VT
Part B

FFY2014
State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Introduction to the State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

In order to ensure consistent data across indicators, provide the number of districts in this field and the data will be loaded into the applicable indicator data tables.

null

This data will be prepopulated in indicators B3A, B4A, B4B, B9, and B10.

General Supervision System:

The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part B requirements are met, e.g., monitoring, dispute resolution, etc.

Working under the direction of the Secretary of Education and the Deputy Secretaries, the Education Services Teams provide technical assistance and support to schools, and carry out state and federal requirements for special education, assessment, and other direct support services.

General Supervision and Monitoring: Teams focus on building supervisory union/regional capacity for federal programs and state regulatory implementation, internal monitoring expertise and problem solving to ensure sustained compliance. Monitoring teams interface directly with school support and improvement teams to strengthen the effectiveness of preventive efforts, action planning and remediation. Technical assistance for parents and professional learning is also provided.

Compliance Monitoring: Through desk reviews, telephone interviews and school visits, the AOE Special Education Consultants on the monitoring team review ten supervisory unions (SU) for special education compliance each year. Based upon the results of these reviews, it may be necessary to issue corrective action plans. These corrective action plans are overseen for completion and improvement by a member of the Monitoring Team who provides guidance and technical assistance. Schools utilizing best practices are often recommended to other schools as model programs. The Agency of Education worked with both the Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators and The Vermont Superintendents Association to build a system of active engagement to assist those schools with consistent non-compliance records. Additionally, those organizations have stated that a system utilizing a more significant method of accountability for continually non-compliant SU, i.e. redirect or withholding of funds, meets with their approval and those systems have been implemented over the last year.

Focused Monitoring: The Focused Monitoring team visits up to three supervisory unions (SU) per year. A Focused Monitoring visit consists of 5 days, with AOE staff, a peer member, a parent representative along with other professionals. Training for Focused Monitoring is held annually. Parents and peers accompany a AOE staff member for the duration of the visit. During the FM visit, AOE teams interview staff (general and special education staff), administrators, parents, students (with permission from parents) and others as appropriate. Classroom observations and file reviews are conducted, and a review of various data, policy, plans and assurances are also completed during the visit. At the conclusion of the week, AOE conducts a presentation of its initial findings to the supervisory union Administrative Team

and others invited. After discussion of needs, a corrective action plan may be issued with concomitant requirements for fulfillment. A final report with both commendations and findings is issued to the Supervisory Union with follow-up by the Focused Monitoring team leader.

Dispute Resolution: The Agency of Education maintains a full complement of dispute resolution options including administrative complaints, mediations, due process with resolution sessions and licensure complaints. Administrative complaints are handled by the Agency legal department with input from the parties involved. Licensed attorneys serve as impartial hearing officers and are supplied through the Agency at no cost to either party. The VTAOE ensures that mediation is voluntary on the part of both parties, is not used to deny or delay a parent's right to a due process hearing and is conducted by a qualified and impartial mediator. Costs are the responsibility of the state education agency. Sessions are held in a timely manner and in a convenient location. Binding agreements are created by the parties following successful mediation. Sessions are confidential and not used in subsequent due process hearings. Licensure complaints are handled through the professional licensing division with AOE investigators conducting a full review with outcomes ranging from license suspension to no findings based upon those investigations.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Technical Assistance System:

The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to LEAs.

Aligned with Vermont's State Performance Plan are the activities of the State Professional Develoment Grant (SPDG). The State of Vermont was granted a five year SPDG in 2013. The projects delineated in that grant continue to reform and improve Vermont's system for personnel preparation and professional development in early intervention and educational services which will continue to improve educational outcomes for children with disabilities. The use of implementation science, reliance on student data and coherence with the APR will facilitate instructional improvement leading to improved outcomes for students. The major focus of the new SPDG will be Multi Tiered System of Support (MTSS) PK-12 and Secondary Transition. Project components continue to leverage resources across distances through the use of technology and are aligned with the APR, AOE school improvement initiatives and Common Core Standards.

Forty professionals from around the state participated in the University of Kansas Online Transition Seminar. A number of those individuals have continued on to the University of Kansas Graduate Certificate Program in Secondary Transition. These professionals form the basis of a state-wide cadre of transition coaches who will support school-based personnel in the area of secondary transition. As a result, the AOE anticipates positive developments in those schools which have shown continued need in the area of Indicator 13. Additional technical assistance is provided on an on-going basis for schools, administrators, teachers and parents through regional meetings for school professionals, contracts with the parent information center, Vermont Family Network (VFN) for parent engagement and training, involvement with the Vermont Higher Education Collaberative, requests made directly to agency staff and by request for particular needs which schools may be addressing such as co-teaching, IEP development or transition.
The State has been involved with the School Wide Integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT) program. Four SUs are participating in the activities and trainings. This work impacts students with disabilities through integrated learning plans, instructional practices and the potential for flexible funding of special education services.

