

**Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for FFY 2005  
(July 2005 through June of 2006)**

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

The Leadership Team of the Child Development Division (CDD), the Vermont Interagency Coordinating Council (VICC), and Regional Early Intervention Program Directors and Supervisors (called Host Agency Directors), the Early Education Team of the State Department of Education have had extensive and ongoing involvement in the development and discussion of the indicators, the measurement requirements, data collection and analysis/discussion, progress and slippage discussions and input regarding program improvement strategies. Numerous meetings and presentations have occurred throughout the year regarding program assessment and improvement. The State Performance Plan has been revised in several areas, including indicator 1 due to the fact that Vermont did not have the data available at the time the original SPP was submitted (December 2005); indicator 2 targets were revised based on a request by the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP); indicator 3 is new and requires a great deal of discussion, training and technical assistance; indicator 4 is new and required significant discussion regarding the content, distribution, collection, analysis and interpretation of the family survey; indicators 7, and 8 now include a statewide measurement in the revised SPP; and indicator 9 has been revised in the SPP based on changes OSEP made in its wording. The Annual Performance Report used the SPP as the baseline for discussing progress, problems and strategies for improvement with all of the groups mentioned above. In addition, the SPP has been on several web sites all year and the constituency groups have also had “hard” copies available to use in meetings. Special discussions have been held regarding timeliness of services, child and family outcomes, transition and monitoring systems. In November of 2006, the VICC spent a day and a half in their annual planning meeting with a major focus on the issues outlined in the Annual Performance Report. Since the VICC is a major “stakeholder” and has a vested interest in quality services, they have served as an important group to oversee the development of the APR. Monthly meetings of the Executive Committee as well as the quarterly meetings of the whole Council have portions of their agendas cover APR issues. The group is well educated about the program and its requirements and expected benefits. In addition meetings with the Regional Host Agency Directors and staff and the staff of Part B-619 will be held to review the APR findings and plan collaborative technical assistance and training.

Vermont plans to report to the public by the end of April 2007 on the progress and or slippage in meeting the measurable and rigorous targets for each regional early intervention program. We plan to distribute and discuss the regional data for the APR indicators at the February meetings of the VICC and the Host Agency Directors.

We will be reviewing what the data means and how best to present it so that families and the general public will understand what the data may or may not say about how well a regional program is doing, based on the APR report. We plan to use the Agency of Human Services, Department for Children and Families, Child Development Division’s web site as well as the Vermont Parent Information Center’s web site. We will also develop other public materials that will be of use to the public. Where the information can be viewed or obtained will be announced electronically as well as by mail to parenting and family organizations, health care professionals and the general public

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

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

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

**Measurement:**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs

**APR Template – Part C (4)**

Vermont

in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.  
 Account for untimely receipt of services.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2005</i> <i>July 05-June 06</i>	<i>100%</i>

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2005: 108/125 = 86.4% taken from file review data during the FFY 2005 reporting period from each regional early intervention programs.**

**Regional Early Intervention Program Data on Timeliness of Services Initiation is Below**

REGION	# of child-family files reviewed	# of children who received all services within 30 days	# of children who did not receive services within 30 days due to child/-family circs	OSEP in compliance timely includes family circ	# of children who did not receive services within 30 days NOT due to child-family circs	Reason for delay when not child-family circs	% Compliance
Addison	10	9	1	10	0	0	100%
Bennington	10	9	1	10	0		100%
Caledonia	10	2	3	5	5	Lack of SLP and EI services	50%
Chittenden	15	10	1	11	4	Lack of PT and no start date documented	73%
Franklin-Grand Isle	10	6	3	9	1	Lack of SLP in Grand Isle	90%
Lamoille	10	9	1	10	0		100%
Orange - Windsor	10	6	2	8	2	Lack of SLP	80%
Orleans – No Essex	10	7	3	10	0		100%
Rutland	10	7	1	8	2	Lack of OT and difficulty scheduling with childcare program	80%
Washington	10	8	1	9	1	No start date documentation	90%
Windham	10	8	2	10	0		100%
Windsor South	10	4	4	8	2	Lack of OT and no start date documented	80%
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>17</b>		<b>86.4%</b>

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that Occurred in FFY 2005**

There has been slight progress from 2004 to 2005, going from 86.3% to 86.4%.

