BTOTS at all 15 provider sites. Train providers and provide TA.	5/06	IT contractor, BWEI staff
6. Early intervention providers will enter data.	6/06	BWEI providers
7. Baby Watch Early Intervention staff will review data entry system and provide necessary T/A for providers.	8/06	BWEI staff
8. Baby Watch Early Intervention staff will analyze baseline data.	12/06 – 1/07	BWEI staff
9. Develop a system to respond to the 5 reporting categories in the APR due February 2008.	ongoing	BWEI staff and providers
10. Test reporting system	ongoing	BWEI staff and providers

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

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

Refer to Overview of State Performance Plan preceding this document.

**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:**

**State Activities:**

Following each program file review, Baby Watch staff surveyed parents on their participation in, and satisfaction with, the early intervention program. Results of telephone interviews demonstrated 35 of 38 families randomly selected from file review expressed satisfaction with services and service providers. All responses were positive in 5 of 7 programs reviewed.

A Parent Rights Handbook in English and Spanish is continually reviewed and updated, and distributed to local programs.

Baby Watch encourages parent participation on the Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) by supporting the activities of the Parent Committee. These activities include providing information and resources to parent leaders in local programs through monthly phone conference calls, support of an internet bulletin board and collaboration with the parent training agency on mentorship training for parents.

**Local Program Activities:**

The Program Application includes a family involvement plan that is reviewed yearly by the Part C technical assistance staff. All new staff participates in the "Family Partnerships" credentialing workshop to ensure that family involvement is infused in all early intervention services. Local programs identify a staff member who is responsible for family participation and who acts as a liaison between the ICC Parent Committee and Baby Watch parent support staff.

All programs have developed a policy to ensure that parents have received and understand their rights under Part C.

## **New Activities:**

Families participating in Part C will be surveyed annually to determine if they perceive that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights, effectively communicate their children's needs and help their children develop and learn. Sampling will not be used. All families in early intervention will be surveyed annually during a six-week window from March to April. Demographic data and program coding from the surveys returned will be evaluated to determine if the returned surveys are representative of the statewide population of infants and toddlers participating in Part C.

Baby Watch will use a paper and pencil version of the NCSEAM Family Survey. The survey will provide data for the family outcomes indicator and will provide family input for state monitoring. Each survey distributed will be identifiable to the local program level.

Local early intervention programs will hand deliver or mail surveys with a self-addressed stamped envelope to each family in early March. Families will be instructed to mail the surveys to the state Baby Watch Program by mid-April. All surveys received by May 15 will be included in the data compilation. Each survey will be accompanied by information on confidentiality and obtaining language assistance. Local program staff will arrange assistance or interpretation services as needed. Baby Watch will be responsible for the interpretation and reporting of the data at the federal, state, and local program levels.

## **Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):**

- A. 74% of respondent families participating in Part C report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights.
- B. 71% of respondent families participating in Part C report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs.
- C. 79% of respondent families participating in Part C report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn.

## **Discussion of Baseline Data:**

BWEIP sent surveys to 2,379 EI families, 605 were completed and returned, or a response rate of 25.4%. The majority were mailed directly from the contractor. One program had service providers hand deliver the surveys. This program had a very small number returned. Spanish speaking families scored higher than English speaking families on all three measures. Survey results showed very little variation between child's age at referral and age at time of survey. Return rates varied greatly throughout the state and seemed not to have any clear pattern of program type, size or location.

Stakeholders met in December 2006 and January 2007 to determine additional improvement activities (10 – 18) detailed below. During the December 2006 meeting the targets for FY 2006 – 2011 were established using the NCSEAM calculator tool.

# SPP Template – Part C (3)

UT  
State

## Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources

Activity	Timeline	Results / Resources
1. Convene Family Outcomes Stakeholder group.	9/05 - ongoing	Part C families, ICC, EI providers determined that a Utah version of the NCSEAM family survey would be given to all to part C Utah families each spring. Each EI provider would determine how the surveys would be conducted. The group met and developed a Utah specific NCSEAM survey tool with local program logos.
2. Research survey/data package options.	11/05	BWEI staff researched survey contractor options.
3. Order survey/data package.	12/05	BWEI staff developed a sole source contract for AVATAR.
4. Collect survey distribution plan from each local EI programs.	1/06	BWEI collected and documented survey distribution plan from each EI provider for their annual application.
5. Distribute surveys to programs.	2/06	BWEI provided the contractor with family address or program delivery information accordingly.
6. Deliver surveys with instructions to all families participating in part C.	3/06 – 5/6	Direct mail from contractor  Local EI programs
7. Families return surveys to state Baby Watch	6/06	Part C families returned completed surveys via postage paid return mail to the contractor.
8. Data analyzed	9/06  12/06	Contractor provided BWEI preliminary data.  Contractor provided final report to BWEI
9. Reports to local programs	10/06	BWEI reported statewide and individual information to EI providers.  Statewide data was presented to the ICC 11/06.
10. Convene stakeholder group to determine improvement activities and targets	November annually	BWEI
11. APR FYY 2005 baseline to OSEP	2/1/07	BWEI



### SPP Template – Part C (3)

UT  
State

12. Report to public. Post local survey results BWEI website.	April annually	BWEI
13. EI programs will work to increase the number of surveys returned.	1/07 – 5/07	BWEI and EI programs
14. All EI programs will strengthen pre-survey announcements.	By 2/28/07	BWEI and EI programs
15. Additional parent surveys will be staggered or combined.	Ongoing	EI programs
16. Training on parent’s rights and strategies for awareness will be strengthened.	Ongoing	BWEI CSPD Family Partnership Module
17. Service providers will increase the awareness of parent’s rights to families.	Ongoing	EI program managers
18. Further analyses of responses by program type.	11/07	BWEI and EI programs

# SPP Template – Part C (3)

UT  
State

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p><b>2006</b> (2006-2007)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. 75% of respondent families participating in Part C will report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights.</li> <li>B. 72% of respondent families participating in Part C will report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs.</li> <li>C. 79.5% of respondent families participating in Part C will report that early intervention services have helped the family help their child develop and learn.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2007</b> (2007-2008)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. 76% of respondent families participating in Part C will report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights.</li> <li>B. 73% of respondent families participating in Part C will report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs.</li> <li>C. 80% of respondent families participating in Part C will report that early intervention services have helped the family help their child develop and learn.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2008</b> (2008-2009)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. 77% of respondent families participating in Part C will report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights.</li> <li>B. 74% of respondent families participating in Part C will report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs.</li> <li>C. 80.5% of respondent families participating in Part C will report that early intervention services have helped the family help their child develop and learn.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2009</b> (2009-2010)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. 78% of respondent families participating in Part C will report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights.</li> <li>B. 75% of respondent families participating in Part C will report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs.</li> <li>C. 81% of respondent families participating in Part C will report that early intervention services have helped the family help their child develop and learn</li> </ul>
<p><b>2010</b> (2010-2011)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. 79% of respondent families participating in Part C will report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights.</li> <li>B. 76% of respondent families participating in Part C will report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs.</li> <li>C. 81.5% of respondent families participating in Part C will report that early intervention services have helped the family help their child develop and learn</li> </ul>

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Refer to Overview of Annual Performance Plan preceding this document.

**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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2005</b> (2005-2006)	Baby Watch Early Intervention programs will serve (with IFSP) 0.78% of infants in Utah.

**Actual Target Data for 2005:**

Baby Watch Early Intervention programs served 0.66% of infants in Utah on December 1, 2005.

(Source: Table 1. Report of Infants and Toddlers Receiving Early Intervention Services in Accordance with Part C. December 1, 2005, Utah.) Revised Table 1 was submitted to OSEP on June Table 1 included 320 infants with IFSP as of December 1, 2005.

Table below compares percentage of infants with IFSPs in Utah with other states with narrow eligibility criteria (A), and national average (B), in descending order.

**Percentage of Infant Population Served December 1, 2005,  
States with Narrow Eligibility Criteria**

State	Percentage of population under age 1 with IFSP
Idaho	1.75
North Dakota	1.58
Oklahoma	1.35

Montana	1.33
District of Columbia	1.23
<b>National baseline</b>	<b>0.95</b>
Connecticut	0.93
South Carolina	0.78
Oregon	0.74
Tennessee	0.73
<b>Utah</b>	<b>0.66</b>
Maine	0.65
Nebraska	0.64
Arizona	0.59
Georgia	0.48
Nevada	0.47

Source: DANS Table 8-4: Infants under 1 year of age (excluding infants at risk) receiving early intervention services under IDEA, part C, by age, and state (in descending order of percent of population): 2005.

DANS Table 8-3c was used to identify other states with narrow eligibility criteria.

- A. Compared to other states with narrow eligibility criteria, Utah ranks lower than 9 states and higher than 5 states.
- B. Utah serves 0.29% less than the national baseline in percentage of infants with IFSP (excluding infants at risk, 0.66% and 0.99%, respectively).

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005:**

Target not met.

**Explanation of slippage:**

Trend data show a decline in the number and percentage of infants served by BWEI programs since 2000. (exception Dec. 1, 2004)

Reporting date	# infants served	% infants served*
December 1, 2000	423	0.92%
December 1, 2001	426	0.90%
December 1, 2002	371	0.78%
December 1, 2003	341	0.73%

# APR Template – Part C (4)

UT  
State

December 1, 2004	360**	0.76%
December 1, 2005	320***	0.66%

\* Source: for 2000-2003 data, OSEP/Westat Part C/B State Data Profiles 2005.

For 2004-2005 data, DANS Table 8-4.

\*\* Revised Table 1 submitted to OSEP and Westat 10/20/2005

\*\*\* Revised Table 1 submitted to OSEP and Westat 6/30/2006.

The decline in number and percentage served from 2001-2003 is most likely associated with a change in eligibility criteria in 2003, which excludes premature infants at risk. According to the DANS Table 8-3c, Utah moved from “moderate” eligibility criteria in 2004 to “narrow” eligibility criteria in 2005.

Utah is a growth state, with the highest birth rate and highest fertility rate of all states. With a rapidly growing population of infants, EI programs must continue to grow in numbers just to maintain a consistent percentage of population served.

Recognizing that the percentage of infants served continued to decline in 2005, BWEI applied for and received a State Analysis Grant from Westat in March 2006. The goals of the grant were: 1) to determine the percentage of infants and toddlers with IFSPs being served at the local program level; and 2) to examine factors related to differences in the percentage of infants and toddlers with IFSPs being served at the local program level. This is the first time BWEI has examined percentage served at the local level. Results were presented to EI programs in October 2006, and final report submitted to Westat November 30, 2006. Results demonstrate a difference in percentage served at the local level, with a few low performing programs. BWEI will use this information to work individually with contracting EI programs to examine the strengths and weaknesses of the Child Find efforts, and establish targeted strategies toward improving performance, where indicated.

Preliminary child count data for December 1, 2006 show an increase in number of infants served (351).

### **Improvement Activities Completed**

July 2005 - June 2006: Child Find and Public Awareness activity data was collected from local E.I. program applications in order to identify successful strategies and identify local program gaps in outreach for infants birth to one.

July 2005 – June 2006: The Community Partnership Specialist provided technical assistance to all programs on Child Find policies and procedures.

July 2005 - April 2006: The Community Partnership Specialist, Medicaid and Utah State University, developed and conducted trainings to all local early intervention programs on the On-line Application System – Utah Clicks.

April 2006 – June 2006: All local early intervention programs are active on the Utah Clicks System. 26 online referrals were submitted during the time period.

July 2005 – February 2006: Developed and signed a memo of agreement between DCFS and Early Intervention to adhere to CAPTA and IDEA federal regulations.

July 2005 – February 2006: Early Intervention and DCFS staff developed a training manual for use in the field to train Child Protective Workers and local Early Intervention Programs on the early screening and referral process. A video was developed to demonstrate the screening process.

March 2006 – June 2006: Trained all Child Protective Workers and local Early Intervention Programs throughout the state on the screening and referral process. This training assisted in building relationships between the two agencies at the local as well as state level.

July 2005 - Dec 2006: The Baby Watch Calendar focused on outreach to ethnic populations incorporating parent stories in English, Spanish and French as well as information in Navajo and Ute. This calendar was included in new parent packets at Neonatal Intensive Care Units in 2 of the major hospitals.

July 2005 – June 2006: The BWEIP nurse developed a model for local programs to meet with the families of premature infants and coordinate with the hospital staff in the Newborn Intensive Care Units. This model is currently being implemented in four urban and one rural hospital.

July 2005 – January 2006: An ICC committee, including pediatricians and therapists, developed the Early Intervention Screening Module for the Utah Medical Home Web Site.

### **Monitoring Activities completed:**

#### 1. Program Applications

July 2005-June 2006: The BWEI Community Partnerships Specialist reviewed all Program Applications and determined that all include appropriate policies and procedures for Child Find.

#### 2. File reviews determining compliance with statewide eligibility criteria.

July 2005 – June 30, 2006. BWEI staff conducted compliance file reviews in 8 contracted EI programs during FFY 2005. The programs were monitored for compliance with referral and statewide eligibility procedures.

Number of files reviewed: 117 eligible and 28 ineligible files

Number of files in compliance: 109 eligible files (93%) and 24 ineligible files (86%)

Number of programs in compliance: 5 (4 resolved previously identified noncompliance, 1 maintained compliance)

Noncompliance identified:

- 1 program resolved previous noncompliance for eligible files and had newly identified noncompliance for ineligible files. Program developed and implemented Improvement Plan. Follow up visit to this program in December 2006 demonstrated resolution of noncompliance (10 files).
- 2 programs had newly identified noncompliance for eligible files. Programs developed and implemented Improvement Plans. Follow up visit to one program in October 2006 demonstrated resolution of noncompliance; follow up visit to one program is scheduled for March 2007.