Corrective action plans resulting from focused and compliance monitoring are provided to schools. These plans include arrangements for direct technical assistance by members of the monitoring team and various AOE teams who can assist with a particular compliance or program issue.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Professional Development System:

The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for students with disabilities.

Integrated Support for Learning Team: Workgroups on this team consist of assessment, content areas, special populations and programs, safe school and school improvement. Coordinators work together to create integrated teams of consultants with expertise in providing support to schools in implementing evidence-based practices, school-wide improvement models, and prevention models to improve instruction and learning for every child in Vermont. Literacy and math coaches are provided to participating schools.

Supervision and Monitoring Team: On-site group and individual professional learning in both general and specialized areas such as finance and transition is provided by team members and other related staff. Webinars, telephone conferences, training sessions and desk audits are also provided. When required, one-on-one professional learning is offered for school administrators.

Title I and Title II-A: Professional Learning Network (PLN)

The Vermont PLN is a collaborative project between Champlain Valley Educator Development Center (CVEDC), Lamoille Area Professional Development Academy (LAPDA) and Vermont Learning Collaborative (VLC) through a contract with the AOE.

The Vermont Professional Learning Network works specifically on Instructional Leadership and Common Core implementation. It is state-wide with face-to-face programs in multiple sites, as well as virtual learning opportunities using Multiple Means of Communication such as online events and courses, webinars, blog with comments, and updates on Google+, Facebook and Twitter, accessible to all professionals at all levels in the State of Vermont.

OTHER PROFESSIONAL LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES: Agency of Education teams partner and participate in various trainings and professional learning opportunities offered by the Vermont parent information center, known as Vermont Family Network, as well as conferences and training provided by the Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators, the Vermont Superinendents Association, the Vermont Higher Education Collaberative and through the provision of literacy and math coaches to schools across the state.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Stakeholder Involvement: ☐ apply this to all Part B results indicators

The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP, including revisions to targets.

Stakeholder Input

To ensure continuous improvement in the Vermont special education processes and accountability system, meetings are held with the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) and various regional and national technical assistance centers. These centers include:

New England Regional Resource Center (NERRC);
National Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (NECTAC);
National Association of State Directors of Special Education (NASDSE) and
The National Secondary Transition Technical Assistance Center (NSTTAC)

Draft information and data from the APR for various indicators were developed for presentation to the following stakeholder groups:
Vermont Special Education Advisory Council (VSEAC)

Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA)

Special Education School Regional Representative Meetings across the state

Vermont Family Network (VFN)

Additional improvement activity information was collected from Stakeholder groups including:
Educators

Center on Disability and Community Inclusion @ the University of Vermont

Agency of Education staff

The Agency of Education continues to solicit input and feedback from various stakeholders in the education community. Final copies of the 2014 APR will be distributed to members of the Vermont Special Education Advisory Council, the Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators, Vermont Part C staff, the Vermont Family Network and others who have been involved in the development process. Information about the APR will be made available to the media by the Vermont Agency of Education Communications Director. The APR will be posted on the Vermont Agency of Education website: http://education.vermont.gov

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Reporting to the Public:

How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2013 performance of each LEA located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2013 APR, as required by 34 CFR §300.602(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its Web site, a complete copy of the State's SPP, including any revision if the State has revised the SPP that it submitted with its FFY 2013 APR in 2015, is available.

Public reporting of the performance of SUs in relation to state SPP targets will take place after this APR is submitted on February 1, 2016 and prior to June 1, 2016. These reports will reflect performance on relevant indicators in relation to

national performance in each area where data is available and in relation to State performance and State targets. Vermont's APR and local APRs will be posted on the AOE web site here: http://education.vermont.gov/special-education/publications/apr.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 1: Graduation

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2011

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			80.00%	80.00%		72.00%	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%
Data		78.48%	78.20%	80.62%	66.16%	68.85%	78.93%	79.07%	81.31%	79.63%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Vermont's Stakeholder Group for the APR is the Vermont Special Education Advisory Council. Proposed targets, along with performance history, was reviewed with that group, as well as with the Executive Board of the Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA). Both groups have concurred with the proposed targets for all Indicators.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	697	868
SY 2013-14 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	12/2/2015	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	992	1,057
SY 2013-14 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	12/2/2015	2012-13 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	70.26%	Calculate

Explanation of Alternate Data

Vermont reports 4, 5 and 6 year graduation rate cohorts. The table below shows this information for the cohorts which ended in the 2013-2014 school year.

4 Year Cohort

Graduate Count	Adjusted Cohort Count	Graduation Rate
735	1034	71.08%

5 Year Cohort

Graduate Count	Adjusted Cohort Count	Graduation Rate
853	1109	76.92%

6 Year Cohort

Graduate Count	Adjusted Cohort Count	Graduation Rate
868	**1057**	**82.12%**

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort graduating with a regular diploma	Number of youth with IEPs in the current year's adjusted cohort eligible to graduate	FFY 2013 Data	FFY 2014 Target	FFY 2014 Data
868	1,057	79.63%	86.00%	70.26%

Explanation of Slippage

There is no slippage, as the 6 year cohort rate is 82.12%, which is higher than the 79.63% rate reported in Vermont's APR for FFY 2013.

Graduation Conditions Field

Provide the four-year graduation cohort rate. The four-year graduation rate follows a cohort, or a group of students, who begin as first-time 9th graders in a particular school year and who graduate with a regular high school diploma in four years or less. An extended-year graduation rate follows the same cohort of students for an additional year or years. The cohort is "adjusted" by adding any students transferring into the cohort and by subtracting any students who transfer out, emigrate to another country, or die during the years covered by the rate.

Under 34 C.F.R. §200.19(b)(1)(iv), a "regular high school diploma" means the standard high school diploma awarded to students in a State that is fully aligned with the State's academic content standards and does not include a GED credential, certificate of attendance, or any alternative award. The term "regular high school diploma" also includes a "higher diploma" that is awarded to students who complete requirements above and beyond what is required for a regular diploma.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 2: Drop Out

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. (20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2013

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			4.00%	3.50%		3.25%	3.25%	3.25%	3.25%	3.25%
Data		3.61%	3.82%	3.71%	3.90%	3.61%	3.15%	3.06%	3.47%	4.19%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	3.25%	3.25%	3.25%	3.25%	3.20%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Vermont's Stakeholder Group for the APR is the Vermont Special Education Advisory Council. Proposed targets, along with performance history, was reviewed with that group, as well as with the Executive Board of the Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA). Both groups have concurred with the proposed targets for all Indicators.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth with IEPs who exited special education due to dropping out	Total number of all youth with IEPs who were in high school (ages 14-21)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
153	4,560	4.19%	3.25%	3.36%

☑ **Use a different calculation methodology**

☐ Change numerator description in data table

☑ Change denominator description in data table

Please explain the methodology used to calculate the numbers entered above.

Vermont calculates dropout rate by dividing the number of youth with IEPs (ages 14 - 21) who exited special education due to dropping out by the total number of youth with IEPs (ages 14 - 21) who were reported in December 1 Child Count.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 3A: Districts Meeting AYP/AMO for Disability Subgroup

Explanation of why this indicator is not applicable

Guidance from OSEP indicates that the signing of ESSA means that States no longer need to report on this Indicator.

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

A. **Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.**
B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

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

This indicator is not applicable.

Indicator 3B: Participation for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

A. **Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.**
B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			98.50%			99.00%	99.25%	99.25%	99.25%	99.25%
			Data		98.33%	96.59%	96.37%	98.80%	97.70%	98.20%	97.46%	97.98%	98.26%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			96.70%			99.00%	99.25%	99.25%	99.25%	99.25%
			Data		98.42%	96.80%	96.23%	98.73%	97.00%	97.70%	96.04%	97.90%	97.83%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	99.25%	99.25%	99.25%	99.25%	99.25%
Math	A ≥ Overall	99.25%	99.25%	99.25%	99.25%	99.25%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Vermont's Stakeholder Group for the APR is the Vermont Special Education Advisory Council. Proposed targets, along with performance history, was reviewed with that group, as well as with the Executive Board of the Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA). Both groups have concurred with the proposed targets for all Indicators.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	6,802	6,479	98.26%	99.25%	95.25%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

The assessment participation rates in 2014-15 for Vermont's IEP students decreased by 4.09 points in reading and 4.44 points in math when compared with the previous school year. There are a variety of explanations for the decreases - foremost among them being the introduction of new computer-delivered general and alternate assessments - that do not necessarily mean that students who should have been tested were not. We suspect that the decreases are related to some or all of the following:

Some schools administered the interim Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBAC) instead of the summative SBAC assessment to students. This resulted in the non-participation of students in those schools.

There were miscommunication and technical difficulties between local educational agencies and independent schools related to, where the test was to be administered, who was responsible, and where the student was reported. This resulted in students not participating because it was not clear where the tests were to be administered and some students were not able to leave their independent school settings to participate in the assessment.

A new approval process for waivers was implemented requiring prior approval for exemption. Students who did not have prior approval were considered non-participants.

In other situations, students who only responded to the computer questions and not the performance section of the SBAC were considered to not have participated.

The Vermont Agency of Education received numerous reports from school personnel around the State regarding technical difficulties related to registration and administration of the DLM (Dynamic Learning Maps) Assessment, which is the Vermont alternate assessment against alternate standards. This also accounted for students not participating in an assessment.

This slippage in participation is considered to be the result of difficulties related to the new administration of the SBAC. In following years, as teachers and students become more familiar with the administration of the SBAC, it is the intention of the Vermont AOE to resolve these issues and increase the participation rates in both the SBAC and DLM.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	6,807	6,426	97.83%	99.25%	94.40%

Explanation of Group A Slippage

The assessment participation rates in 2014-15 for Vermont's IEP students decreased by 4.09 points in reading and 4.44 points in math when compared with the previous school year. There are a variety of explanations for the decreases - foremost among them being the introduction of new computer-delivered general and alternate assessments - that do not necessarily mean that students who should have been tested were not. We suspect that the decreases are related to some or all of the following:

Some schools administered the interim Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBAC) instead of the summative SBAC assessment to students. This resulted in the non-participation of students in those schools.

There were miscommunication and technical difficulties between local educational agencies and independent schools related to, where the test was to be administered, who was responsible, and where the student was reported. This resulted in students not participating because it was not clear where the tests were to be administered and some students were not able to leave their independent school settings to participate in the assessment.

A new approval process for waivers was implemented requiring prior approval for exemption. Students who did not have prior approval were considered non-participants.

In other situations, students who only responded to the computer questions and not the performance section of the SBAC were considered to not have participated.

The Vermont Agency of Education received numerous reports from school personnel around the State regarding technical difficulties related to registration and administration of the DLM (Dynamic Learning Maps) Assessment, which is the Vermont alternate assessment against alternate standards. This also accounted for students not participating in an assessment.

This slippage in participation is considered to be the result of difficulties related to the new administration of the SBAC. In following years, as teachers and students become more familiar with the administration of the SBAC, it is the intention of the Vermont AOE to resolve these issues and increase the participation rates in both the SBAC and DLM.

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

Vermont's Assessment information can be found here:
http://edw.vermont.gov/ReportServer/Pages/ReportViewer.aspx?/Public/NECAP%20Assessment%20Report

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 3C: Proficiency for Students with IEPs

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on Statewide assessments:

A. **Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP/AMO targets for the disability subgroup.**
B. **Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
C. **Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.**

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

Historical Data

	Group Name	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Reading	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			27.00%			27.00%	27.00%	28.00%	28.00%	28.00%
			Data		17.81%	21.41%	18.58%	25.65%	26.62%	21.91%	24.70%	23.83%	22.97%
Math	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			20.00%			24.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%
			Data		19.10%	21.80%	14.89%	22.39%	22.60%	17.46%	18.37%	17.68%	17.14%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	12.13%	12.13%	12.15%	12.20%	12.25%
Math	A ≥ Overall	7.21%	7.21%	7.25%	7.30%	7.35%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Targets are updated to reflect change in primary and alternate assessments.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Vermont's Stakeholder Group for the APR is the Vermont Special Education Advisory Council. Proposed targets, along with performance history, was reviewed with that group, as well as with the Executive Board of the Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA). Both groups have concurred with the proposed targets for all Indicators.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	6,479	786	22.97%	12.13%	12.13%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	Number of Children with IEPs Proficient	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A Overall	6,426	463	17.14%	7.21%	7.21%

Public Reporting Information

Provide links to the page(s) where you provide public reports of assessment results.

http://edw.vermont.gov/ReportServer/Pages/ReportViewer.aspx?/Public/NECAP%20Assessment%20Report

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 4A: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. **Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and**
B. **Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≤			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		1.67%	1.67%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Vermont's Stakeholder Group for the APR is the Vermont Special Education Advisory Council. Proposed targets, along with performance history, was reviewed with that group, as well as with the Executive Board of the Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA). Both groups have concurred with the proposed targets for all Indicators.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- (●) Number of districts in the State
- ( ) Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	59	0%	0%	0%

Choose one of the following comparison methodologies to determine whether significant discrepancies are occurring (34 CFR §300.170(a)):

- ( ) Compare the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs among LEAs in the State
- ( ) The rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs in each LEA compared to the rates for nondisabled children in the same LEA

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

A significant discrepancy for any individual LEA is defined as an LEA that has a rate of suspension/expulsions greater than ten days that is more than 3 percent of that LEAs total special education population. The suspension/expulsion rate is derived from the total number of suspension/expulsions >10 days for special education students in an LEA (numerator) divided by the total number of special education students in the LEA (denominator).

The source information for the numerator in the LEA calculations was the same as that used to populate the "Report of Children with Disabilities Subject to Disciplinary Removal: School Year 2012-2013" (Table 5, in Section A, Column 3B), submitted to OSEP on November 1, 2012. The source information for the denominator in the LEA calculations was the same as that used to populate the "Report of Children with Disabilities Receiving Special Education Under Part B of IDEA, as Amended" (Table 1) submitted to OSEP on February 1, 2014. Additional information on these reports may be found at ideadata.org.

During the 2012 - 2013 school year, only 5 of Vermont's then 59 LEAs reported any occurrences of suspensions or expulsions greater than 10 days. Of these LEAs that reported suspensions or expulsions exceeding 10 days, the rate of suspension/expulsion averaged less than 1%. No LEAs were excluded due to minimum "n" size in this calculation.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)

The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). If YES, select one of the following:

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Indicator 4B: Suspension/Expulsion

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Compliance indicator: Rates of suspension and expulsion:

A. **Percent of districts that have a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and**
B. **Percent of districts that have: (a) a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year for children with IEPs; and (b) policies, procedures or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A); 1412(a)(22))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

(•) Number of districts in the State
( ) Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity	Number of those districts that have policies, procedures, or practices that contribute to the significant discrepancy and do not comply with requirements	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	59	0%	0%	0%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

State's definition of "significant discrepancy" and methodology

Vermont identifies LEAs with significant discrepancies in the rates of long-term suspensions and expulsions, by race or ethnicity, through the following steps:

- Separately, for each race and ethnicity category, aggregate each LEAs total number of IEP students who were suspended or expelled for greater than 10 days, and divide by the total number of IEP students of that race or ethnicity in the LEA. This process produces the rate of long-term suspensions and expulsions by race and ethnicity for each LEA.

- Separately, for each race and ethnicity category, identify LEAs which have a long-term suspension rate of greater than 3%. LEAs which had fewer than 4 long-term suspensions and expulsions in a given race or ethnicity category are excluded. Five LEAs were excluded from identification due to minimum "n" size for one of more race or ethnicities.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

FFY 2013 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2014 using 2013-2014 data)

Description of review

- The State DID NOT identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b)
- The State DID identify noncompliance with Part B requirements as a result of the review required by 34 CFR §300.170(b).

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Indicator 5: Education Environments (children 6-21)

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:

A. **Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;**
B. **Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; and**
C. **In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.**

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2005	Target ≥			78.00%	78.50%	78.50%	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%
		Data		77.89%	71.15%	69.95%	69.82%	72.21%	74.01%	73.71%	73.78%	74.15%
B	2005	Target ≤			8.00%	7.50%	7.50%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%
		Data		8.59%	10.14%	9.47%	8.90%	8.14%	7.14%	6.90%	7.12%	6.61%
C	2005	Target ≤			4.04%	4.00%	4.00%	3.85%	3.75%	3.75%	3.75%	3.75%
		Data		5.81%	6.35%	6.48%	6.88%	6.28%	6.14%	5.95%	5.65%	6.24%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%
Target B ≤	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%
Target C ≤	3.75%	3.75%	3.75%	3.75%	3.75%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Vermont's Stakeholder Group for the APR is the Vermont Special Education Advisory Council. Proposed targets, along with performance history, was reviewed with that group, as well as with the Executive Board of the Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA). Both groups have concurred with the proposed targets for all Indicators.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	6/4/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	12,189	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	9,133	null

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	767	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	555	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	127	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/2/2015	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	21	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	9,133	12,189	74.15%	79.00%	74.93%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	767	12,189	6.61%	7.00%	6.29%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	703	12,189	6.24%	3.75%	5.77%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 6: Preschool Environments

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:

A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2011	Target ≥									71.78%	71.78%
		Data								71.58%	73.68%	76.17%
B	2011	Target ≤									6.19%	6.19%
		Data								6.39%	4.81%	2.19%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	71.78%	71.78%	71.78%	71.78%	71.78%
Target B ≤	6.19%	6.19%	6.19%	6.19%	6.19%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Vermont's Stakeholder Group for the APR is the Vermont Special Education Advisory Council. Proposed targets, along with performance history, was reviewed with that group, as well as with the Executive Board of the Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA). Both groups have concurred with the proposed targets for all Indicators.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	1,819	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	a1. Number of children attending a regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,393	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	42	null
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec	7/2/2015	b2. Number of children attending separate school	n	null

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
C089; Data group 613)				
SY 2014-15 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/2/2015	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 attending	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,393	1,819	76.17%	71.78%	76.58%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	46	1,819	2.19%	6.19%	2.53%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 7: Preschool Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs who demonstrate improved:

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

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A1	2014	Target ≥						92.88%	92.88%	92.88%	92.88%	92.88%
		Data					92.38%	89.91%	89.90%	91.14%	87.52%	89.13%
A2	2014	Target ≥						53.34%	53.34%	53.34%	53.34%	53.34%
		Data					52.84%	48.75%	52.30%	48.50%	48.80%	68.00%
B1	2014	Target ≥						91.21%	91.21%	91.21%	91.21%	91.21%
		Data					90.71%	89.32%	91.10%	92.69%	86.16%	90.68%
B2	2014	Target ≥						50.03%	50.30%	50.03%	50.03%	50.03%
		Data					49.53%	46.36%	49.80%	48.20%	39.60%	56.00%
C1	2014	Target ≥						93.27%	93.27%	93.27%	93.27%	93.27%
		Data					92.77%	91.30%	92.20%	90.55%	87.83%	91.46%
C2	2014	Target ≥						61.23%	61.23%	61.23%	61.23%	61.23%
		Data					60.73%	58.31%	62.50%	59.43%	56.75%	64.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A1 ≥	86.63%	86.63%	86.63%	86.63%	87.13%
Target A2 ≥	40.91%	40.91%	40.91%	40.91%	41.41%
Target B1 ≥	87.30%	87.30%	87.30%	87.30%	87.80%
Target B2 ≥	32.49%	32.49%	32.49%	32.49%	32.99%
Target C1 ≥	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%	86.00%	86.50%
Target C2 ≥	54.71%	54.71%	54.71%	54.71%	55.21%

Key:

Explanation of Changes

Vermont is resetting baseline and calculating new targets to reflect changes in collection methodology we have implemented.

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Vermont's Stakeholder Group for the APR is the Vermont Special Education Advisory Council. Proposed targets, along with performance history, was reviewed with that group, as well as with the Executive Board of the Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA). Both groups have concurred with the proposed targets for all Indicators.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	594.00

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	67.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	284.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	150.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	93.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	434.00	501.00	89.13%	86.63%	86.63%
A2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	243.00	594.00	68.00%	40.91%	40.91%

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

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	72.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	329.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	166.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	27.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
B1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	495.00	567.00	90.68%	87.30%	87.30%
B2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	193.00	594.00	56.00%	32.49%	32.49%

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children
a. Preschool children who did not improve functioning	0.00
b. Preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	63.00
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	206.00
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	181.00
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	144.00

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
C1. Of those preschool children who entered or exited the preschool program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (c+d)/(a+b+c+d)	387.00	450.00	91.46%	86.00%	86.00%
C2. The percent of preschool children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program. (d+e)/(a+b+c+d+e)	325.00	594.00	64.00%	54.71%	54.71%

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COSF)? No

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 8: Parent involvement

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.

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

Do you use a separate data collection methodology for preschool children?

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			30.12%	32.12%	34.12%	36.12%	38.12%	38.12%	38.12%	38.12%
Data		28.00%	34.02%	34.13%	36.18%	34.56%	37.04%	31.88%	37.09%	35.73%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	38.12%	38.12%	38.12%	38.12%	38.12%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Vermont's Stakeholder Group for the APR is the Vermont Special Education Advisory Council. Proposed targets, along with performance history, was reviewed with that group, as well as with the Executive Board of the Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA). Both groups have concurred with the proposed targets for all Indicators.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent parents who report schools facilitated parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities	