

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

The Vermont Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, known in Vermont as the Family, Infant and Toddler Program (FITP), is supported by both the Department of Education and the Agency of Human Services acting as Co-Lead Agencies for FITP. The administrative agency, holding operational responsibility for FITP is the Agency of Human Services, Department for Children and Families, Child Development Division. In that role, the state office staff for FITP as part of the Child Development Division planned a process for stakeholder input that covered a three month period of time in the fall of 2005. Vermont was pleased to access the services of the North East Regional Resource Center to assist us in presenting information on the Office of Special Education Programs' Monitoring Priorities and Indicators/State Performance Plan (SPP) and obtaining helpful feedback on them during the Vermont Interagency Coordinating Council (VICC) two day Annual Planning Session that included a broad array of additional "stakeholders."

The process during the period of September through November of 2005, for obtaining broad stakeholder review and input on the State Performance Plan (SPP) included:

- meetings of the ICC Executive Committee
- a half day session on the SPP at the Annual Planning meeting of the ICC – additional stakeholders from the broader Child Development, Family Support and Disability Services Communities attended, including Head Start/EHS, University of Vermont, Community College of Vermont, Disability Rights Advocacy, Disability Law Services, Vermont Parent Information Center, University Center for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities, Northern Lights Career Development Center, Department of Education Early Education Team and others.
- conference calls with Regional Host Agency Directors (Directors of the grantees that are responsible for carrying out the Family, Infant and Toddler Program in Vermont/Part C of IDE IA);
- a full day meeting with Host Agency Directors and Supervisors;
- discussions with the leadership of the Child Development Division
- a host agency staff and partners meeting devoted to child outcomes planning

Dissemination of the SPP will occur by posting the State Performance Plan on the web sites of the Agency of Human Services, Department for Children and Families, Child Development Division, the Vermont Department of Education and Vermont Parent Information Center web sites. Hard copies will be distributed to each Regional Early Intervention Program (Host Agencies), ICC members, Co-Lead Agency Leadership, and key partners. Announcements will be sent to the Vermont Coalition for Disability Right, the Developmental Disabilities Council, the Developmental, The Vermont Children's Forum, the Early Childhood Work Group, the Early Childhood Councils, the Special Education Advisory Council and other key organizations about the availability of down-loadable copies from the web sites, or hard copies from the Child Development Division.

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

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.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The **general systems** in place to collect, assess, measure and report on baseline data for this SPP and the future APR's include the following systems for Vermont Part C of IDEA, the Family, Infant and Toddler Program: (a) a hand posted time defined child and family data system used to produce 618 child count data and related service information; (b) regional monitoring of Part C host agencies and partners that consists of file reviews, parent focus groups, provider focus groups, family survey and assessment of performance/compliance standards; (c) early intervention policies, procedures and forms; (d) a grant accountability system; (e) a system of dispute resolution; (f) a system of parental rights and due process and complaints review; and (f) a system of personnel development and support.

Vermont is developing an online, real time data management system that will be able to collect data in a more timely manner that reflects the OSEP time periods. It is expected that this system will be phased in beginning in July of 2006, and in full swing within a year. Some data may be available in the 2007 reporting year, for the 2/09 Annual Performance Report that covers FFY 2007.

Regarding the overview for this issue on Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments, "Indicator 1: the percent of infants and toddlers receive early intervention services on their IFSP's in a timely manner" – the current FITP IFSP procedures require that the service coordinator report the projected dates for beginning the early intervention services as soon as possible after the IFSP meeting.

The data reported below in the baseline table is from estimates from the child count data base and regional monitoring of child files in five regions that are representative of the state. However, Vermont expects to revise its baseline beginning with data collected in monthly reports to the state on the specific indicator wording required by OSEP in this SPP regarding timeliness of the initial services. The real-time on-line data management system will then pick up the reporting of this data.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (July 2004-June 2005):

All current IFSP's have the dates that services are expected to begin. The baseline data will be updated and revised beginning in January of 2006 to include data on timely initiation of initial IFSP services from file reviews and from the new actives monthly child count data base so that it can be reported in the FFY 2005 APR.

SPP Indicator 1 Region	Number and percent of children with active IFSP's with date services to begin from 12/1/04 child count data base	Number and percent children with IFSP's with date services to begin. From Host Agency file reviews as part of monitoring. # files reviewed/# in compliance with current VT procedures.
Bennington	41	13/13 = 100%
Caledonia	24	9/9 = 100%
Franklin/Gl	55	8/8 = 100%
Orleans/Essex	31	15/15 = 100%
Windham	55	11/11 = 100%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Vermont has data on when services are expected to begin. This is part of the IFSP which is a statewide form used by all regions. The form currently requires that the date services are expected to begin be documented; however a change in procedure will occur on January 1, 2006 to collect the particular data required for this indicator. The data in the above table comes from regional monitoring of files. While the child count data base is the source of data relied upon for data elements used in the OSEP 618 data reports; its other data elements are not used in identifying non-compliance. Revised data will be provided beginning in January of 2006 when the information on timely initiation of services will be submitted to the state office by regions along with other data collected monthly on all new children with IFSPs.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activities	Timelines	Resources	Notes
Procedure clarification/forms changed (service grid of IFSP and monthly data report to state office includes this data element)	By 1/06	State Staff	Date services to begin changes to date initial service did begin, and must begin within 30 days of IFSP meeting/family consent for services
Disseminate, inform staff; ICC, partners especially schools and	By 1/06 and ongoing	State staff	Follow up with data management system; host agency director's

SPP Template – Part C (3)

Activities	Timelines	Resources	Notes
any partners doing service coordination			conference calls; professional development events
File reviews as part of host agency monitoring	Spring of 2006 and ongoing through FFY 2010	Team of cross agency staff, providers, families, who comprise the monitoring team	
Ongoing analysis of new actives monthly data submissions by regions	Ongoing beginning January 2006 through FFY 2010	State staff	Develop ongoing “reporting” for each region and statewide – maximize use of monthly data reports
Regional resource/personnel issues addressed through annual budgeting and planning process	Ongoing beginning January 2006 through FFY 2010	State staff and partners in professional development	
New data management system phased in, real time analysis statewide and regional in place.	Spring of 2006 ongoing and through 2007; with improvements ongoing through FFY 2010	University, Part C staff and Child Development Division and staff	

Improvement activities will be reconsidered when revised/updated data for this indicator suggest changes need to be made.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to the description provided under Indicator 1 as it applies to each indicator in Vermont’s Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 2: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.

Measurement:
Percent = # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children divided by the total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The general description of the multiple methods used to assess and improve compliance and performance is found under indicator 1 and applies throughout Vermont’s SPP as general background.

Vermont currently and historically has put high value on the use of natural environments for carrying out the IFSP strategies and outcomes. Nearly 100% of our services are provided in family’s homes, child care or Early Head Start settings. Natural environments are discussed during IFSP meetings and home visits and documented in the IFSP. Professional development addresses the use of daily routines in natural environments. In the past several years Vermont Part C has brought OSEP sponsored technical assistance on natural environments. Vermont Part C considers natural environments and the use of daily routines to be best practice that is of great use to the broader child development and family support services and therefore offered these trainings to this broad group of early childhood practitioners.

All data reported to OSEP via the 618 format is reviewed thoroughly by the state FITP staff and discussed with regional host agencies if there are questions about the data as it comes in and before it is entered. The data used for the baseline for indicators 2, 5 and 6 comes from the FITP child count data base. It is generated by hand by service coordinators, annually, in regions and submitted to the State Data Coordinator for review and data entry into this stand alone annual Access data base. The data used for the 618 data reporting is carefully reviewed and discussed with regional host agency staff if there are any questions prior to data entry. The accuracy and validity of the system was reviewed and approved by OSEP in their site visit to Vermont in July of 2004.

The data in the table below is from the current child count data system and is used to report data on this indicator to OSEP via the 618 data reporting system.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005) from 618 data base:

SPP Indicator 2 Region	Number of children with active IFSPs 12/1/04 Child Count 618 Data Collection	Number and percent of children with active IFSP's who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.	Notes
Addison	26	26 100%	
Bennington	41	39 95%	2 (5%) Service Provider Location
Caledonia	24	24 100%	
Chittenden	129	125 97%	3 (2%) Service Provider Location 1 (.007%) School
Franklin/Gl	55	55 100%	
Lamoille	29	29 100%	
Orange/Windsor	63	33 100%	
Orleans/Essex	31	30 97%	1 (3%) Service Provider Location
Rutland	52	35 67%	16 (31%) Service Provider Location 1 (2%) School
Washington	58	57 98%	1 (2%) School
Windham	55	54 98%	1 (2%) Service Provider Location
Windsor South	36	36 100%	
TOTALS	599	573 96%	23 (4%) Service Provider Location 3 (.002%) School¹

Discussion of Baseline Data: Of the 599 children served by Vermont Part C 96% (573 of 599) received services in natural environments. Of these 599 children, 106 (18%) were served primarily in community based settings such as child care, Early Head Start etc; 467 of the children (78%) were served primarily in their home. The remaining 26 children (5%) were served primarily through the service provider location, in mainly one region. The region with the highest number of children receiving services primarily through the Service Provider Location was recently monitored and has submitted a corrective action plan to address this issue. The situation in this region has to do with a lack of resources for physical therapy, occupational therapy and speech and language services. Most of these services are provided at a group

¹ 618 data table revised as of 11/29/05.

practice that has historically not provided home visiting or community based services. In the few situations where the school is listed it means that speech and language services for that child are being offered at the office of a school based SLP or a school based autism program. In addition, feedback from regions indicate that there are parent preferred providers in combination with a lack of well trained infant toddler therapists in the areas of speech, physical therapy and/or occupational therapy.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	96%
2006 (2006-2007)	97%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activities	Timelines	Resources	Notes
Procedure clarification in memo regarding use of Service Provider Location in light of Natural Environments rationale and compliance: define valid justification and process for services to be provided primarily outside of the natural environment	By 1/06 and ongoing	State staff	
Region specific focus and improvement based on annual data review and monitoring findings using child	December 2005 and ongoing through FFY 2010 with identified regions and providers	State staff and regional host agency director	

Activities	Timelines	Resources	Notes
count data in regional profiles.			
Meet with identified group practices as needed to clarify practices under Part C. Meet with DOE/EEE – SPED Unit on school office based service provision and LEA with Host Agency director	January 2006 and ongoing, as needed through 2010	State and regional staff, SEA and LEA as needed.	
Data management and reporting system phased in, real time analysis statewide and regional in place.	Phase in Spring of 2006 ongoing and through 2007; revisions as needed to improve system through FFY 2010	University, Part C staff and Child Development Division and staff	

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: Please refer to the description provided under Indicator 1 as it applies to each indicator in Vermont’s Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

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

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

Measurement:

Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improve functioning = # of infants and toddlers who improved functioning divided by # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100.
- c. 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.

If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

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

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning = # of infants and toddlers who improved functioning divided by # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100.
- c. 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.

If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = # of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning = # of infants and toddlers who improved functioning divided by # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100.
- c. 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.

If children meet the criteria for a, report them in a. Do not include children reported in a in b or c. If a + b + c does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Since this indicator is a performance-based and new monitoring indicator, with no baseline information available until the FFY 2005 APR which is due February 1, 2007 – an outline of the plan to collect data on child outcomes follows.

The purpose of measuring infant and toddler developmental outcomes is to have data that will inform the regional programs, the State of Vermont, the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Special Education Program and Congress of the impact early intervention have on helping to produce positive child outcomes. Linking child outcomes in groups of children in three functional areas of development to typically developing children for program evaluation and continuous improvement purposes is expected to provide information that will allow Vermont to look at the conditions associated with successful outcomes (such as type and intensity of services, training and qualifications, methods of service delivery, by region and statewide etc). The data will not be used to compare individual children; child data from outcome measurement will be coded and stored separately from child records and anonymously.

The individual child's ongoing assessment information, part of the IFSP and child's file, indicates progress in a manner that families and service providers find useful to them. This assessment information will be enhanced and will continue to be the first line of information used in discussing child functioning, progress outcomes, strategies and improvements. Several families, state agency representatives, advocates and service providers at the recent VICC meeting expressed grave concern over the impact that the child outcomes rating process might have on them emotionally. They felt many families, whose children are so young and quite vulnerable, may prefer to not enter the world of comparing how well their child is doing in relationship to children who are typically developing. The purpose for collecting child outcomes data was reiterated (for purposes of program evaluation, not particular child evaluation), the plan to collect data was described and the policy/procedure, after considering the input, will include an option for family involvement in the process as well as family consent.

Vermont's plan to measure infant and toddler outcomes, at entry and exit, for children who are under the age of 30 months and who receive Family, Infant and Toddler Program services for at least six months will include the following elements:

- The collaborative development of policies and procedures that will describe the rationale, as well as who will be involved, what practices will be used, when it will be done, where and how the data will be collected, reported, analyzed and used for program evaluation/continuous improvement;
- Development of budget to support cost projections and estimates of time to collect data for IFSP teams, and costs associated with revisions and operation of data management-reporting system;
- Dissemination of the rationale, policies and procedures to the field;
- Provision of initial and ongoing professional development and/or technical assistance to the Host Agency Directors, supervisors, staff and partner- providers;
- Quality of data collection, reporting, storing – methods to assure the accuracy and appropriate use of the infant-toddler outcomes data;
- Development of procedures to be used in regional and statewide analysis of the data and follow-up to the analysis;

Each of these elements is described below.

The collaborative **development of policies and procedures** to guide Vermont's infant and toddler outcomes assessment and measurement practices in collaboration with other stakeholders.

The policy and procedure for administering the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Rating Scale will be built on the FITP initial and ongoing assessment process. This process involves the collection and analysis of multiple sources of information on the current level of child functioning in each of the five developmental areas as part of the multi-disciplinary evaluation for eligibility/IFSP service planning activities completed initially by the child and family's team and assessed

over time by the child's IFSP team, using timelines already in place. The evaluation and ongoing assessment process includes information from state-approved assessment tools (current tools include the DAYC, AEPS, HELP, and the IDA). The selection of additional tools will depend on further identification of tools that are considered especially useful for infants, toddlers, their families and to providers planning or delivering early childhood (special education) services for children ages three and up. Vermont expects to link with efforts by Early Head Start, child care and other early childhood development services as improved assessments become available. The FITP initial evaluation and ongoing assessment process also includes observations from families and providers, reviews of health and medical information, clinical opinion and other relevant information, required by Part C of IDE IA and best practices.

The information from this assessment process will be integrated, analyzed and used to produce the Child Outcomes Summary Rating Scale data required by OSEP:

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

The Child Outcome Summary Rating Scale will be completed for children less than 30 months of age on entry. Using the information garnered from the developmental assessment process, this rating scale will be done within one week of the initial IFSP. The second rating scale will be completed for children who have received at least six months of early intervention services. This will be done during the transition process before children exit from FITP. The rating scale will be completed by qualified personnel (e.g., Developmental Educator, family if they wish, Community Resource Parent and key service providers) who are responsible for conducting the initial and/or ongoing all domain developmental assessments. Staffs are encouraged to use the IFSP meetings to engage all providers in the process of completing the rating scale.

Child Outcomes Summary Rating Scale data will initially be coded regionally and documented on a statewide form that all regions will submit to the state office where it will be hand entered into a spreadsheet for state and regional reporting and analysis until the under development data management system is operational.

The VICC's Executive Committee will be asked to review the policy, procedure and overall plan elements as will the Early Education Team of the Vermont Department of Education and the Child Development Division's Leadership Team.

Development of cost/budget projections related to the work of administering the ECO Center's Child Outcomes Summary Rating Scale.

Costs of IFSP team assessment on entry and exit, regional coding, separate storage, data entry on to statewide forms, statewide data management system completion and personnel to enter and analyze data regionally and statewide, etc. will be discussed with Host Agency Directors, Co-Lead Agencies and the Department for Children and Families/Child Development Division leadership – the administrative agency for FITP.

Dissemination of rationale, policy, procedures to the field will be coordinated whenever possible with dissemination of the early childhood special education policy and procedures. Information will also be available on the AHS/Department for Children and Families, Child Development Division web site, with copies or links from the SEA special education and early childhood web sites to the Child Development Division and the web site of the Vermont Parent Information Center. Paper copies will be sent to the VICC membership and any other individuals who may request a copy.

This plan will be discussed at the combined meeting of the 619 – Early Childhood Special Education Coordinators, the FITP Host Agency lead staff, and the Early Education Initiative Coordinators meeting on

December 8th, an event sponsored by the Early Education Team, which includes these three services plus Even Start.

Further written materials regarding the plan to collect and analyze for program evaluation purposes child outcomes data will be made available in an ongoing manner, beginning this month.

The VICC will receive copies and have the opportunity to discuss the plans, policy and procedures at their quarterly meeting in February, 2006.

The Early Childhood Work Group's committee on learning standards and child outcomes will be discussing the use of the infant and toddler outcomes and the ECO Child Outcomes Summary Rating Scale as part of the foundation for an evolving "Baby VELs" project, a projected piece of work that mirrors the recently developed Vermont Early Learning Standards for use in early care and education settings for children prior to kindergarten. Some of the foundation work done by FITP in preparation for the OSEP child outcomes work and this recent work by ECO will be useful to the group when combined with other child outcomes work underway in Early Head Start and other infant/child development programs.

Plan to provide initial and ongoing professional development, training and/or technical assistance to the Host Agency Directors, supervisors, staff and partner- providers.

Statewide training and technical assistance on the assessment process that is the foundation for the infant and toddler outcomes work (observation, tools and infant/toddler development, parenting/family issues) will continue to be offered from January through September, 2006. Statewide professional development, training and technical assistance will be provided during winter, 2005-2006 on the rationale, policy and procedures which will include how, when, and who will the use of the ECO child outcome rating scale and summary forms; and the responsibilities of coding, filing and data entry at the regional and state levels. The December 8th, 2005 meeting of EEE, EEI and FITP personnel has as part of its agenda a discussion of the plan to collect and analyze for program evaluation purposes, the child outcomes data birth to five.

Training will continue to be available on an annual basis to new FITP practitioners and ongoing technical assistance will be available to FITP practitioners and regional Host Agencies through monthly statewide meetings. It will also be available through individual technical assistance to regions as follow up to their correction action plans that occur as a part of monitoring, and it will be available on request. Issues that are priorities for professional development and training/technical assistance include the OSEP monitoring priorities and indicators as well as other compliance and/or performance issues that come to attention during regional monitoring, through the complaints system and/or other general supervision systems.

Ongoing pre and in-service efforts addressing assessment of young children are occurring across the state. A required University of Vermont course for undergraduate and graduate students in Early Childhood Special Education (ECSE) is offered on Assessment of Young Children with Disabilities and their Families, funded in part through the OSEP State Improvement Grant. In addition course work planned for the near future includes a course on Assessment and Eligibility for those obtaining the ECSE endorsement.

The Department of Education is planning a 2006 Summer Institute, a part of which will be devoted to assessment tools, methods and the use of the Early Childhood Outcomes Center Child Outcomes Summary Rating Scale.

In the fall of 2006, a statewide training will prepare service providers and administrators on how to use and interpret the reports of child outcome data for program improvement.

Quality of data collection, reporting, storing – methods to assure the accuracy and appropriate use of the infant-toddler data on outcomes;

A small workgroup consisting of the Research Associate in charge of developing the data management system, with state FITP staff, a host agency director, a representative from the Early Education Team and several key staff from the Bright Futures Child Care Management System/Child Development Division Leadership Team will develop procedures for monitoring the quality and protection of the data.

Multidisciplinary evaluation and IFSP teams, including the parent/guardian, review evaluation and assessment data for accuracy prior to completing the ECO Child Outcomes Summary Rating Scale Summary Form.

Regional monitoring/file review procedures will address the inclusion of a review of the Child Outcome Summary Forms files (separate from child's file/IFSP), including assessment data from the child's file that are used in to determine outcome rating.

When data are analyzed, regional reports will give the percentage of children with an IFSP that have completed both entry and exit data. Regions with incomplete data will receive follow up calls from the data coordinator to determine the reason and how to assure accurate and complete data is submitted.

Development of procedures for the analysis and use of the regional and statewide child outcomes data.

A small workgroup consisting of the Research Associate in charge of developing the data management system, with state FITP staff, a host agency director, a representative from the Early Education Team and several key staff from the Bright Futures Child Care Management System/Child Development Division Leadership Team, and staff from Marketing Partners will develop a plan (objectives and curriculum outline) to train Regional Host Agency Directors and state FITP staff on how to use the data from the Child Outcomes Summary Rating Scale Summary for program evaluation and continuous improvement, including what are the appropriate questions to ask when the data is presented – pre and post analysis (the role of staffing, qualifications, caseloads, child status/conditions impacting development, intensity of services etc).

Training will occur for administrators in the Fall-Winter of 2006.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Baseline data on this new indicator (entry data only) will be included in Vermont's 2005 Annual Performance Report, which is due 2/1/07. The following section outlines the draft plan to collect baseline data on child outcomes:

Evaluation data, including a state approved assessment tool and other sources of data as determined by the multidisciplinary evaluation team will be used to determine the rating to assess level of functioning on entry and on exit in each of the three outcome areas in relation to typically developing peers. Because the state allows regions to individualize each child's evaluation and assessment based on child needs, the ECO Child Outcomes Summary Rating Scale will be used as a mechanism to integrate the child's FITP assessment data and translate it into the 7 point outcome rating scale. This 7-point system summarizes the child's level of functioning in each of the three areas in relation to typically developing peers. The high point (7) on this scale indicates outcome achieved at an age-expected level. The low point (1) indicates the farthest distance from age-expectations.

The ECO Center's Child Outcomes Summary Rating Scale will be used to collect data for children who are under 30 months of age and entering FITP beginning April 1, 2006 from three regions/programs that are representative of Vermont's child and family population. The remaining nine regions will be phased in

beginning October 2006. The determination of or measurement of where a child enters/ranks on the rating scale will be made by qualified personnel (e.g., Developmental Educator, family if they wish, Community Resource Parent and key service providers) who are responsible for conducting the initial and/or ongoing all domain developmental assessments.

Child Outcomes Summary Rating Scale data will initially be coded by qualified personnel and documented on a statewide form that all regions will submit to the state office where it will be hand entered into a spreadsheet for state and regional reporting and analysis until the under development data management system is operational.

Host Agencies will have state provided codes for each child and will assign codes locally. Scores will be linked by child from time 1 to time 2. Rating data will be entered into the data system within 1 month of the initial IFSP date and prior to exiting for children who have been in the system for at least 6 months

The state will generate statewide and regional reports. The state will make the conversions of the data for SPP reporting.

The outcome ratings for each child at entry (time 1) will be matched to that child’s outcome ratings at exit (time 2). At both the state and regional levels, an analysis of the matched scores will yield for each of the three outcomes:

- a) Percent of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers: Children with ratings of 7 at time 1 and at time 2 will be categorized as **a**. Children who have ratings below 7 at time 1, but 7 at time 2 will also be categorized as **a**.
- b) Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning: Children with higher ratings at time 2 than at time 1 (with time 2 ratings below 7) will be categorized as **b**. Children who do not have increased rating scores, but who the team decides have made progress, based on available data, will also be categorized as **b**.
- c) Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning: Children who do not have increased rating scores, and who the team decides have not made progress, based on available data, will be categorized as **c**.

In addition, the state will analyze by state and region the mean and distribution of the entry status of children, exit status, and percentages of children who increased ratings from time 1 to time 2.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Baseline entry data will be reported in Vermont’s FFY 2007 Annual Performance Report.

Targets will be set once progress data are available, in the FFY 2008 Annual Performance Report.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	
2006 (2006-2007)	
2007 (2007-2008)	

2008 (2008-2009)	
2009 (2009-2010)	
2010 (2010-2011)	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

The improvement activities, timelines and resources will be determined when data for this indicator are available.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development: Please refer to the description provided under Indicator 1 as it applies to each indicator in Vermont’s Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010.

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.

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The general systems in place to measure, collect, analyze, and report on baseline data for the Family Outcomes Indicators in the SPP and in the future APR’s include the following systems for Vermont Part C of IDEA, the Family, Infant and Toddler Program: (a) the annual collection and analysis of a statewide survey of families by region that uses the Early Childhood Outcomes Center draft survey as the primary source of survey questions. In addition, Vermont will use family focus groups that occur as part of the monitoring of Part C host agencies and partners process as another level of verification of outcomes.

The plan to collect data on family outcomes includes the following elements:

Describing the purpose and process for collecting and analyzing data statewide and by region and disseminating this information through Host Agencies and partners about the use of a written survey (with some phone call potential for families that may prefer that method) by February 2006.

Assessing the “state of the surveys” issue from the family perspective, so as to integrate with or be aware of other Agency of Human Services or Department of Education survey of families requirements or intentions by February 2006.

Developing a work plan with the Child Development Division’s Leadership Team, University of Vermont Research Partnership and the Vermont Parent Information Center (VPIC) to review and revise as needed the ECO Family Survey Instrument . The work plan will address the administering of the survey and the role of the above organizations.

Finalizing protocol for who will gather names, addresses, set demographic categories (length of stay, child status on entry, active, exited etc), production, distribution and collection of surveys; coding and data

entry; data analysis and reporting formats; and instructions on how to analyze and use data for program evaluation – continuous improvement, by March 2006.

Distributing surveys, collect, enter, analyze and report data on status of family outcomes statewide and by regions for use in program improvement between April and October 2006.

Producing regional and statewide report by September 2006 on meaning and use of family survey data and enter data into baseline for 2005 APR, due 2/1/07. The report will address:

- The number and percent of families responding to the survey and reporting that early intervention services have helped their family know their rights;
- The number and percent of families responding to the survey and reporting that early intervention services have helped their family effectively communicate their childrens’ needs;
- The number and percent of families responding to the survey and reporting that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Baseline data will be reported in the FFY 2005 APR.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

The first time family outcomes data will be available, for baseline, will be in the 2005 APR submitted in February of 2007. Targets will be set once data is available.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	
2006 (2006-2007)	
2007 (2007-2008)	
2008 (2008-2009)	
2009 (2009-2010)	
2010 (2010-2011)	

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources: Improvement activities will be determined when data for this indicator are available.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Part C State Performance Plan (SPP): Please refer to the description provided under Indicator 1 as it applies to each indicator in Vermont’s Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010.

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.

Measurement:

- A. Percent = # of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs divided by the population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions.
- B. Percent = # of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs divided by the population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 times 100 compared to National data.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Child Find efforts to locate and identify all eligible infants and toddlers include outreach by the Regional Host Agencies schools, and other partners. Contacts are made with primary referral sources such as: hospitals, health care providers, child care and Head Start/Early Head Start programs, homeless shelters, child welfare organizations, disabilities advocacy and parent support services organizations, maternal and child health services. Special attention is given to the promotion of the services offered through FITP for children with diagnosed conditions at birth, children under three who have a substantiated case of child abuse and or neglect, children whose families are homeless and those who have been exposed during the pregnancy to illegal or toxic substances, and those born prematurely and/or with low birth weight – the target in these categories is infants under the age of one, as close to birth and the discovery of a condition or delay that may be helped through the provision of FITP services.

Regional Host Agency staff and partners participate in child find by communicating with health care providers and presenting at Grand Rounds at hospitals about the eligibility, purpose, and services available through the Part C- FITP in Vermont. There is special liaison work between Parent to Parent of Vermont, the Regional Host Agency in the most populous area of Vermont (Chittenden County, where nearly one quarter of the children served in FITP live), the State FITP staff, and the Neonatal Intensive Care Staff at Fletcher Allen Health Care. Referrals are made to FITP, often in collaboration with Children with Special Health Needs and their clinical staff. An important relationship between FITP statewide staff through the Regional Host Agencies with CSHN Medical Social Workers who act as part of the child’s team. The identification part of child find is carried out by qualified Host Agency staff, school personnel, CSHN social workers and other partners.

The recent history of serving infants under the age of 12 months is as follows for Vermont:

Early Intervention Services Over a Six Year Period: 12/01/99 - 12/01/04

Child Count Year	IFSPs Active	% Change Year to Year	# Infants under 12 months	% infants under 12 months	Age at time of referral is under 12 months
12/1/99	409				
12/1/00	438	7%			
12/1/01	472	8%			
12/1/02	577	22%	72	12.5%	288 (50%)
12/1/03	625	8%	64	10.2%	297 (48%)
12/1/04	599	-4%	54	9.0%	276 (46%)

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Compared to the “broad” eligibility states that do not serve children “at risk” Vermont ranks 17 of 24 states, using the child count data reported for 12/1/04 for infants under the age of 12 months. Vermont used Table 8-6 as the base and highlighted the broad eligibility states by hand in order to derive this ranking.

Comparing Vermont to all States/National Data:

In 2000 Vermont served 54 infants or .8% of 1% of the population, which was .03% above the national baseline data reported by OSEP for serving infants covered by the 12/1/2000 child count data.

In 2001 Vermont served 59 infants or .9% of 1% of the population, which was .06% above the national baseline data reported by OSEP.

In 2002 Vermont served 72 infants or 1.2% of the population, which was 1.21% above the national baseline data reported by OSEP.

In 2003 Vermont served 64 infants or 1.0% of the population, which was 1.3% above the national baseline data reported by OSEP.

In 2004 Vermont served 54 infants or .9% of 1% of the population, which was - .05% below the national baseline data reported by OSEP.

Regional Data on Serving Infants under 12 months of age at time of child count and at time of referral. Data reported to OSEP from the 12/1/04 Child Count for use in OSEP comparisons between states and against national data for infants served under 12 months of age. (Revised 618 data on 10/31/05):

Region SPP indicator 5	Total Actives 12/1/04	Total children < 12 months 12/1/04	Total number of births for region (2003)	Percent of children < 12 months with IFSPs 12/1/04	Age at time of referral < 12 months 12/1/04
Addison	26	0	316		10
Bennington	41	4	514	.00782%	26
Caledonia	24	4	245	.01633%	9
Chittenden	129	9	2,260	.00398%	50
Franklin/Gl	55	10	487	.02053%	21
Lamoille	29	4	260	.01538%	17
Orange-Windsor	63	4	328	.01222%	18
Orleans – Essex North	31	4	226	.01769%	19
Rutland	52	1	585	.00017%	24
Washington	58	4	450	.00889%	35
Windham	55	8	385	.02078%	34
Windsor-South	36	2	234	.00855%	13
Total	599	54	6,290	.00858%	276

Discussion of Baseline Data:

There was a large outreach effort made by the VICC (VICC) in 2002 and 2003 to reach children at the earliest possible times. In addition staff increased and the general visibility and credibility of the program has increased over time. In fact, there was a 32% increase in the total number of children served from 12/1/01 to 12/1/03 (472 to 625). However, there has been a slight decrease in the overall number of children active on 12/1/04 and also a parallel decrease in the number and percent of infants served.

Vermont currently ranks .05% below the national baseline reported by OSEP (.98 is the national baseline, Vermont is .90), there has been an overall positive trend of 4% for Vermont in the last five years. There has been a slight decrease in overall numbers served, as well as a slight decrease in the Vermont birth rate.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	.90%
2006 (2006-2007)	.91%
2007 (2007-2008)	.93%
2008 (2008-2009)	.94%

2009 (2009-2010)	.96%
2010 (2010-2011)	.98%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activities	Timelines	Resources	Notes
Regional Host Agency- partners; disseminate SPP information – address data analysis issues - regional issues discussed on conference calls – use regional goals for budget to address SPP indicator issues + status on “finding” and serving infants, and other eligible children under three etc	Ongoing 12/6/05 -- through FFY 2010	State staff and Directors, Co-Lead Agencies	
Regions below state average address increase in infants in annual plan, including plans for discussion with primary referral sources to address efforts to continue to “find” all eligible infants	Ongoing 12/6/05 – - through FFY 2010	State and regional partners	
Presentations continue to be made (some with CSHN) to hospitals, VT Chapter of AAP, shelters, child welfare, drug treatment programs, and related organizations	Ongoing 12/6/05 - – through FFY 2010	Regional and state resources including CSHN as appropriate	

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to the description provided under Indicator 1 as it applies to each indicator in Vermont's Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010.

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.

Measurement:

- A. Percent = # of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs divided by the population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions.
- B. Percent = # of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs divided by the population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 times 100 compared to National data.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Child Find efforts to locate and identify all eligible infants and toddlers include outreach by the Regional Host Agencies schools, and other partners. Contacts are made with primary referral sources such as: hospitals, health care providers, child care and Head Start/Early Head Start programs, homeless shelters, child welfare organizations, disabilities advocacy and parent support services organizations, maternal and child health services. Special attention is given to the promotion of the services offered through FITP for children with diagnosed conditions, children under three who have a substantiated case of child abuse and or neglect, children whose families are homeless and those who have been exposed during the pregnancy to illegal or toxic substances, and those born prematurely and/or with low birth weight.

Once referrals are received by the Regional Host Agencies - they, along with qualified partners and the family, plan the evaluation process. This process includes the completion of a multidisciplinary evaluation(s) that encompasses initial comprehensive assessment of the current level of functioning in each of the five developmental areas and a voluntary, family-driven assessment of the family's concerns, resources and priorities. This information determines the child's eligibility and at this point families are offered early intervention services through the Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP).

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

According to the Vermont Child Count Data for 12/1/04 submitted via the 618 Data Report for OSEP's use in reporting to Congress, Vermont is a **broad eligibility** state, and **is ranked number five out of the twenty-four broad eligibility states**. Five hundred and ninety nine (599 revised 10/31/05) children had active IFSP's on 12/1/2004 and the population statistics for this age group in Vermont indicate a total of 18,602 resulting in Vermont's **servicing of 3.2%** of the birth to three population which is .98% above the national baseline reported by OSEP. The national baseline was not calculated by eligibility category; however, for all states the baseline was reported as 2.24%.

Comparing Vermont to all States/National Data:

In 2000 Vermont FITP served 438 children under age three and their families or 2.2% of the Vermont birth to three population, which was .40% above the national baseline data reported (1.8%) by OSEP in its 12/1/2000 child count data report.

In 2001 Vermont FITP served 472 children under age three and their families or 2.5% of the Vermont birth to three population, which was .46% above the national baseline data reported by OSEP in its 12/1/2001 child count data report.

In 2002 Vermont FITP served 577 children under the age of three and their families or 3.1% of the Vermont birth to three population, which was .91% above the national baseline data reported by OSEP in its 12/1/2002 child count data report.

In 2003 Vermont FITP served 625 children under age three and their families or 3.3% of the Vermont birth to three population, which was 1.16% above the national baseline data reported by OSEP in its 12/1/2003 child count data report.

In 2004 Vermont FITP served 599 (revised 10/31/05) children under the age of three and their families or 3.2% of the Vermont birth to three population, which was .98% above the national baseline data reported by OSEP in its 12/1/2004 child count data report.

The Program/Regional Breakdown for baseline data birth to three child find results is found in the table below and is based on 618 data and Vermont population data:

Region SPP indicator 6	Total Actives 12/1/04	Birth to Three population data	Percent of birth to three in region served by region
Addison	26	1,072	2.4%
Bennington	41	1,078	3.8%
Caledonia	24	936	2.6%
Chittenden	129	4,914	2.6%
Franklin/Gl	55	1,961	2.8%
Lamoille	29	988	2.9%
Orange-Windsor	63	1,421	4.4%
Orleans – Essex North	31	862	3.6%
Rutland	52	1,871	2.8%
Washington	58	2,114	2.7%
Windham	55	984	5.6%
Windsor-South	36	1,141	3.2%
Total	599	19,342	3.1%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Vermont is doing well on child find, identification and provision of services and has done very well, even among the “broad” eligibility states. There is a slight drop in children served between 2003 and 2004. We are not sure of the reason, although the budget climate in Vermont at that time was concerning to the general public; Vermont also has had a slight dip in birth rates during the past few years.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2005 (2005-2006)</p>	<p>3.2%</p>
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	<p>3.25%</p>
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>3.28%</p>
<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	<p>3.3%</p>
<p>2009 (2009-2010)</p>	<p>3.4%</p>
<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	<p>3.5%</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Continue public awareness and child find activities for the birth to three population in Vermont by analyzing regional, statewide and national comparison data and reporting this data to stakeholders and regions, including the results of child find by region, age, category of eligibility, referral sources etc from FFY 2005 through FFY 2010.

Key resources are: VICC, the Vermont Agency of Human Services, Department for Children and Families, Child Development Division, and FITP state staff in collaboration with the Department of Education and Local Education Agencies/Supervisory Unions and all partners involved in the provision of early intervention services.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to the description provided under Indicator 1 as it applies to each indicator in Vermont’s Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010.

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.

Measurement:
 Percent = # of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline divided by # of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed times 100.
 Account for untimely evaluations.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Vermont’s policy related to initial evaluation and assessment / initial IFSP meeting requires completion of a multidisciplinary evaluation and assessment of current level of functioning in the five areas of development and the initial IFSP meeting occurs within the 45 day timeline from referral.

Vermont monitors early intervention programs (same as regions) every three years, and as part of the monitoring conducts file reviews for compliance. Vermont has not yet defined what constitutes noncompliance. This issue will be addressed in the discussion of OSEP priority indicator 9. The baseline data for indicator 7 is found below and its source is the child count data base and regional monitoring file reviews.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Regions	Total Actives from 618 Child Count data	Number and percent of initial IFSPs meeting 45 day timeline from file review as part of regional monitoring
SPP Indicator 7	12/1/04	
Bennington	41	13 reviewed/relevant 12 of 13 met timelines or 92%
Caledonia	24	9 reviewed/relevant 6 of 9 met timelines or 66%
Franklin/Gl	55	8 reviewed with 6 of 8 meeting timelines or 75%
Orleans – Essex North	31	15 total reviewed all reasons; 10 relevant; 5 of 10 met timelines or 50%
Windham	55	11 reviewed with 10 of 11 meeting 45 day timelines or 92%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Vermont has not yet defined “compliance” other than literally – if one file is out of compliance for one indicator, then that program is considered out of compliance for that indicator. This is a problem that results in Vermont’s data from monitoring showing low compliance with little capacity to show full compliance with the current procedure.

The baseline data will be updated as the procedure to define compliance rates is completed and used in the future.

Orleans-Essex was the first program reviewed by a new staff and had also experienced a high rate of staff turnover; Caledonia was the second program reviewed and had an even higher rate of staff turnover; the host agency for Caledonia has changed to a new agency effective January 2006.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activities	Timelines	Resources	Notes
SPP Indicator 7			
See indicator 9 for development of definition for compliance	February 2006	State FITP staff	

Activities	Timelines	Resources	Notes
SPP Indicator 7			
Develop file review check list for self assessment of compliance on key indicators (see 9 also)	Spring 2006	State FITP staff	
Disseminate checklist to regions with procedures for self-monitoring	Spring 2006 and ongoing	State staff	
Orleans-Essex North to do a records self assessment – if not compliant provide technical assistance	March 2006 and ongoing as needed	Regional staff, state staff	
Provide training and technical assistance to Caledonia-So Essex staff and new host agency leadership on compliance issues	December 2005 and ongoing at least monthly for 6 months or as needed	State staff and partners	
Provide ongoing training and technical assistance to regions out of compliance to assure 100% compliance	January 2006 and ongoing through 2010	State staff and partners	
Annual regional goals address possible performance issues identified in regional profiles.	May 2006 and ongoing through 2010	State staff and partners	

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to the description provided under Indicator 1 as it applies to each indicator in Vermont’s Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010.

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.

Measurement:

- A. Percent = # of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services divided by # of children exiting Part C times 100.
- B. Percent = # of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred divided by the # of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B times 100.
- C. Percent = # of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred divided by the # of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B times 100.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The general description of the multiple methods used to assess and improve compliance and performance is found under indicator 1 and applies throughout Vermont’s SPP as general background.

The Vermont Part C transition planning process includes a written plan that has transition steps and services, notification to the LEA no later than 2.6 years and a transition conference that occurs at least 90 days prior to the child’s 3rd birthday.

The Family, Infant Toddler Program collects data on the transition plan with steps and services, notification to the LEA, and 90-day transition conference. This data has been collected through the regional monitoring process via file reviews. Baseline data was collected during 5 initial and close-out regional monitorings completed between 7/04 and 6/05.

Baseline data from regional monitoring during the period July of 2004 through June of 2005 is reported in the following table.

Regional Monitoring – file reviews SPP indicator 8	Total Files	Transition Plan in compliance	Notification to LEA at least 6 months prior to child’s 3rd B-day	Transition conference at least 90 days prior to child’s 3rd birthday
Bennington	13	2 of 2- 100%	4 of 4 – 100%	2 of 2 – 100%
Caledonia – Southern Essex	9	0 of 1- 0%	2 of 2 – 100%	0 of 1- 0%
Franklin – G.Isle	18	0 of 2- 0%	3 of 3 – 100%	1 of 2 – 50%
Orleans – Essex North	15	4 of 6 – 67%	9 of 9 – 100%	6 of 6 – 100%
Windham	11	3 of 4 – 75%	4 of 4 – 100%	2 of 4 – 50%

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Data from Orleans-Essex North, Caledonia Southern Essex, and Franklin/Grand Isle are from close-out file reviews conducted during the 7/04-6/05 time period to determine compliance one year from the determination of non-compliance. Data from the Windham and Bennington regions reflect data collected during file reviews conducted as part of the initial monitoring process during the 7/04-6/05 time period. The close-out and initial data from the regions reflect the files of children whose birthdates made them eligible for the six-month notification, transition plan, and 90-day conference; therefore, percentages are based on the number of files out of the total number reviewed that met this criteria at the time of the file review.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activities	Timelines	Resources	Notes
See indicators 7 and 9 improvement strategies: definition of non-compliance procedures developed	January 2006 and ongoing	State Staff	
Close-out verification of one-year corrective action plans continued in regions	July 2005 and ongoing	State Staff	
Follow-up technical assistance provided to regions with findings of non-compliance during monitoring process to ensure 100% compliance within one year	Winter 2006 and ongoing	State Staff	
Regional profiles used for I self –assessment and date verification.	December 2005 and ongoing through 2010	State Staff	
Monthly Child Count reporting form revised and data collected and analyzed	January 2006	State Staff	
Statewide form for timely notification to LEA developed and implemented statewide	Winter 2006 and ongoing	State Staff	

SPP Template – Part C (3)

Activities	Timelines	Resources	Notes
Revised IFSP disseminated (that includes revised transition pages)	Winter 2006	State Staff	
Trainings conducted regionally/statewide for families and providers (to include new data management system; Stepping Stones workshops - transition Part C to Part B)	Winter 2006 and ongoing	State Part C staff; State Part C/619 staff when appropriate	

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to the description provided under Indicator 1 as it applies to each indicator in Vermont’s Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 9 A: 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.

Measurement:
A. Percent of noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:
a. # of findings of noncompliance made related to priority areas.
b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.
Percent = b divided by a times 100.
For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The data used in compliance monitoring comes solely from file reviews for this time period as other data that is collected (such as information from focus groups or surveys) may be used as backup data, but is not data we feel is accurate enough to determine compliance. This related data helps to back up compliance data or indicates a need to look more deeply into an identified issue.

Early Intervention Programs in Vermont are referred to as regions. These regions cover the same areas as the Agency of Human Services regions in Vermont. Vermont monitors early intervention regional programs every three years. As part of the monitoring process, Part C staffs conduct file reviews for compliance. For the purposes of this report, early intervention programs are referred to as “regions.” Compliance indicators are used to monitor files. Vermont’s prior and current definition of compliance is 100% for each indicator in each file reviewed. If one file is out of compliance for one indicator, then that program is considered out of compliance for that indicator. The lack of clearly defined parameters for compliance results in Vermont’s monitoring data showing a low level of compliance and little capacity to achieve full compliance within one year using the current definition/procedure.

The data included here are based on initial file reviews and file reviews done at the one year verification visit in three regions. The files reviewed were not the same number nor the same files except in Region 1 where the file review was repeated on five of the same children to determine compliance at transition (these children were “actives” during the initial review and “exits” during the one year verification visit). It is therefore challenging to make meaningful comparisons between initial and verification data. Since we have not developed a definition of compliance (level of files in compliance for each indicator that would be considered in or out), Vermont, for this reporting period, shows a lower level of compliance than other states that have developed these definitions. If Vermont uses the OSEP measurement instructions, we would be comparing different bases of information, which make it a challenge to report out meaningful

data. For this reporting period, therefore, Vermont Part C is using percentage point improvements in showing rates of improved compliance. The data comparing rates of improvement in decreasing non compliance are available in the tables.

For programs out of compliance, training and technical assistance is offered as part of the corrective action planning and verification process. Technical assistance was provided to each region monitored between initial and verification visits. The grant work specifications include expectations of compliance, use of training, and potential sanctions. In addition, the budget process includes a review of non-compliance and performance issues in order to assist the region in fulfilling its responsibilities in carrying out FITP services under Part C of the IDE IA.

The under-development FITP data management system will include real-time, on-line data for use by practitioners, families and State staff. Use of the data management system will begin in April 2006 with a phase in of modules and regions. Since this system will be actively used by practitioners and eventually by families, the data entered into it will be much more useable and effective for assessing compliance and/or performance.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005) for A: Percent of noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification.

Please see discussion above under Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process and discussion below under Discussion of Baseline Data for 9 A.

Baseline Data for Indicator 9 A FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Indicator – 9 A	Monitoring Method	# Programs Reviewed	# programs with Findings	a. # of Findings	b. # Corrected w/in 1 yr.	% Corrected w/in 1 year: see data discussion
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	On-site Visit	3	0	NA	NA	
		Region 1	0	NA	NA	
		Region 2	0	NA	NA	
		Region 3	0	NA	NA	
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.	On-Site Visit	3	0	NA	NA	
		Region 1	0	NA	NA	
		Region 2	0	NA	NA	
		Region 3	0	NA	NA	
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	3	3: 22 files reviewed initial monitoring; 27 files reviewed close-out at 1 yr.	10 in 22 files = 45% non-compliant ; 12 in 22 files = 55% compliant	10 in 27 files = 37% non-compliant; 17 in 27 files = 63% compliant	

Indicator – 9 A	Monitoring Method	# Program sReviewed	# programs with Findings	a. # of Findings	b. # Corrected w/in 1 yr.	% Corrected w/in 1 year: see data discussion
		Region 1		6 in 10 files = 60% noncompliant; 4 in 10 files = 40% compliant	5 in 10 files = 50% non-compliant; 5 in 10 files = 50% compliant	
		Region 2		2 in 5 files = 40% noncompliant; 3 in 5 files = 60% compliant	3 in 9 files = 33% non-compliant; 6 in 9 files = 67% compliant	
		Region 3		2 in 7 files = 29% non-complaint ; 5 in 7 files = 71% compliant	2 in 8 files = 25% non-compliant; 6 in 8 files = 75% compliant	
<p>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:</p> <p>A. IFSPs with transition steps and services</p>	<p>On-site Visit</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>2: 22 files reviewed initial monitoring – 6 relevant to</p>	<p>2 in 6 files = 33% non-compliant ; 4 of 6 files =</p>	<p>4 in 8 files non-compliant = 50%; 4 of 8 files = 50% compliant</p>	

Indicator – 9 A	Monitoring Method	# Program sReviewed	# programs with Findings	a. # of Findings	b. # Corrected w/in 1 yr.	% Corrected w/in 1 year: see data discussion
their third birthday including: B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B	On-site Visit	3	0 (in 22 files) =100%compliance	NA	NA	
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: B. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B	On-site Visit	3	2	2 in 6 files = 33% non-compliant ; 4 in 6 files = 67% compliant 1 in 2 files = 50% non-compliant ; 1 of 2 files = 50% compliant 0 in 2 files = 100%compliance	1 in 8 files (2 regions) = 12% non-compliant; 7 in 8 files = 88% compliant 6 in 6 files = 100% compliant NA 1 in 2 files = 50% non-compliant;	

Indicator – 9 A	Monitoring Method	# Program sReviewed	# programs with Findings	a. # of Findings	b. # Corrected w/in 1 yr.	% Corrected w/in 1 year: see data discussion
		Region 3		1 in 2 files = 50% non-compliant ; 1 in 2 files = 50% compliant	1 in 2 files = 50% compliant	

Discussion of Baseline Data for 9 A:

Data from the three monitored programs show 100% compliance for **Indicators 1 (timely) and 2 (natural environments)** because there were no findings for these three regions/programs.

Indicator 7 (45-Day timeline): Each of the three regions had findings. The total number of findings among the three were 10 in 22 files in the initial reviews (NC = 45%). In the verification visits within one year of findings, there were 10 findings in 27 files across the three programs (NC = 37%). For this indicator, there is a high level of non compliance still existing in each of the three programs and each program has received ongoing technical assistance.

Indicator 8 (Transition plan with steps and services, notification to LEA, and transition conference). For the **transition plan** with steps and services, two of the three regions had initial findings in the six files reviewed across the three regions. Two of 6 files had findings (NC = 33%). In the verification visits within one year of findings, there were 4 findings in 8 files (NC = 50%), which was an **increase in non compliance**. For **notification to LEA**, none of the three regions reviewed had findings; therefore they had **100% compliance**. For the **transition conference**, two of the three regions had initial findings in the six files reviewed across the three regions. Two of six files had findings (NC = 33%). In the verification visits within one year of findings, there was 1 finding in 8 files (NC = 12%), **a significant improvement**.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Develop and implement standard definitions of compliance for each indicator. Timeline/Resources: Begin January 2006 and ongoing, state staff.

Develop excel spreadsheet for data recording of findings. Timeline/Resources: January 2006, state staff.

Use regional profiles to verify data. Timeline/Resources: Beginning March 2006 and ongoing through 2010, state and regional staff.

Phase in FITP real-time, on-line data management system, beginning with outcomes module. Timeline/Resources: April 2006; full operations in place July 2007 and ongoing refinements through 2010, state and regional staff and consultants.

Develop levels of technical assistance and training based on compliance findings, including sanctions. Timeline/Resources: May 2006 and ongoing through 2010, state staff with advice and assistance from host agencies and VICC.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to the description provided under Indicator 1 as it applies to each indicator in Vermont’s Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 9 B: 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.

Measurement:

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

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

Percent = b divided by a times 100.

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Please see description in 9 A.

Baseline Data for Indicator 9 B FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Indicator 9 B	Monitoring Method	# Reviewed	# with Findings	a. # of Findings	b. # Corrected w/in 1 yr.	% Corrected w/in 1 year: see data discussion
1. Single Service Coordinator	On-site Visit	3: 22 files reviewed initial monitoring; 32 files reviewed close-out at 1 yr. Region 1	2	4 in 22 files = 18% non-compliant; 18 in 22 files = 82% compliant 3 in 10 files = 30% non-compliant; 7 in 10 files = 70% compliant	2 in 24 files = 8% non-compliant; 22 in 24 files = 92% compliant 15 in 15 files = 100% compliant	

SPP Template – Part C (3)

Indicator 9 B	Monitoring Method	# Reviewed	# with Findings	a. # of Findings	b. # Corrected w/in 1 yr.	% Corrected w/in 1 year: see data discussion
		Region 2		1 in 5 files = 20% non-compliant; 4 in 5 files = 80% compliant	1 in 9 files = 11% non-compliant; 8 in 9 files = 89% compliant	
		Region 3		0 in 7 files = 100% compliance	NA	
2. Five-Domain Evaluation & Assessment/ Current Levels of Functioning	On-Site Visit	3	3	10 in 22 files = 45% non-compliant; 12 of 22 files = 55% compliant	12 in 27 files = 44% non-compliant; 15 in 27 files = 56% compliant	
		Region 1		3 in 10 files = 30% non-compliant; 7 in 10 files = 70% compliant	4 in 10 files = 40% non-compliant; 6 in 10 files = 60% compliant	
		Region 2		5 in 5 files = 100% non-compliant	5 in 9 files = 55% non-compliant; 4 in 9 files = 45% compliant	
		Region 3		2 in 7 files = 29% non-compliant; 5 in 7 = 71% compliant	3 in 8 files = 37% non-compliant; 5 in 8 = 63% compliant	
3. Prior Written Notice initial IFSP meetings	On-Site Visit	3	3	16 in 22 files = 73% non-compliant; 6 in 22 files = 27% compliant	14 in 32 files = 44% non-compliant; 18 in 32 files = 56% compliant	
		Region 1		5 in 10 files = 50% non-compliant; 5	15 in 15 files = 100% compliant	

Indicator 9 B	Monitoring Method	# Reviewed	# with Findings	a. # of Findings	b. # Corrected w/in 1 yr.	% Corrected w/in 1 year: see data discussion
		Region 2		in 10 files = 50% compliant	7 in 9 files = 78% non- compliant; 2 in 9 files = 22% compliant	
		Region 3		5 in 5 files = 100% non- compliant	7 in 8 files = 86% non- compliant; 1 in 8 files = 14% compliant	
4. Parental Rights	On-site Visit	3	2	8 in 22 files = 36% non- compliant; 14 in 22 files = 64% compliant	2 in 23 files = 9% non- compliant; 21 of 23 files = 91% compliant	
		Region 1		1 in 10 files = 10% non- compliant; 9 in 10 files = 90% compliant	15 in 15 files = 100% compliant	
		Region 2		0 in 5 files = 100% compliant	NA	
		Region 3		7 in 7 files = 100% non- compliant	2 in 8 files = 25% non- compliant; 6 of 8 files = 75% compliant	

Discussion of Baseline Data for 9 B:

Vermont monitored the same three regions for compliance within one year of identification in the following areas that are not included in the OSEP priority compliance indicators described in 9 A above:

1. Single Service Coordinator
2. Five domain evaluation and assessment/current level of functioning
3. Prior Written Notice initial IFSP meeting
4. Parental Rights

Single service coordinator: Two of the three regions had initial findings in the 22 files reviewed across the three regions. Four of 22 files had findings (NC = 18%). In the verification visits within one year of findings, there were two findings in 24 files in the two programs (NC = 8%).

Five domain evaluation and assessment/current level of functioning: Three regions had findings. Ten of 22 files at the initial visit had findings (NC = 45%). In the verification visits within one year of findings, there were 12 findings in 27 files (NC = 44%).

Prior written notice initial IFSP meeting: Three regions had findings. Sixteen of 22 files had findings (NC= 73%) at the initial visit. In the verification visits within one year of the findings, there were 14 findings in 32 file reviews (NC = 44%). This was a significant improvement of 29 percentage points.

Parental rights: Two of the three regions had findings in the 22 files reviewed at the initial visit. Eight of the 22 files had findings (NC = 36%). During the verification visits within one year of the findings, there were two findings in 23 files reviewed (NC = 9%), a significant improvement of 27 percentage points.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Please see indicator 9 A, all of which apply to 9 B.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to the description provided under Indicator 1 as it applies to each indicator in Vermont’s Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 9 C: 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.

C. Percent of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, due process hearings, mediations, etc.) corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of EIS programs in which noncompliance was identified through other mechanisms.
- b. # of findings of noncompliance made.
- c. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = c divided by b times 100.

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Families are informed of their rights to file a formal complaint or request mediation or a due process hearing during the intake process, and at least at the initial IFSP meeting, annual reviews, and transition. Written materials are given to families at these times and additionally upon request. Service Coordinators also share this information with families verbally as situations arise. Staff also, in discussing informal complaints, discuss the formal complaint process and mail out copies of the written information on parental rights as follow up to these informal discussions.

Vermont Part C has an agreement with the SEA to use the special education complaint process, as there are resources and skills in special education to implement the complaint process that are not available to the Part C program, since administratively it sits in the Agency of Human Services.

Baseline Data for Indicator 9 C FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

# programs (regions) with formal complaint	# findings of non-compliance made	# corrections completed within a year
1	1	In process

Discussion of Baseline Data: there was one signed, written complaint filed during this time period. The complaint was received on 1/20/05 (Case # AC05-02). The report was due out on 3/21/05. The deadline was extended to 4/8/05 and the Report was issued on 4/6/05 w/ corrective actions. This was counted as report issued within the extended timeline in the Part B Attachment 1. The Part C Attachment 1 has a reference to Part B Attachment 1 in order to not double count this complaint.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100%
2006 (2006-2007)	100%
2007 (2007-2008)	100%
2008 (2008-2009)	100%
2009 (2009-2010)	100%
2010 (2010-2011)	100%

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part C will continue its efforts to ensure families understand their rights and the processes available to make formal complaints. Timeline/Resources: Ongoing through 2010 by staff and partners of Part C.

Part C will continue to utilize the expertise of the SEA in investigating and processing complaints, requests for mediation, and other due process options. Timeline/Resources: Ongoing.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to the description provided under Indicator 1 as it applies to each indicator in Vermont’s Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010.

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.

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Families are informed of their rights to file a formal complaint or request mediation or a due process hearing during the intake process, at least at the initial IFSP meeting, annual reviews and transition. Written materials are given to families at these times and additionally upon request. Service Coordinators also share this information with families verbally as situations arise.

The staff, in discussing informal complaints, discusses the formal complaint process and mail out copies of the written information on parental rights as follow to these informal discussions.

Vermont Part C has an agreement with the SEA to use the special education complaint process as that process has resources and skills in special education not available to the Part C program that administratively sits in the Agency of Human Services.

From the Department of Education Indicator 16 overview of issue/description of system or process:

Any person has the right to file an administrative complaint with the Vermont Commissioner of Education if they believe a child’s early intervention or special education rights have been violated. An organization or a group of parents may also file a complaint if it believes that there are violations affecting a number of children. The Commissioner will appoint Department staff to investigate the complaint, and a decision must be issued within 60 days of receipt of the complaint, unless an extension is granted. A copy of the decision will be forwarded to the complainant, the local educational agency and/or the State Part C office.

To investigate the complaint, the Department of Education may, but is not required to, conduct an on-site review. The Department will also give the complainant an opportunity to present additional information, orally or in writing. The Department of Education staff will review all relevant information and make a decision about whether the school district and/or the Part C program has violated federal or state special education laws. If the administrative complaint is also the subject of a due process hearing, the Department will not investigate any part of the complaint that is being addressed as part of the due process hearing.

To file an administrative complaint, one should write to the Commissioner of Education, Vermont Department of Education, 120 State Street, Montpelier, VT 05620-2501.

A database managed by a representative of the Vermont Department of Education is used to track signed written complaints, including complaints with reports issued, complaints withdrawn or dismissed and complaints pending and the timelines within each action was completed. This database also includes tracking data for due process hearings and mediations.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

SECTION A: Signed, written complaints	
Section (1) Signed, written complaints total	1
Section (1.1) Complaints with reports issued	1
(a) Reports with findings	1
(b) Reports within timeline	0
(c) Reports within extended timelines	1
Section (1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	0
Section (1.3) Complaints pending	0
(a) Complaint pending a due process hearing	0

Discussion of Baseline Data: there was one signed, written complaint filed during this time period. The complaint was received on 1/20/05. The report was due out on 3/21/05. The deadline was extended to 4/8/05 and the Report was issued on 4/6/05 w/ corrective actions. This was counted as report issued within the extended timeline in the Part B Attachment 1. The Part C Attachment 1 has a reference to Part B Attachment 1 in order to not double count this complaint.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% and continue to coordinate and support Education’s efforts to resolve complaints in a timely manner.
2006 (2006-2007)	100% and continue to coordinate and support Education’s efforts to resolve complaints in a timely manner.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% and continue to coordinate and support Education’s efforts to resolve complaints in a timely manner.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% and continue to coordinate and support Education’s efforts to resolve complaints in a timely manner.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% and continue to coordinate and support Education’s efforts to resolve complaints in a timely manner.

<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	<p>100%and continue to coordinate and support Education’s efforts to resolve complaints in a timely manner.</p>
------------------------------------	--

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part C will continue its efforts to assure families understand their rights, including parental consent for services and procedural safeguards. This is ongoing through 2010 by staff and partners of Part C.

Part C will continue to utilize the expertise of the SEA in investigating and processing complaints, requests for mediation and other due process options.

Please see Part B indicator 16 for additional improvement strategies submitted by Part B.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to the description provided under Indicator 1 as it applies to each indicator in Vermont’s Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010.

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.

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Please see indicator 10 for Part C description and indicator 17 under Part B since Vermont Part C uses the Part B dispute resolution process.

From Part B Indicator 17 overview of issue/description of system or process:

A due process hearing is a formal review conducted by a trained, impartial hearing officer appointed by the Vermont Department of Education. After reviewing the evidence provided by the parties, the hearing officer issues written decisions including findings of fact and conclusions of law. The hearing officer decision is a final agency decision.

Parties requesting a due process must file their request with the Commissioner, Vermont Department of Education within two years of the date the problem occurred or two years from the date the problem was discovered; a 90 day timeframe applies for reimbursement of unilateral placement cases. The Department has a due process complaint request form that is available through contacting the Department, the school district, or the Department’s website.

With the addition of the resolution session requirements in the new IDEIA, the hearing officers are now contacting parties a few days after the receipt of the complaint for an early status conference. In the early status conference, the hearing officer explains the new resolution session requirement and ascertains whether the parties will meet. If they plan to meet, the hearing officer has the parties confirm the date of the resolution session. If not, the hearing officer either confirms intent to request mediation or waive the resolution session and proceed to hearing. If the parties waive, the hearing officer would confirm the dates for pre-hearing conferences, if any, distribution of 5-day rule materials, the hearing date, and the decision date.

A database managed by a representative of the Vermont Department of Education is used to track fully adjudicated hearing requests, fully adjudicated hearings and those fully adjudicated hearing requests that resolved without a hearing, and the timelines within each action was completed. This database also includes tracking data for administrative complaints and mediations. For FFY 2006, Vermont is in the process of modifying this database to accommodate tracking of resolution sessions and settlement agreements.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

None to report for this time period

Discussion of Baseline Data:

See above.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p>2005 (2005-2006)</p>	<p>From Part B indicator 17: Within 45 days or with proper extensions, 100% of due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated.</p>
<p>2006 (2006-2007)</p>	<p>From Part B indicator 17: Within 45 days or with proper extensions, 100% of due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated.</p>
<p>2007 (2007-2008)</p>	<p>From Part B indicator 17: Within 45 days or with proper extensions, 100% of due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated.</p>
<p>2008 (2008-2009)</p>	<p>From Part B indicator 17: Within 45 days or with proper extensions, 100% of due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated.</p>
<p>2009 (2009-2010)</p>	<p>From Part B indicator 17: Within 45 days or with proper extensions, 100% of due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated.</p>
<p>2010 (2010-2011)</p>	<p>From Part B indicator 17: Within 45 days or with proper extensions, 100% of due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated.</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part C will continue its efforts to assure families understand their rights, including parental consent for services and procedural safeguards. This is ongoing through 2010 by staff and partners of Part C.

Part C will continue to utilize the expertise of the SEA in investigating and processing complaints, requests for mediation and other due process options.

Please see Part B indicator 17 for additional improvement strategies submitted by Part B.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to the description provided under Indicator 1 as it applies to each indicator in Vermont’s Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Please see description for indicator 10.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

None requested during this time period.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

There have been no hearing requests during this time period.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Vermont Part C will coordinate with and support Part B targets.
2006 (2006-2007)	Vermont Part C will coordinate with and support Part B targets.
2007 (2007-2008)	Vermont Part C will coordinate with and support Part B targets.
2008 (2008-2009)	Vermont Part C will coordinate with and support Part B targets.
2009 (2009-2010)	Vermont Part C will coordinate with and support Part B targets.
2010 (2010-2011)	Vermont Part C will coordinate with and support Part B targets.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part C will continue its efforts to assure families understand their rights, including parental consent for services and procedural safeguards. This is ongoing through 2010 by staff and partners of Part C.

Part C will continue to utilize the expertise of the SEA in investigating and processing complaints, requests for mediation and other due process options.

Please see Part B indicator 18 for additional improvement strategies submitted by Part B.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to the description provided under Indicator 1 as it applies to each indicator in Vermont’s Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

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

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

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Please see description for Part C indicator 10 and Part B indicator 19.

Overview of issue/description of system or process taken from Part B indicator 19:
Mediation is a mechanism by which a State or local educational agency and a parent of a child with a disability may resolve a dispute, before or after the filing of a complaint or request for due process. Mediation is a voluntary process that will be used only if both parties to a dispute agree to take part. A mediator’s job is to help the opposing parties come to an agreement, not to make decisions for the parties. The parties may end mediation at any time. Agreeing to mediate will not delay or deny access to a due process hearing or any other rights afforded under IDEA. The Department of Education will offer mediation when either the parent or school official asks for a due process hearing, but the parties are not required to accept it. Mediation will be scheduled at a time and place convenient to the parties.

Requests for mediation shall be submitted to the Vermont Department of Education, Special Education Mediation Service (VDE-SEMS), 120 State Street, Montpelier, Vermont 05620-2501. Upon receipt of such request, the Department shall send each parent who requests mediation the Parents’ Rights in Special Education Notice and shall send its mediation procedures to the parties to the mediation. The agreement to mediate shall be in writing and signed by all parties.

A trained, impartial mediator who is not an employee of the school district and has no conflict of interest with the situation will conduct the mediation. Mediators shall be knowledgeable in law and regulations relating to the provision of special education and related services. The Vermont Department of Education maintains a list of qualified mediators who are assigned to a case by the Department on a random, rotational, basis from the list. A mediator will be assigned to a case by the Department within five days of receipt of a joint written request for mediation or upon receipt of one party’s written request and confirmation by the other party or parties. One may bring an advocate, support person and/or family members to the mediation. Either party may bring an attorney to the mediation session. The information that the parties discuss during mediation is confidential. What the parties say during a mediation session cannot be repeated in a subsequent due process hearing or court proceeding. If the parties to a mediation reach an agreement, it will be put in writing and become part of a child’s permanent education records.

A database managed by a representative of the Vermont Department of Education is used to track mediation requests, total mediations conducted (including those related and not related to due process), and mediations not held (including pending mediations) and the timelines within each action was completed. This database also includes tracking data for fully adjudicated due process hearings and administrative complaints.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

There have been no mediations held during this time period.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

See above, no mediations during this time period.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Assist education in promoting the use of mediation; please see part B indicator 19 targets.
2006 (2006-2007)	Assist education in promoting the use of mediation; please see part B indicator 19 targets.
2007 (2007-2008)	Assist education in promoting the use of mediation; please see part B indicator 19 targets.
2008 (2008-2009)	Assist education in promoting the use of mediation; please see part B indicator 19 targets.
2009 (2009-2010)	Assist education in promoting the use of mediation; please see part B indicator 19 targets.
2010 (2010-2011)	Assist education in promoting the use of mediation; please see part B indicator 19 targets.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Part C will continue its efforts to assure families understand their rights, including parental consent for services and procedural safeguards. This is ongoing through 2010 by staff and partners of Part C.

Part C will continue to utilize the expertise of the SEA in investigating and processing complaints, requests for mediation and other due process options.

Please see Part B indicator 19 for additional improvement strategies submitted by Part B.

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

Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Please refer to the description provided under Indicator 1 as it applies to each indicator in Vermont’s Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010.

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.

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).

Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

The child count data system produces the data for the OSEP 618 reporting. Service Coordinators in the regions prepare by hand the state prepared data input forms for every child referred. The data is submitted between December 15 and January 15, and is then cleared by state FITP staff; Questions about the data are discussed with the service coordinators in the regions. The data are then entered into a state (MS Access) database for all actives. The 618 data for actives is then reviewed and upon approval submitted on line.

Training sessions are held with regional host agency staff on the data collection forms and instructions prior to the 12/1 child count activities each year. A power point presentation has been completed to assist this process.

The exit data is processed in the same manner and entered between February and October. State reports and profiles of regions are done following the November 1 submission.

Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Vermont has been timely and accurate in submission of 618 data, and State and annual performance plans.

Discussion of Baseline Data:

Vermont has been timely and accurate in submission of 618 data, and State and annual performance plans.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005	100% and keep up the verification and timely submission of reports and plans.

(2005-2006)	
2006 (2006-2007)	100% and keep up the verification and timely submission of reports and plans.
2007 (2007-2008)	100% and keep up the verification and timely submission of reports and plans.
2008 (2008-2009)	100% and keep up the verification and timely submission of reports and plans.
2009 (2009-2010)	100% and keep up the verification and timely submission of reports and plans.
2010 (2010-2011)	100% and keep up the verification and timely submission of reports and plans.

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Keep up the verification and timely submission of reports and plans. State staff and partners

Phase in the real-time, on line data management system between April 2006 and June 2007; state staff and host agency personnel. Test and improve over time ongoing and through 2010.

Part C SPP/APR Attachment 1 (Form)

Report of Dispute Resolution Under Part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Complaints, Mediations, Resolutions Sessions, and Due Process Hearings

SECTION A: Signed, written complaints	
(1) Signed, written complaints total	1
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	1
(a) Reports with findings	1
(b) Reports within timeline	DNA
© Reports within extended timelines	1
(1.2) Complaints withdrawn or dismissed	0
(1.3) Complaints pending	0
(a) Complaints pending a due process hearing	0
SECTION B: Mediation requests	
(2) Mediation requests total	0
(2.1) Mediations	
(a) Mediations related to due process	
(i) Mediation agreements	
(b) Mediations not related to due process	
(i) Mediation agreements	
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	
SECTION C: Hearing requests	
(3) Hearing requests total	0
(3.1) Resolution sessions	
(a) Settlement agreements	
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated)	
(a) Decisions within timeline SELECT timeline used { 30 day/Part C 45 day/Part B 45 day }	
(b) Decisions within extended timeline	
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	

Since Vermont Part C uses the Part B dispute resolution process under IDE IA for complaints, mediations, resolution sessions and due process hearings, the data for Part C are reported in Part B's attachment 1 and included in the data reported in Part B indicators 16, 17, 18, and 19. Vermont Part C has had 1 formal complaint during this reporting period, no mediation requests and no requests for hearings.

For a full picture of Vermont on these indicators, please use the Part B indicators so as not to duplicate counts.