## APR Template – Part C (4)

Vermont

Of the 125 children's IFSPs in the data review, 108 received timely, in compliance, initiation of services with 23 children included in the 108 who had family circumstances that were beyond the control of the early intervention program and who did not have services begin within 30 days consent for services. There were 17 children whose services were not initiated within 30 days of consent and their reasons did not have to do with child or family circumstances. The main reasons cited for this non compliance included the lack of specific early intervention personnel such as speech and language pathologists and the challenges of scheduling scarce resources in rural areas, primarily in homes and community based programs.

This data was reviewed by the staff in regional early intervention programs who verified reasons for not meeting the initiation of services requirements by reviewing actual files for documentation. The same process was used for the data in the revised baseline for the SPP. For FFY 2006 Vermont is collecting and reporting data on each child and the initiation of each service in its annual child count data collection which requires an explanation when any service is not initiated within the 30 days from consent timeline. The possible explanations include specific child and family circumstances such as illness or hospitalization, family wishing to delay services and explanations that have to do with non-family reasons. Each regional early intervention program's data is reviewed by a central office staff member and as questions arise, the central office staff person verifies the answers with the regional early intervention program staff and makes corrections on the data forms if necessary.

Again there has been slight progress from 2004 to 2005, going from 86.3% to 86.4%. This is a new data collection for Vermont so we will be watching this and reinforcing our improvement strategies. The following improvement strategies, identified in the SPP have all been implemented and three have been added.

### Program Improvement Activities:

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 any partners doing service coordination	By 1/06 and ongoing	State staff	Follow up with data management system; host agency director's 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	Ongoing beginning	State staff	Develop ongoing

## APR Template – Part C (4)

Vermont

Activities	Timelines	Resources	Notes
new actives monthly data submissions by regions	January 2006 through FFY 2010		“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	

With the exception of phasing in the new data system Vermont Part C has successfully implemented and is carrying out all of improvement activities. Due to unforeseen staffing issues the implementation of data system has been delayed. We expect it to be phased in during FFY 2007 with improvements ongoing through FFY 2010.

### **Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:**

OSEP Letter of 3/15/06 required Vermont to include baseline data from FFY 2004 and progress data from FFY 2005 on indicator 1.

Targets remain the same.

Improvement Activities are the same with three added based on discussions with Host Agencies, Department of Education and ICC.

### **Vermont has added three additional improvement activities:**

Work closely with Vermont Association of Speech and Language Pathologists to address shortages	December 2006 and ongoing through FFY 2010	State FITP staff, community partners and SLP professional association
Continue to work with State Department of Education on State Improvement Grant and other personnel prep and development	Ongoing January 2007-2010	Staff FITP staff and DOE staff

## APR Template – Part C (4)

Vermont

resources on recruiting, training and maintaining pediatric SLP's and other key personnel.

Continue to seek resources in the SLP – Communication fields to work with FITP staff and families.

Ongoing January 2007-2010

State FITP staff, community partners, University of Vermont and SLP professional association

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

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

Please see the description that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report (APR).

Karen

**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.<sup>1</sup>

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2005</i>	96%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2005: 601/615 = 98%** This data was reported in October of 2006 for use in the “618” data and is based on the 12/1/05 child count.

Region	# Active 12/1/05	# Natural Env.	% Natural Env.	Notes
Addison	23	23	100%	
Bennington	37	37	100%	
Caledonia	19	19	100%	
Chittenden	155	155	100%	
Franklin/Gl	69	67	97%	2 SPL
Lamoille	24	24	100%	
Orange/Windsor	51	51	100%	
Orleans/Essex	29	29	100%	
Rutland	50	38	76%	12 SPL
Washington	71	71	100%	
Windham	51	51	100%	
Windsor South	36	36	100%	
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>615</b>	<b>601</b>	<b>98%</b>	

<sup>1</sup> At the time of the release of this package, revised forms for collection of 618 State reported data had not yet been approved. Indicators will be revised as needed to align with language in the 2005-2006 State reported data collections.

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

Improvement activities were implemented and changes in the 618 data regarding infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children show an increase from 96% in 2004 to 98% in 2005. In the 2004 data, 599 children had active IFSPs with 573 receiving services in natural environments. Of those 573, 467 received services in their home and 106 received services in programs with typically developing children. The remaining 26 children were served primarily through Service Provider Location, with the IFSP team supporting that decision.

In 2005 the data from the “618” (data for OSEP’S report to Congress) report shows an increase to 98%. In the 2005 data, 615 children (a revised figure submitted on 10/31/06 reported a revision from 610 to 615 children with active IFSPs) had active IFSPs with 601 children receiving services primarily in natural environments. Of those 601 children, 461 or them received services primarily in their homes and 140 received services primarily with typically developing children. The remaining 14 children, 2%, were served at the Service Provider Location with the support for that decision coming from the IFSP team.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005**

Through email and telephone communications with the OSEP project officer, Vermont has changed its target figures in the SPP. No other changes to the SPP for this indicator were made



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

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

Please see the description that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report (APR).

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

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

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

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

**Measurement:**

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

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

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

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

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

same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

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

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

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

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2005	Baseline data reported in SPP for this time period as a new indicator.

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:** None reported for this reporting period, will report progress data, targets and improvements for FFY 2006 in February 2008.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005.** See above.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005.** See above.

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

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

Please see the description that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report (APR).

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

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

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

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

**Measurement:**

A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2005</i>	Baseline data reported in SPP as a new indicator.

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:** See SPP as useful information not available until 2006.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:** See SPP as information not available until 2006.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005.** See SPP revision for this new indicator, comparison information not available until 2006.

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

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

Please see the description that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report (APR).

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

**Indicator 5:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:

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

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

**Measurement:**

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2005</i>	.90%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:** using the “618” data from the most recent child count – 12/1/05, there were 70 infants under the age of one served at that point in time, which is 1.10% of those children born during the most recent year of birth statistics in Vermont (6345). This means that Vermont ranks 21 of 55 states and territories (for states and territories not serving the “at-risk” population) reporting, with Vermont .15 above the national baseline figure of .95.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:** Vermont exceeded its target figure and will likely keep doing so given our emphasis on seeking children who may be eligible at the earliest possible time. This is a key priority not only of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act, but also it has been a key priority of the VICC as well as the Child Development Division, the operating agent for the Co-Lead Agencies.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005.** There are no revisions in the SPP for this indicator.

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

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

Please see the description that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report (APR).

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

**Indicator 6:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:

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

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

**Measurement:**

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2005</i>	3.2%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:** Vermont met its target of 3.2% (615 children with IFSPs, revised “618” data, of 19088 children birth to three in Vermont). The revised data reported (10/31/06) from the 12/1/05 child count data which was used for the “618” report was used for this reporting period.

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:** Vermont implemented its improvement strategies and was successful. The broad eligibility category consists of 27 states and territories, Vermont was ranked number 6 in this group, serving 3.2% of the birth to three population, which is .85 above the national baseline reported for all states and territories of 2.34.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005.** There were not revisions to the SPP for this indicator.

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

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

Please see the description that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report (APR).

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

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2005</i>	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:** 491 children of 615 children with IFSPs in the child count data base of 12/1/05 for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within the 45 day timeline =  $491/615 = 79.8\%$ .

**Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2005:** 79.8% is an improvement over the revised baseline reported in the SPP for FFY 2004 of 76.5%. Vermont carried out its program improvement strategies focusing on technical assistance to regions that fell below 70%. Timelines are a challenge in a rural state with limited resources. Some of the most identified reasons for non compliance include a lack of personnel trained in speech and language, physical and occupational therapies and in resources who are competent in providing evaluations for children with multiple challenges in the social-emotional-behavioral and communication domains and for children with ASD. More effort will be devoted to attempting to recruit and maintain appropriately trained resources who can travel and be available in remote areas of Vermont as well as in the urban areas, as there is a lack of personnel in nearly all areas in Vermont for those specialties mentioned above. Although we are working with the Co-Lead Agency, the Department of Education, on increasing or further addressing the needs of the Part C program in grants for personnel preparation and development, more creativity is needed as even with grants to assist the state, there are still not enough resources who actually stay in their positions for very long. There is very high turnover with these resources, with many leaving the state for more lucrative positions or possibly better working conditions elsewhere. This issue is not just a Part C issue, but also is an early childhood and early childhood special education issue as well.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:** The only change to the SPP was a revision that now reports a statewide

## APR Template – Part C (4)

Vermont

measure instead of separate regional ones. That revision was requested by OSEP in their March 15, 2006 letter to Vermont remarking on the original SPP submitted in December of 2005.

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

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

Please see the description that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report (APR).

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

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

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

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

**Measurement:**

A. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100.

B. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

C. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2005	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:**

- 8. A. Using the child count data base for 12/1/05 (the “618” data just submitted in October of 2006) on exits, instead of on site monitoring, 467 children exited at age three and 428 of them had an IFSP with transition steps and services or 92%.
- 8. B. Using the same data, the number of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where LEA notification occurred, was 324 of 418 or 79.5%.
- 8. C. Using the same data, the number of children statewide exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred, was 346 of 418 or 83%. Of the 346 there were 82 children where the regional early intervention program had no control over the reported child or family circumstances that prevented the transition conference from occurring at least 90 days prior to the child’s third birthday. There were 70 situations of non compliance where timelines were not met and they were not due to child or family circumstances, they were due to personnel availability and/or scheduling issues. Comparing the five regions reported in 2004 for 8.C using on site



monitoring as the data collection method, to the data in 2005 from the same five regions, but using the child count data which now picks up this data element, the analysis for the regions follows:

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

In comparing the 2004 data to the 2005 data, Bennington achieved 100% with a small number of on-site records reviewed in 2004 going to 80% in 2005, a slippage but with a much higher number of records reviewed - 20 of 25 records in the data analysis pool were in compliance.

Caledonia - Southern Essex was at 0% compliance in 2004 with 0 of 1 record in compliance, during an on-site review of records, for the prior to 90 day transition conference; whereas in 2005 using the child count data base, their compliance progressed to 73% with 14 of 19 records in the data analysis pool (14 of 19 in compliance with 6 of the 14 involving child and family circumstances).

Franklin - Grand Isle was at 50% compliance in 2004 with 1 of 2 files compliant in this area, using the on-site method; however in 2005 using the child count data base 41 of 43 eligible for part b children had their transition conferences at least 90 days prior to their third birthday (95%), including 9 who had child/family circumstances – with only 2 out of compliance. This was progress going from 50% to 95% and with a larger data analysis pool.

Orleans-Essex North was 100% with 6 children's files reviewed during on-site monitoring; in 2005 using the child count data base/618 data, they dropped to 14 of 21 or 67%. Seven were non compliant and 7 had child/family circumstances with one family declining services. However the data pool is bigger in 2005.

Windham was 50% with 2 of 4 files from an on-site review in 2004; however, in 2005 using the larger data base from the 2005 child count data base/618 data, progress was made with 25 of 29 records or 86%. 4 were non compliant and 8 had child or family circumstances out of the 25.

Overall for these five regions combined (the statewide rate in 2004), their rate of compliance was 11/15 or 73% in 2004 from on-site monitoring of files; and in 2005, using the much larger data pool of the child count/"618" data, the rate is 114 of 128 or 89%. Of the 114, thirty eight involved child or family circumstances.

In summary, using the small data pool from 5 regional file reviews during on site monitoring the 2004 statewide rate was 11/15 or 73% and 2005 shows a statewide figure of 346 of 418 or 83% for all twelve regional early intervention programs. Of the 346 records there were 82 with child or family circumstances.

All program improvement activities have taken place except the ones related to self assessment, although certain regions are doing periodic record reviews as part of their follow up corrective action plans after an on-site monitoring has occurred. Transition is the featured topic for an all day training event that will include examples of best practices from key regional early intervention programs and LEA's in March of 2007. The data from the SPP and the APR will be featured in the discussions among early childhood special educators and early interventionists to assure timelines for both Part C and Part B-619 are met and families are satisfied that the transition process has been successful. In a review of the data, we have found a number of instances where the initial transition meeting was not held within the at least 90 days prior to the child's third birthday; however the child has had a transition plan and an IEP implemented by their third birthday – often the meetings begin in time for a successful transition and implementation of an IEP by the third birthday.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:** The only revisions in the SPP are the addition of statewide totals, the discussion of baselines and several improvement activities. These revisions are based on requests that Vermont provide statewide data analysis, rather than region by region data.

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

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

Please see the description that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report (APR).

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

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

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

**Measurement:**  
 Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:  
 a. # of findings of noncompliance.  
 b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.  
 Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.  
 For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
FFY 2005	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2005 (July 2005-June 2006) –please see the following analysis.**

**A. Priority Areas and Indicators** (Initial Monitoring Visit FFY 2004: July 2004-June 2005; One-Year Verification Visit FFY 2005: July 2005-June 2006)

Priority Areas/Indicators	#Programs Reviewed FFY 2004	#Programs with Findings	a. # of Findings	b. # Corrected w/in 1 year FFY 2005	% Corrected w/in 1 year
2. Natural Environments	2	1	4	4	100%
7. 45-Day Timeline	2	2	14	8	57%
8. Transition	2	1	2	0	0%
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>20</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>60%</b>

Data reported below are based on data collected through statewide (i.e., in all 12 regions) file reviews.

## APR Template – Part C (4)

Vermont

Priority Area/Indicator	#Programs Reviewed FFY 2005	#Programs with Findings	a. # of Findings	b. # Corrected w/in 1 year FFY 2005	% Corrected w/in 1 year
1. Timely Provision of EI Services	12	7	17	8	47%

**B. Other Topical Areas** (Initial Monitoring Visit FFY 2004: July 2004-June 2005; One-Year Verification Visit FFY 2005: July 2005-June 2006)

Other Topical Areas	#Programs Reviewed FFY 2004	#Programs with Findings	a. # of Findings	b. # Corrected w/in 1 year FFY 2005	% Corrected w/in 1 year
Single Service Coordinator	2	0	NA	NA	NA
Present Levels Development	2	2	3	3	100%%
Prior Notice Initial IFSP Meeting	2	0	NA	NA	NA
Parental Rights	2	0	NA	NA	NA
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>

### C. Percent of Non-Compliance Identified Through Other Mechanisms

Number regions in which non-compliance identified	a. # of Findings	b. # Corrected w/in 1 year FFY 2005	% Corrected w/in 1 year
1	1	1	100%

Total Number Findings Priority, Topical Areas and Other (FFY 2004):	40
Total Number Corrections (FFY 2005):	24
<b>Total Corrected within 1 Year:</b>	<b>60%</b>

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

#### Improvement Activities Completed

Revised monthly child count, file review forms, and the “pilot” data management system, particularly to ensure data is accurately collected on priority areas/indicators 1, 7, and 8.

Developed excel spreadsheet to track findings and corrections.

Developed levels of technical assistance and training based on compliance findings.

Continued to follow up with and provide technical assistance to the five regions monitored FFY 2003 that did not correct non-compliance within one year (FFY 2004) (see discussion below under Slippage).

Submitted new Part B/Part C Interagency Agreement.

Continued process to revise state Part C rules and regulations and policies and procedures.

Continued work on piloting data management system.

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

The baseline data reported in the SPP for five regions monitored indicates that 71% of findings were corrected within one year. The data reported on in the APR indicates that 60% of findings were corrected within one year. During the 2004-2005 year, Part C monitored only two regions. Since we monitored only two regions, the data for findings and corrections is based on more limited data for all priority areas/indicators (excluding timely services) and topical areas, e.g., one of two programs monitored this reporting period had only two findings in Indicator 8, Transition, but there were no corrections within the reporting period. Based on data from monitoring these two sites, Indicator 7, 45-day timeline, continues to be a significant area of non-compliance and one in which there is little progress in making corrections within one year. In looking at the statewide 2005 child count data under Indicator 7 for the two regions monitored during this reporting period, however, one region shows 88% compliance (50 children) (Rutland) and the other region (Windsor South) 86.11% compliance (36 children).

Although for Indicator 1 (timely services) the rate of correction was only 47%, Vermont Part C staff were pleased with the relatively high level of compliance demonstrated in the SPP baseline data. Staff are encouraged by the relatively low number of findings (18 in the SPP baseline data and 17 in this APR) from a review of 125 files each reporting year. The level of compliance increased only slightly during the reporting period, but Vermont Part C staff feel revisions to reporting forms potentially will result in increased compliance in the next reporting period. Vermont Part C staff have spent a great deal of time informing the regions about the need to be more “vigilant” in their documentation.

Part C staff continued to follow up with the five regions reflected in the revised SPP baseline data, since none “closed-out” at the one-year verification visit for corrections. The frequency and level of technical assistance was based on the region’s progress towards compliance, e.g., from minimal to substantial. During this reporting period, one of the five regions (Bennington) reached 100% compliance in all priority and topical areas and was “closed-out.”

The March of 2006 letter and accompanying Tables A and B from OSEP in response to Vermont’s SPP submitted December 2005 required that Part C Vermont provide data from three of the four remaining regions demonstrating compliance with Part C’s 45-day timeline and IFSP content (present level of functioning) under Indicators 7 and 9 by June 1, 2006. The necessary data were submitted to OSEP in a letter and report dated May 24, 2006. Table B in the letter noted that we were not to include family circumstances in the calculation for Indicator 7, but were to separately report findings attributable to family circumstances, which we did. The Office of Special Education Programs has since revised the calculation to include family circumstances and to report the actual number of findings attributable to family circumstances in the discussion. Part C staff reviewed the 5/24/06 report and re-calculated the data across the three regions to include family circumstances in the measurement to report on in this APR. Staff reviewed the data for just the three regions from the reporting period 2004-2005 to determine corrections. The table below still indicates that the regions are struggling to make corrections for Indicator 7, 45-day timeline, but attained full compliance for present level of functioning. Staff attribute this progress to the fact that there has been ongoing training and technical assistance provided to all regions around all domain assessment and appropriate documentation.

Personnel shortages continue to have an impact on meeting the 45-day deadline. In looking at the statewide 2005 child count data under Indicator 7 for two of these three regions, however, one region shows 93.10% compliance (29 children) (Orleans-Essex) and the other region 91.30% compliance (69 children). The third region (Caledonia) continues to experience significant challenges (data from 2005 Child Count for Indicator 7 demonstrate less than 50% compliance). During this reporting period, the region received programmatic sanctions, i.e., there was a change in the sub-recipient for this region, and there continues to be significant staff turnover. Prior to the sanction, Vermont Part C staff were on site frequently until a determination was made that there were too many programmatic issues and ongoing non-compliance. During the region’s (program’s) transition to the new agency and following the transition, staff have been maintaining monthly visits to provide support and technical assistance.

Priority Area/Indicator & Topical Area	#Programs Reviewed FFY 2005 (5/06)	#Programs with Findings	a. # of Findings	b. # Corrected w/in 1 year FFY 2005	% Corrected w/in 1 year
7. 45-day Timeline	3	3	4	6	67%
Present Levels Development	3	2	5	5	100%

The March 2006 SPP letter from OSEP also stated that OSEP would review the data in the APR that demonstrates full compliance with the single service coordinator requirement. The revised Indicator 9 in the SPP shows 100% compliance for the 2004-2005 reporting period; data reported in this APR demonstrates 100% compliance in the two regions.

Although regions continue to have some challenges in the area of transition, specifically 90-day conference (Indicator 8), it is felt the new Part B/C Interagency Agreement (IAA) will positively contribute to progress in this priority area. Along with developing the new IAA during this reporting period, Part C and Part B staff and others from the Agency of Human Services and Department of Education have been devoting significant time to revising the Part C state rules and regulations and policies and procedures. This is a significant undertaking that hopefully will also contribute to major progress in meeting our one-year target for corrections of non-compliance.

Vermont Part C experienced multiple staffing challenges during this reporting period. There was a full-time vacant position that was filled due to the best candidates deciding to take other positions, leaving the position unfilled until the end of this reporting period and then filling it with an excellent candidate who then resigned to attend medical school; other staff members and consultants reduced their work schedules for personal – family reasons; the staff person responsible for developing and maintaining data support to track data from on-site monitoring of regions assumed another position outside the Vermont Part C program. In addition, and related to the recent reorganization of some child development and family support services, several of the existing Part C state staff participated in and acted as resources to an initiative to assist in the integration of health based family support and early childhood and family mental health services with early intervention services. Significant staff and consulting resources went in to training and professional development in preparing staff and partners for ongoing assessment and child and family outcomes work, as well as preparation for the data management system. There has been a heavy and increased effort on documentation, analysis and reporting of data that was not previously required of regional the early intervention programs or the state level staff.

These issues had a significant impact on our ability to monitor more than the two regions during this reporting period and to follow up effectively on an ongoing basis with regions previously monitored that did not reach full compliance. While follow up did occur in all regions that had compliance issues, documentation of corrections did not always occur as many other issues were of concern to the programs (caseloads, CAPTA, children with intense needs including ASD, child and family outcomes, increased documentation requirements, services integration etc). Overall during this reporting period, staff resources often were stretched beyond capacity at both the state and regional program levels, even though increases in regional early intervention program budgets occurred to assist with the staffing needed for the increasingly complicated caseloads and workloads required under IDEA 2004.

Vermont Part C also is considering a transition from a cyclical monitoring process to a more focused one. During this reporting period, staff met with two national consultants to discuss the challenges of completing a cyclical monitoring process while at the same time trying to move to a more focused monitoring system. The two consultants recommended that VT Part C complete its cyclical monitoring process (all 12 regions to be monitored by spring 2007) prior to implementing a focused monitoring system. One of the Vermont Part C staff members is a member of the stakeholders group to assist Vermont Part B's efforts in moving to a focused monitoring system (Vermont Part B is working with NCSEAM). It is felt that this will contribute significantly to Part C's efforts to do the same.

## APR Template – Part C (4)

Vermont

### Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005

Revised Indicator 9 in SPP because of change in measurement required based on OSEP's March 2006 SPP letter to Vermont Part C.

Added four improvement activities to the revised SPP indicator 9 to enhance progress in meeting 100% target.

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

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

Please see the description that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report (APR).

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

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2005 (July 05-June 06)</i>	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:**

There were no signed written complaints for the Part C program during this reporting period.

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

Does not apply since there were no signed written complaints during this time period that involved the Part C program.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:**

There are no revisions to the Part C SPP for this indicator.

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

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

Please see the description that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report (APR).

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

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2005</i>	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:**

There were no requests and no adjudications during this time period for the Part C program.

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

The Part C SPP Improvement Activities continue with Part B; however there has been no activity related to the Part C program.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:**

There have been no revisions for the Part C program's SPP during this reporting period.



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

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

Please see the description that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report (APR).

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

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2005</i>	<i>Vermont will coordinate with and support Part B targets</i>

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:**

There have been no Part C requests for hearings that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution settlement agreements.

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

Does not apply during this reporting period.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:**

No Part C SPP revisions occurred.

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

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

Please see the description that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report (APR).

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

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

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

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

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2005</i>	<i>Assist Part B in promoting mediation and in reaching their targets</i>

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2005:**

There were no mediation requests for Part C that resulted in mediation agreements during this time period.

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

Does not apply during this reporting period.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:**

There were no revisions to the Part C SPP for this indicator during this reporting period.

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

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

Please see the description that precedes Indicator 1 for a full description of the overview of the development of this Annual Performance Report (APR).

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

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

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

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

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, settings and November 1 for exiting, personnel, dispute resolution); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>FFY 2005 (July 05-June 06)</i>	100%

**Actual Target Data for FFY 2005: 100%**

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

Vermont reached the goal of timely and accurate submissions and reporting to OSEP and others. However, it takes a very large commitment of staff time to do this at the state and the regional levels. When data collection and verification is done mainly by hand, the process is cumbersome and takes away from direct services. Vermont is working on having the kind of electronic and other systems in place to make data collection and verification more efficient.

Training and technical assistance plus respectful communication has allowed us to continue to collect and report data that can be used to assure the Part C program is making a positive difference in the lives of the children and families we are fortunate to serve.

**Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2005:**

There are not revisions on indicator 14 in the Part C SPP at this time.

Training and technical assistance plus respectful communication has allowed us to continue to collect and report data that can be used to assure the Part C program is making a positive difference in the lives of the children and families we are fortunate to serve.

The data management system is testing in three regions this winter, with plans to be partially “live” by the next child count collection date – 12/06.

# APR Template – Part C (4)

Vermont

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION  
AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES  
OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION  
PROGRAMS

TABLE 4  
REPORT OF DISPUTE RESOLUTION UNDER PART C, OF THE  
INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT  
2006-07

PAGE 1 OF 1  
OMB NO.: 1820-0678  
FORM EXPIRES: 11/30/2009

Vermont

As reported in the APR 2005 for indicators 10-13 there were no written, signed complaints, mediations requests, or hearing requests during this reporting period of July 2005 through June 2006.

SECTION A: Written, signed complaints	
(1) Written, signed complaints total	0
(1.1) Complaints with reports issued	0
(a) Reports with findings	0
(b) Reports within timeline	0
(c) Reports within extended timelines	0
(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	0
(i) Mediation agreements	0
(b) Mediations not related to due process	0
(i) Mediation agreements	0
(2.2) Mediations not held (including pending)	0
SECTION C: Hearing requests	
(3) Hearing requests total	0
(3.1) Resolution meetings (For States adopted Part B Procedures)	0
(a) Settlement agreements	0
(3.2) Hearings (fully adjudicated) (For all states)	0
(a) Decisions within timeline SELECT timeline used {30 day Part C, 30 day Part B, or 45 day Part B}	DNA 0
(b) Decisions within extended timeline (only applicable if using Part B due process hearing procedures).	DNA 0
(3.3) Resolved without a hearing	0