### **Resolution of previously identified noncompliance:**

- Noncompliance in the area of eligibility determination was identified in one program during FFY 2004. This program developed a Corrective Action Plan and provided data to BWEI demonstrating resolution of noncompliance, effective October 2005.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006**

Activity	Timeline	Resources
1. BWEI staff will utilize results of State Analysis Grant to establish targeted intervention to low performing programs. Low performing programs will develop strategies and action plans to increase percentage of infants served.	3/07 – 6/07	Local EI programs and BWEI staff.
2. Form a joint ICC, State, Provider committee to develop a plan to increase awareness of early intervention for infants birth to 1.	3/07	ICC, Local EI programs and BWEI staff.
3. Work with BTOTS Users Group to standardize BTOTS data on referral sources.	4/07	BWEI staff, BTOTS users group.
4. Form a finance committee to monitor budget requests, service costs, Medicaid funding, private insurance and alternate funding streams.	11/06	Stakeholders
5. BWEI will monitor programs for compliance with this indicator. When noncompliance is identified, BWEI TA staff will work with program to determine nature of noncompliance, develop and implement Improvement Plan or Corrective Action. (As described for Indicator 9).	ongoing	BWEI Compliance Coordinator, TA staff, EI program managers and staff
6. Investigate funding sources to conduct additional analyses of factors related to differences in percentage served at local level.	ongoing	BWEI and other EI staff

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Refer to Overview of Annual Performance Plan preceding this document.

**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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p><b>2005</b> (2005-2006)</p>	<p>Baby Watch Early Intervention Programs will serve (with IFSP) 1.8% of infants and toddlers through age 2 in Utah.</p>

**Actual Target Data for 2005:**

Baby Watch Early Intervention programs served 1.9% of infants and toddlers through age 2 in Utah on December 1, 2005.

(Source: Table 1. Report of Infants and Toddlers Receiving Early Intervention Services in Accordance with Part C. December 1, 2005, Utah.) Table 1 included 2682 infants and toddlers with IFSP as of December 1, 2005.

Table below compares percentage of infants and toddlers with IFSPs in Utah with other states with moderate eligibility criteria, and national average (in descending order).

**Percentage of Population 0-2 with IFSP, December 1, 2004,  
States with Narrow Eligibility Criteria**

State	Percentage of population 0-2 with IFSP
Connecticut	3.16
North Dakota	3.02



Idaho	2.90
Maine	2.89
<b>National Baseline</b>	<b>2.34</b>
Montana	2.21
Oklahoma	2.03
South Carolina	1.87
<b>Utah</b>	<b>1.87</b>
Tennessee	1.80
Oregon	1.78
District of Columbia	1.68
Nebraska	1.67
Arizona	1.61
Guam	1.47
Nevada	1.36
Georgia	1.34

- A. Compared to other states with narrow eligibility criteria, Utah ranks lower than 6 states, higher than 8 states, and equal to 1 state.
- B. Utah is 0.47% below the national baseline in percentage of infants and toddlers with IFSP (excluding infants and toddlers at risk, 1.87% and 2.34%, respectively).

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005:**

Target met.

**Improvement Activities Completed, Contributing to Progress:**

July 2005 - June 2006: Child Find and Public Awareness activity data was collected from local E.I. program applications in order to identify successful strategies and identify gaps in local program outreach procedures for infants and toddlers birth to three

July 2005 – June 2006: The Community Partnership Specialist provided technical assistance to all programs on Child Find policies and procedures – specifics below.

July 2005 - April 2006: The Community Partnership Specialist, Medicaid and Utah State University, developed and conducted trainings to all local early intervention programs on the On-line Application System – Utah Clicks.

April 2006 – June 30, 2006: All local early intervention programs are active on the Utah Clicks System. 26 online referrals were submitted during the time period.

July 2005 – February 2006: Developed and signed a memo of agreement between DCFS and Early Intervention to adhere to CAPTA and IDEA federal regulations.

July 2005 – February 2006: Early Intervention and DCFS staff developed a training manual for use in the field to train Child Protective Workers and local Early Intervention Programs on the early screening and referral process. A video was developed to demonstrate the screening process.

March 2006 – June 2006: Trained all Child Protective Workers and local Early Intervention Programs throughout the state on the screening and referral process. This training assisted in building relationships between the two agencies at the local as well as state level.

July 2005 - December 2005: The Baby Watch Calendar focused on outreach to ethnic populations incorporating parent stories in English, Spanish and French as well as information in Navajo and Ute. This calendar was included in new parent packets at Neonatal Intensive Care Units in 2 of the major hospitals.

July 2005 – January 2006: An ICC committee, including pediatricians and therapists, developed the Early Intervention Screening Module for the Utah Medical Home Web Site.

### **Monitoring Activities completed:**

#### **1. Program Applications**

July 2005-June 2006: The BWEI Community Partnerships Specialist reviewed all Program Applications and determined that all include appropriate policies and procedures for Child Find.

#### **2. File reviews determining compliance with statewide eligibility criteria.**

July 2005 – June 30, 2006. BWEI staff conducted compliance file reviews in 8 contracted EI programs during FFY 2005. The programs were monitored for compliance with referral and statewide eligibility procedures.

Number of files reviewed: 117 eligible and 28 ineligible files

Number of files in compliance: 109 eligible files (93%) and 24 ineligible files (86%)

Number of programs in compliance: 5 (4 resolved previously identified noncompliance, 1 maintained compliance)

Noncompliance identified:

- 1 program resolved previous noncompliance for eligible files and had newly identified noncompliance for ineligible files. Program developed and implemented Improvement Plan. Follow up visit to this program in December 2006 demonstrated resolution of noncompliance (10 files).
- 2 programs had newly identified noncompliance for eligible files. Programs developed and implemented Improvement Plans. Follow up visit to one program in October 2006 demonstrated resolution of noncompliance; follow up visit to one program is scheduled for March 2007.

### **Resolution of previously identified noncompliance:**

- Noncompliance in the area of eligibility determination was identified in one program during FFY 2004. This program developed a Corrective Action plan and provided data to BWEI demonstrating resolution of noncompliance, effective October 2005.

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006**

### **Revisions to proposed targets for FY 2006-2008:**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p><b>2006</b> (2006-2007)</p>	<p>Baby Watch Early Intervention Programs will serve (with IFSP) 1.88% of infants and toddlers through age 2 in Utah.</p>
<p><b>2007</b> (2007-2008)</p>	<p>Baby Watch Early Intervention Programs will serve (with IFSP) 1.89% of infants and toddlers through age 2 in Utah.</p>
<p><b>2008</b> (2008-2009)</p>	<p>Baby Watch Early Intervention Programs will serve (with IFSP) 1.9% of infants and toddlers through age 2 in Utah.</p>

**Justification for revised targets:**

Percentage of infants and toddlers served on December 1, 2005 by Utah’s Part C programs exceeded the targets for FFY 2006 and 2007. Therefore, the lead agency proposes revising the targets upward with a goal that the program will at least maintain the growth accomplished in FFY 2005.

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources**

Refer to table in Indicator 5, page 5.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Refer to Overview of Annual Performance Plan preceding this document.

**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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	In all files reviewed in 8* contracting early intervention programs, an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting will be conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline for all eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs.

\* SPP incorrectly reported the number of EI programs scheduled for file review in 2005-2006, based on 18-month monitoring cycle. The correct number is 8 programs, rather than 9.

**Actual Target Data for 2005:**

Monitoring data:

July 2005 – June 2006: BWEI conducted file review of 8 contracting EI programs during FY 2005.

Number of applicable files reviewed: 87

Number and percentage in compliance for this indicator: 73 (92%).

Number of programs in compliance: 6

Number of programs with newly identified noncompliance, developed and implemented Improvement Plan: 2

- One program had follow up review in December 2006. Files reviewed demonstrate resolution of noncompliance. BTOTS Timely Initial IFSP report for 1/1/06 – 11/28/06 shows 206 of 207 IFSPs developed during the previous 11 months were in compliance with 45-day time frame. 181 were developed within 45 days, and 25 were completed after 45 days, due to documented family circumstances (99.5% of IFSPs in compliance). BWEI concludes Improvement Plan was effective and noncompliance has been resolved.
- One program had follow up review in October 2006. All new files reviewed demonstrate resolution of noncompliance. BTOTS Timely Initial IFSP report for 1/1/06 – 10/31/06 shows all 19 IFSPs developed during the previous 10 months were in compliance. Eleven were developed within 45 days and 8 were completed after 45 days due to documented family circumstances. BWEI concludes noncompliance has been resolved.

Statewide data system: BTOTS Timely Initial IFSP report. For 2 programs, BTOTS data includes IFSPs for the time period 7/1/2005 – 6/30/2006. In 13 programs, BTOTS data is for time period 1/1/2006 – 6/30/2006. (Complete data for report was not available until BTOTS was installed in each program).

Number of IFSPs developed and entered into BTOTS during FY 2005: 2616

Number and percentage completed within 45 days of referral date: 2141 (81.8%)

Number and percentage not completed within 45 days due to documented family circumstances: 387 (14.8%)

Number and percentage not completed within 45 days due to program circumstances: 88 (3.4%)

Number and percentage in compliance: 2528 (2141 timely + 387 family circumstances); 96.6%  $[(2141+387) / 2616] \times 100$ .

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005:**

Target not met. However, Improvement was shown from baseline rate of 81% of files in compliance during FY 2004, to 92% of files reviewed in compliance and 96% of all IFSPs in compliance. The BTOTS data are more comprehensive and show more progress than the file review data, which are based on a limited number of files in 8 of the 15 contracted EI programs. Using BTOTS data, target is nearly met.

**Improvement Activities Completed:**

July 2005 - January 2006: BTOTS, statewide data system, installed in all EI programs. Data and program staff in all programs received comprehensive training on the system by BWEI IT and Technical Assistance staff. Programs began entering data capturing required delay reason for all IFSPs that are not completed within 45 days of referral date. BTOTS calculates 45 day IFSP due date, which eliminates mathematical errors that may contribute to noncompliance. Complete assessment data, including assessment method, date and results, must be entered into BTOTS for each child before the IFSP can be completed (exception – interim IFSP). BTOTS generates an alert when IFSPs are overdue.

December 2005: Timely IFSP report was developed for monitoring EI program performance at the state level. Compliance Coordinator began using this report for focused monitoring during file reviews, including verification of dates and delay reasons (family circumstances or provider circumstances).

July 2005 – June 2006: An increased focus on compliance, partially due to the State Performance Plan reporting requirements, may be resulting in EI programs developing more effective Improvement Plans when noncompliance is identified. In the past 2 years, BWEI staff have increased Technical Assistance efforts in the development, implementation and resolution of EI program Improvement Plans.

July 2005 – June 2006: Eight contracted EI programs had monitoring file reviews. Noncompliance was identified in 2 programs, which developed Improvement Plans. These programs received follow up technical assistance visits within 1 year, and data from those visits demonstrate resolution of the noncompliance December 2006.

June 2006: All EI programs submitted applications with appropriate policies and procedures ensuring all eligible infants and toddlers receive an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting within Part C's 45-day timeline.

July 2005 – June 2006: 50 EI providers received Assessment and IFSP training.

**Resolution of previously identified noncompliance:**

BWEI compliance coordinator and TA staff conducted follow up TA visits to 2 programs with noncompliance identified or not resolved during FY 2004 and found all noncompliance was resolved.

## APR Template – Part C (4)

Utah

State

Program 1: follow up TA June 2006 – 5 new files reviewed, all in compliance (3 on time and 2 late due to documented family circumstances). BTOTS timely IFSP report for 1/1/06 – 6/30/06 shows full compliance (of 37 IFSPs developed during the reporting period, 29 were completed within 45 days (78.4%), and 8 were completed after 45 days due to documented family circumstances (21.6%). No IFSP were completed after 45 days due to provider circumstances.

Program 2: follow up TA December 2005 – reviewed BTOTS 45-day delinquent IFSP report as of December 14, 2005. Found all files in compliance: only 1 IFSP was not completed within 45 days, due to documented family circumstances. BTOTS Timely IFSP report for 1/1/06 – 6/30/06 shows 92.2% of IFSPs in compliance: of 115 IFSPs developed during the reporting period, 74 (83.1%) were completed within 45 days, 32 (27.8%) were completed after 45 days due to documented family circumstances, and 9 (7.8%) were completed after 45 days due to provider circumstances or circumstances not documented.

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006**

No applicable revisions.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Refer to Overview of Annual Performance Plan preceding this document.

**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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2005</b> (2005-2006)	100% of files reviewed of children exiting Part C will receive timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. IFSPs with transition steps and services</li> <li>B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B (unless family opts out): and</li> <li>C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.</li> </ul>

**Actual Target Data for 2005:**

Data from Program File Reviews:

A: IFSPs with transition steps and services. In 97% of files reviewed, IFSP included transition steps and services.

Number of programs reviewed: 8

Number of applicable files: 70

Number of files with IFSP transition steps and services: 68

Percentage of files in compliance: 97% [(68/70) x 100]

Number of programs in compliance: 8

Programs with noncompliance identified during the reporting period: 0

B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B. In 93% of files reviewed, LEA was notified.

Number of programs reviewed: 8

Number of applicable files reviewed: 27

Number of files with signed Release of Information to Part B: 25

Percentage of files in compliance: 93%

Number of programs in compliance: 8

Programs with noncompliance identified during the reporting period: 0

Part B Data (compiled by Part B and Part C personnel statewide): Part C referred 1466 toddlers to Part B programs statewide, between July 1, 2005 and June 30, 2006. During that timeframe, Part C exited 1613 toddlers at 3 years of age. 63 toddlers were not referred to Part B because parent declined. This results in a potential referral rate of 95%  $[(1466 + 63) / 1613] \times 100$ . It is possible that additional toddlers were not referred because parent declined; information was not available. The figures used in the numerator and denominator do not necessarily represent the same cohort of toddlers, because referral occurs prior to the third birthday and exit occurs on the 3<sup>rd</sup> birthday. Therefore, 95% is based on an assumption that the cohorts of toddlers referred to Part B during FFY 2005 and exiting Part C during FFY 2005 are overlapping and of similar size.

C. Transition conference. In 64% of files reviewed, transition conference was held in a timely manner.

1. File Review Data

Number of programs reviewed: 8

Number of applicable files: 25

Number of files in which transition meeting was convened at least 90 days prior to child's third birthday: 16

Percentage of files in compliance: 64%

Number of programs with newly identified noncompliance: 3 (Jordan, SE, Primetime)

- In one program, follow up site visit in August 2006 found improvement, but not full resolution of noncompliance. BWEI TA staff increased improvement planning activities. Full resolution anticipated within 6 months.
- In two programs, follow up site visits are scheduled in January 2007 and March 2007. BTOTS data for these programs show noncompliance was resolved in one program (Prime Time).

Number of programs that resolved previously identified noncompliance: 3

Number of programs in which compliance was maintained: 2

2. Data from BTOTS, state data system.

8.C. Timely Transition Meeting Report run for all programs for period 7/1/2005 – 6/30/2006. Includes all children who had transition meetings due during the time period. Data are not complete for the time period, but are complete from the time BTOTS 1.0 was installed in each program (ranges from July 2005 – January 2006).

Number of transition meetings due during time frame: 884 (statewide)



Number and percentage of meetings held at least 90 days prior to child's third birthday: 421 (47.6%)

Number and percentage of meetings declined by family: 33 (3.7%)

Number and percentage of meetings held late due to family circumstances: 306 (34.6%)

Number and percentage of meetings held late due to provider circumstances: 88 (10.0%)

Number and percentage of meetings held late due to Part B circumstances: 36 (4.1%).

Number and percentage in compliance: 760 (includes number timely plus number declined and late due to family circumstances):  $[(421 + 33 + 306 / 884) \times 100 = 86\%$

## **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005:**

### **Explanation of progress:**

8.A. Percentage of files in compliance increased from baseline of 91% in FY 2004 to 97% in FFY 2005.

8.B. Percentage of files in compliance did not change from baseline of 93% in FY 2004. Part B referral data shows improvement to 95%.

### **Explanation of Slippage:**

8.C. Percentage of files in compliance declined from baseline of 71% in FY 2004 to 64%. BTOTS data, which are comprehensive and inclusive of all programs, demonstrate progress, with 86% compliance rate for all transition meetings due from time of system installation through the end of FFY 2005.

However, for 8.B. and 8.C., file review data collected in FY 2005 do not adequately represent program performance in this area. For both indicators, a small number of transition files were reviewed, not necessarily representative of programs statewide. Different programs were reviewed in FY 2004 and FY 2005; thus it is difficult to compare results.

For Indicator 8.B., the file was considered in compliance if it included a signed release of information to the LEA by the time the transition meeting was due. BWEI had not collected data on number of toddlers referred to Part B during the reporting period. This data will be available for FY 2007.

For Indicator 8.C, the majority of noncompliance found during the reporting period can be attributed to one large program, in which a new transition coordinator had recently been hired and was being trained. Files reviewed during this period do not adequately represent program performance in this area over time.

In the future, the state data system, BTOTS, will be used to report progress for Indicator 8.C. BWEI is still developing capacity to report through BTOTS for Indicator 8.B.

## **Improvement Activities Completed**

July 2005 - January 2006: BTOTS data system installed in all EI programs. Programs began entering transition data into BTOTS, including transition plan implemented, transition meeting status (scheduled, declined, completed). If transition meeting is not completed at least 90 days prior to child's third birthday, user receives an alert and must enter delay reason when meeting is completed (family circumstances, provider circumstances, or LEA circumstances). BTOTS calculates the transition meeting due date and informs the user of the transition meeting due date, eliminating errors due to incorrect calculation of 90 days. BTOTS also includes expanded exit reasons to capture additional detail when child is exited with "Part B Eligibility Not Determined".

## APR Template – Part C (4)

UT  
State

June 2006: Timely Transition Meeting Report developed; BWEI Compliance Coordinator began using for focused monitoring. During biannual monitoring and technical assistance visits, the report will be used to verify accuracy of data regarding transition. Report was used to develop state baseline data for Indicator 8.C. (reported above).

July 2005 and May 2006: Data manager attended OSEP Part C Data Managers' Meetings, and attended sessions regarding Part C obligation to provide directory information to Part B.

December 2006: Lead Agency adopted opt-out policy for disclosure of directory information to Part B. Policy drafted March 2006.

April 2006: Opt out for disclosure of directory information to Part B incorporated into BTOTS version 1.2, installed in all programs July 1, 2006. BWEI Research Analyst developed BTOTS report for disclosure of directory information to Part B.

December 2006: All Program Applications were reviewed for policy and procedure that included appropriate transition steps and services on the IFSP.

March 2006 - June 2006 – The ICC formed a Transition Committee to receive input from Part B, Part C agencies and Head Start related to a smooth transition process

May 2006 – June 2006: The Part B coordinator and the Part C transition specialist convened a work group of Part B and C providers to address the issues put forward by the ICC committee. A checklist of topics that need to be discussed during the development of the transition agreement was developed.

May 2006 – June 2006: The Part C transition specialist and the Part B coordinator developed an audio-visual power point presentation on developing a smooth transition process.

June 2006: One EI Program revised Interagency Agreement with LEA during FFY 2005.

### **Resolution of previously identified noncompliance**

In the 2003-2004 APR, BWEI reported that noncompliance was identified in 7 of 15 contracted EI programs. These programs developed and implemented Improvement Plans. In Indicator 9A of its SPP, the State reported that 6 of the 7 programs where the state had identified noncompliance in this area in 2003-2004 had shown correction. The one program with outstanding noncompliance had a follow up TA visit in April 2006. At that time, compliance was demonstrated for 93 of 97 transition meetings. BWEI concludes outstanding noncompliance has been resolved from 2003-2004 in all EI programs.

### **Explanation of slippage – Improvement Activities not completed**

Fourteen EI Programs have not revised Interagency Agreements with LEA's to include the process for notifying the Part B program of children potentially eligible for Part B services.

Part C will develop a new Memorandum of Understanding with Part B upon approval of new state special education rules. This MOU will include a timeline for the transition meeting and responsibilities of the Part C and Part B agencies in conducting the transition meeting. These activities were delayed as waiting for Part B regulations to be released.

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006**

Activity	Timeline	Resources
1. Monitoring data will include file review	Annually	BWEI Compliance Coordinator and TA staff

**APR Template – Part C (4)**

UT  
State

and BTOTS data.		
2. Each contracting program will develop policies and procedures for disclosure of directory information to Part B.	By 3/2007	BWEI staff, EI program directors
3. Technical assistance will be available to EI providers on request. Compliance issues will be addressed as the need arises.	ongoing	Baby Watch staff and the Pre-school Coordinator
4. The power point presentation will be used at the Special Ed Pre-school Conference and will be available on the BWEI website.	October 2006	BWEI Community Partnership Specialist, 619 Coordinator

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Refer to Overview of Annual Performance Plan preceding this document.

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

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

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

**Measurement:**

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2005</b> (2005-2006)	General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) will identify and correct all noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

**Actual Target Data for 2005:**

94% of all noncompliance identified by general supervision system was corrected within one year from identification.

For all indicators except Indicator 1, all noncompliance was corrected within one year from identification. In one program, noncompliance for Indicator 1 was not fully corrected within one year from identification. However, the noncompliance was subsequently corrected in FFY 2006.

Due Process Hearing: noncompliance was identified in one program on August 19, 2005, as a result of a due process hearing. Program implemented corrective action and provided data demonstrating resolution of noncompliance by November 28, 2005.

Data from file reviews are presented in Compilation Tables below.

Compilation Table 9.A.

SPP Indicators	Monitoring Method	# of programs reviewed 2004-2005	a. # with Findings (2004 – 2005)	b. # corrected w/in 1 yr (2005-2006)	% corrected w/in 1 year
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.	On-Site Visit	8	4	2	75%
	State Data System			1	
	total			3	
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.	Self-Review			1	100%
	On-Site Visit	7	3	2	
	Total			3	
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrated improved: positive social-emotional skills, acquisition and use of knowledge and skills; use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs. <b>NEW INDICATOR NO DATA 2004-05</b>					N/A
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services helped the family: know their rights; effectively communicate their children’s needs; and help their children develop and learn. <b>NEW INDICATOR NO DATA 2004-05</b>					N/A
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs.	Self-Review (Corrective Action)			1	100%
	On-site Visit	7	1	0	
	Total			1	
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to three with IFSPs.	Self-Review (Corrective Action)			1	100%

# APR Template – Part C (4)

UT  
State

	On-site Visit	7	1	0	
	Total			1	
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.	On-site Visit	7	2	2	100%
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.	Self-Review (Corrective Action)			1	100%
8a. IFSPs with transition steps and services.	On-site Review	7	2	1	
	Total			2	
8b. Notification to the LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B.	On-site Visit	7	0	0	N/A
8c. Transition Conference, if child is potentially eligible for part B.	Self-Review (Corrective Action)			1	100%
	On-site Visit	7	2	1	
	Total			2	
Totals			15	14	93%

Compilation Table 9.B.

Indicator	Monitoring Method	# of programs reviewed 2004 – 2005	a. # with findings 2004– 2005	b. # corrected w/in 1 year	% Corrected w/in 1 year
1. Procedural Safeguards: Prior written notice is provided prior to evaluation, IFSP development, 6-month IFSP review, transition, and any other time changes occur.	Self-Review			1	100%
	On-site Visit	7	2	1	
	Total			2	
Total			2	2	100%

Discussion of data in Compilation Table

9.A.1. Reported as 8 programs monitored. However, only 7 programs had file reviews and the 8<sup>th</sup> program reported is services provided within these EI programs by the Utah Schools for the Deaf and Blind. In 2 programs, noncompliance was resolved by follow-up file reviews. In the third program data from state data system was used to determine resolution of noncompliance. Using this source, 93% of services were delivered in a timely manner between 7/1/05 and 6/30/06. (366 IFSPs developed; 317 timely initial services (87%); 22 not timely due to family circumstances (5%), and 27 not timely due to circumstances not documented in database (7%).)

Indicators 5 and 6: File review data reported is for state indicator that eligibility/ineligibility for EI services is appropriately determined. In SPP, this was reported as an indicator in Compilation Table 9.B. However, because it reflects percentage served, it was used to report compliance with Indicators 5 and 6 in this APR.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005:**

**Explanation of progress:**

Target not met. However, data shows improvement from 87% in FFY 2004 to 94% in FFY 2005. Except for one indicator in one EI program, all noncompliance identified through the general supervision system was resolved during FFY 2005-2006.

**Improvement Activities completed, contributing to progress:**

FFY 2004 – 2005: BWEI Compliance Coordinator and Technical Assistance (TA) staff completed file reviews to determine compliance in 7 contracted early intervention programs plus sensory services provided in these 7 programs by the Utah Schools for the Deaf and the Blind (USDB). Where noncompliance was identified, the programs developed and implemented Improvement Plans in a timely manner. The BWEI TA staff member assigned to the contracted program provided assistance and support in the development and implementation of the Improvement Plans. This included a follow up TA visit during which data were reviewed to determine effectiveness of the Improvement Plan, i.e., resolution of noncompliance. In FFY 2005-2006, the BWEI Compliance Coordinator worked with Technical Assistance staff to conduct follow up visits for those programs in which noncompliance was identified.

FFY 2005 - 2006: BWEI Compliance Coordinator and TA staff completed file reviews in 8 contracted Early Intervention Programs. For all programs reviewed, the BWEI Compliance Coordinator issued a Compliance Determination Report within 45 days. In one program, no noncompliance was identified. The other seven programs developed and submitted Improvement Plans within 30 days. BWEI TA staff are following up on results of Improvement Plans during FFY 2006.

December 2005: SPP Indicator 1 added as a state indicator for file reviews. File reviews completed during FFY 2005 included this indicator.

2005-2006: BWEI TA staff completed follow up TA visits to 6 of 7 programs with noncompliance identified during FFY 2004-2005. One additional program conducted internal review of files according to a Corrective Action Plan, and submitted data to BWEI documenting resolution of noncompliance. In 6 of 7 programs, Compliance Coordinator issued a report documenting results.

June 2005: BWEI Compliance Coordinator developed schedule for 2-year monitoring process, including a representative sample of programs annually. Each program receives a file review every two years, and a TA follow up visit during alternate years.

June 2006: All EI providers submitted a Program Application that includes evidence of Policies and Procedures to ensure IDEA compliance. BWEI TA staff provided Technical Assistance to ensure all local policies and procedures demonstrate compliance. All Program Applications were approved by December 2005.

July 2005 – January 2006: BTOTS data system was installed in all contracted programs. BWEI IT and TA staff provided training to providers on all aspects of the system. BTOTS includes features to assist EI programs in achieving compliance with required timeframes (45 day evaluation and IFSP, timely IFSP reviews, timely transition meeting), assessment in all domains, required procedural safeguards, and service delivery. EI providers are using BTOTS reports to achieve compliance.

April - May 2006: BWEI Compliance Coordinator conducted 2 technical assistance visits to EI programs to provide additional training on BTOTS system.

June 2006: BWEI Compliance Coordinator verified accuracy of BTOTS data in two programs during annual TA visit. This was adopted as a routine activity during file reviews. During TA visits, BWEI staff will also verify 10% of BTOTS data, focusing on data related to the Compliance Indicators in the SPP.

### **Resolution of previously identified noncompliance**

Indicator 2: Noncompliance was identified in 4 programs in FFY 2003-2004. Monitoring from 2004-2005 demonstrated resolution of noncompliance in 3 programs. In the fourth, 2004-2005 monitoring demonstrated improvement, but not full compliance, for this indicator. Follow-up on-site review in September 2005 demonstrated full compliance for this indicator in this program.

For Indicator 7, the SPP noted that noncompliance identified in FY 2003-2004 was not fully resolved within 1 year in one contracted EI program. TA visit to this program in June 2006 demonstrated full resolution of noncompliance. BTOTS timely IFSP report indicates that 37 IFSPs were developed during FFY 2005. Of these, 29 were completed within 45 days of referral, and 8 were completed after 45 days, due to documented family circumstances (100% compliance).

Indicator 8.C. In 1 program, noncompliance identified in 2003-2004 was not fully resolved during FFY 2004-2005. Follow up TA visit in April 2006 demonstrated resolution of noncompliance. Of 101 records for transition meetings due between 9/1/2005 and 3/31/06, 97 met requirements for timely transition meeting.



**The following discussion shall serve as the State’s final progress report regarding resolution of noncompliance identified in FFY 2003-2004 with the requirement to conduct evaluations in all five developmental domains, as required by 34 CFR §303.322©(3)(iii) (per SPP letter, Table B Chart, Indicator 9B).**

Resolution of previously identified noncompliance from FFY 2003-2004 APR, regarding Assessment in All Domains. In FY 2003-2004, the State identified noncompliance with requirements regarding assessment in all domains in 8 local EI programs. In the November 30, 2005 progress report, the State indicated that 7 of the 8 programs had demonstrated compliance with the requirement to conduct evaluations and assessments in all 5 developmental domains. In the remaining program, file review in June 2005 demonstrated improvement in this area, but not full compliance. The program implemented additional Improvement Planning strategies. Files reviewed in follow up TA visit June 2006 demonstrated full compliance in this area. BWEI concludes all noncompliance from FFY 2003-2004 has been resolved.

Note: BTOTS requirement to enter complete evaluation data prior to the IFSP has resulted in BWEI discontinuing this as a separate indicator. Compliance in this area is now included in SPP Indicator 7. If the IFSP is completed within 45 days, the child has been evaluated in all domains.

**Explanation of Slippage**

The data in the table indicate that noncompliance identified in FFY 2004-2005 for Indicator 1 was not resolved within 1 year in one program. Because the data prior the SPP submission were collected retrospectively, this program was not required to implement a formal Improvement Plan. However, subsequent file review in this program in September 2006 demonstrated resolution of noncompliance.

Activity 6 (Investigate developing self-assessment protocol and tool for providers). BWEI presented this to providers in April 2006. Some providers already have self-assessment protocols in place. It was decided to postpone this activity.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets/Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for 2006**

Activity	Timeline	Resources
1. During file reviews and TA visits, verify accuracy of BTOTS data related to SPP compliance in 10% of BWEI program files.	July 2006 - June 2007	BWEI Compliance Coordinator and TA staff

Refer also to Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for Indicator 10 (Complaint resolution).

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Refer to Overview of Annual Performance Plan preceding this document.

**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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2005</b> (2005-2006)	Utah will ensure that 100% of signed written complaints with reports issued will be resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

**Actual Target Data for 2005:**

Not applicable for FFY 2005.

Lead Agency received one written complaint on 1/17/06. The parent preferred to resolve the issue informally, and withdrew the complaint on 1/30/06. No other complaints were received during FFY 2005.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005:**

July 2005 – June 2006: EI program distributed Parents Rights booklet (in English and Spanish) in to all families.

May 2005 and January 2006: Booklet was posted on BWEI Website and updated (in English and Spanish).

July 2005: 4 of 15 EI providers revised prior notice document. This was reviewed in Program Applications (as described below) and prior notice documents in files during program file reviews. In one remaining program, it was noted during December 2006 file review that the Parents' Rights Summary was not included with written prior notices, and program developed an Improvement Plan to resolved the noncompliance.

November 2005: BWEI Compliance Coordinator and Community Partnership Specialist revised the Parents' Rights booklet.

December 2005: All Program Applications submitted to Baby Watch and approved included the required policy elements incorporating the Procedural Safeguards documents.

## APR Template – Part C (4)

UT  
State

June 2005: BTOTS was developed to include procedural safeguards documentation  
Users must enter the dates when procedural safeguards are provided (Parents' Rights, Written Prior Notices, Consent to Evaluate, and Consent to Services).

July 2005 – January 2006: BTOTS was installed in all EI programs

January 2006: One written complaint was received 1/17/06. BWEI Compliance Coordinator contacted the parent, who indicated she preferred to resolve the complaint informally. The parent withdrew her complaint on 1/30/06.

July 2006 – June 2005: BWEI Compliance Coordinator and TA staff conducted file reviews in 8 contracted EI Programs:

- # programs in full compliance with procedural safeguards requirements: 6 (2 maintained compliance, 4 demonstrated resolution of previously identified noncompliance).
- # programs with noncompliance identified: 2
- noncompliance regarding prior written notice requirement was identified in October 2005, program developed Improvement Plan, follow up TA visit in September 2006 demonstrated resolution of noncompliance.

August 2005: BWEI Program Manager, Compliance Coordinator and TA staff attended Utah Institute on Special Education Law conference.

### **Resolution of previously identified noncompliance:**

Noncompliance was identified in one program in April 2004. Review in October 2005 demonstrated significant improvement from previous review, but not full compliance with requirements regarding written prior notices. New Improvement Plan was developed. BWEI Compliance Coordinator conducted follow up visit in August 2006, files demonstrated resolution of noncompliance.

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006**

No applicable revisions.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Refer to Overview of Annual Performance Plan preceding this document.

**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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	BWEI will ensure that 100% of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.

**Actual Target Data for 2005:**

Not applicable for FFY 2005.

No due process hearing requests were filed with BWEI during FFY 2005.

One due process hearing that was initiated during FFY 2004 was fully adjudicated during FFY 2005. The hearing officer issued his decision on August 19, 2005. The EI program involved implemented corrective action as required, and the noncompliance was fully resolved as of November 28, 2005.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005:**

July 2005 – June 2006: EI program distributed Parents’ Rights booklet (in English and Spanish) in to all families.

May 2005 and January 2006: Booklet was posted on BWEI Website and updated (in English and Spanish).

July 2005: 4 of 15 EI providers revised prior notice document. This was reviewed in Program Applications (as described below) and prior notice documents in files during program file reviews. In one remaining program, it was noted during December 2006 file review that the Parents; Rights Summary was not included with written prior notices, and program developed an Improvement Plan to resolved the noncompliance.

November 2005: BWEI Compliance Coordinator and Community Partnership Specialist revised the Parents’ Rights booklet.

## APR Template – Part C (4)

UT  
State

December 2005: All Program Applications submitted to Baby Watch and approved included the required policy elements incorporating the Procedural Safeguards documents.

June 2005: BTOTS was developed to include procedural safeguards documentation. Users must enter the dates when procedural safeguards are provided (Parents' Rights, Written Prior Notices, Consent to Evaluate, and Consent to Services).

July 2005 – January 2006: BTOTS was installed in all EI programs.

January 2006: One written complaint was received 1/17/06. BWEI Compliance Coordinator contacted the parent, who indicated she preferred to resolve the complaint informally. The parent withdrew her complaint on 1/30/06.

July 2006 – June 2005: BWEI Compliance Coordinator and TA staff conducted file reviews in 8 contracted EI Programs:

- # programs in full compliance with procedural safeguards requirements: 6 (2 maintained compliance, 4 demonstrated resolution of previously identified noncompliance).
- # programs with noncompliance identified: 2
- noncompliance regarding prior written notice requirement was identified in October 2005, program developed Improvement Plan, follow up TA visit in September 2006 demonstrated resolution of noncompliance.

August 2005: BWEI Program Manager, Compliance Coordinator and TA staff attended Utah Institute on Special Education Law conference.

### **Resolution of previously identified noncompliance:**

Noncompliance was identified in one program in April 2004. Review in October 2005 demonstrated significant improvement from previous review, but not full compliance with requirements regarding written prior notices. New Improvement Plan was developed. BWEI Compliance Coordinator conducted follow up visit in August 2006, files demonstrated resolution of noncompliance.

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006**

No applicable revisions.

Part C Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

*(The following items are to be completed for each monitoring priority/indicator.)*

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

**N/A**

**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.

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Refer to Overview of Annual Performance Plan preceding this document.

**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.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Target not applicable due to lack of mediation requests.

**Actual Target Data for 2005:**

Not applicable for FFY 2005. No mediation requests filed with BWEI during FFY 2005.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005:**

July 2005 – June 2006: EI program distributed Parents’ Rights booklet (in English and Spanish) in to all families.

May 2005 and January 2006: Booklet was posted on BWEI Website and updated (in English and Spanish).

July 2005: 4 of 15 EI providers revised prior notice document. This was reviewed in Program Applications (as described below) and prior notice documents in files during program file reviews. In one remaining program, it was noted during December 2006 file review that the Parents; Rights Summary was not included with written prior notices, and program developed an Improvement Plan to resolved the noncompliance.

November 2005: BWEI Compliance Coordinator and Community Partnership Specialist revised the Parents’ Rights booklet.

December 2005: All Program Applications submitted to Baby Watch and approved included the required policy elements incorporating the Procedural Safeguards documents.

June 2005: BTOTS was developed to include procedural safeguards documentation  
Users must enter the dates when procedural safeguards are provided (Parents’ Rights, Written Prior Notices, Consent to Evaluate, and Consent to Services.

July 2005 – January 2006: BTOTS was installed in all EI programs

January 2006: One written complaint was received 1/17/06. BWEI Compliance Coordinator contacted the parent, who indicated she preferred to resolve the complaint informally. The parent withdrew her complaint on 1/30/06.

July 2006 – June 2005: BWEI Compliance Coordinator and TA staff conducted file reviews in 8 contracted EI Programs:

- # programs in full compliance with procedural safeguards requirements: 6 (2 maintained compliance, 4 demonstrated resolution of previously identified noncompliance).
- # programs with noncompliance identified: 2
- noncompliance regarding prior written notice requirement was identified in October 2005, program developed Improvement Plan, follow up TA visit in September 2006 demonstrated resolution of noncompliance.

August 2005: BWEI Program Manager, Compliance Coordinator and TA staff attended Utah Institute on Special Education Law conference.

### **Resolution of previously identified noncompliance:**

Noncompliance was identified in one program in April 2004. Review in October 2005 demonstrated significant improvement from previous review, but not full compliance with requirements regarding written prior notices. New Improvement Plan was developed. BWEI Compliance Coordinator conducted follow up visit in August 2006, files demonstrated resolution of noncompliance.

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006**

No applicable revisions.



**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2005**

**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

Refer to Overview of Annual Performance Plan preceding this document.

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

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

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

**Measurement:**

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

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, settings and November 1 for exiting, personnel, dispute resolution); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring accuracy).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2005</b> (2005-2006)	Utah will ensure that 100% of the State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

**Actual Target Data for 2005:**

100% of State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

Table 1: submitted January 24, 2006, revised Table 1 submitted June 20, 2006 (revisions due to new data system).

Table 2 submitted June 20, 2006.

Table 3 submitted October 30, 2006.

State Performance Plan (SPP) was submitted on November 30, 2005.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005:**

Improvement Activities Completed

June 2005 – October: BTOTS beta tested in 2 local agencies. BTOTS 1.0 installed in all EI Programs by 1/27/06. BWEI IT and TA staff trained management and data staff in all programs. BTOTS helpline established, Users Guide completed.

January 2006: BTOTS Users Group (BUG) established, includes BWEI IT and TA staff, management and data staff from each EI program. Meetings held February, March and May. BUG provides training on BTOTS issues and discussed needs for updates and enhancements to program and reports.

## APR Template – Part C (4)

UT  
State

April 2006 - July 2006: BTOTS 1.1 developed to include enhancements for child outcomes data, beta tests April-June, 2006, installed in all programs by July 1, 2006.

June 2006: Ongoing BWEI Compliance Coordinator/Data Manager began validating BTOTS data in all file review and TA site visits. At TA visits and file reviews, BWEI staff will compare BTOTS data with file record to verify accuracy of data in 10% of program files, focusing on data needed to report on compliance indicators. BTOTS data were included in 2 program File Reviews in June 2006.

December 2006: In 14 EI programs, BOTS was used to compile 618 data reports. Each program manager verified that the data were complete and accurate prior to being compiled and submitted to Westat. One remaining program submitted data manually, but now has full capacity to report through BTOTS.

April 2006: BWEI added requirement to Program Applications that each provider must establish Data Policy to ensure appropriate procedures are in place for data entry, management, integrity, confidentiality, synchronization with state, and back-up. BWEI Data Manager reviewed all Program Applications to ensure policies and procedures include required elements.

October 2006: "Community" setting added to BTOTS options for service location, in preparation for changes to Federal Table 2.

June 2006: BWEI Research Analyst developed BTOTS reports to provide statewide baseline data for SPP Indicators 7 and 8c.

January 2007: BWEI Research Analyst used BTOTS data to report status on entry for all infants and toddlers for Indicator 3.

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006**

Activity	Timeline	Resources
<p>1. Develop QA process with EI providers. BWEI data manager discussed this with EI Provider consortium at meeting in April 2006. It was decided not to require a QA process for providers at this time, as this may overburden local staff. BWEI staff will perform this function during Program File Reviews and TA visits.</p>	<p>ongoing</p>	<p>BWEI Compliance Coordinator and TA staff</p>
<p>2. Report Child Count data October 15 of each year. BWEI decided to continue reporting Child Count December 1 of each year, to align with Part B.</p>	<p>By 12/01/07</p>	<p>BWEI Compliance Coordinator</p>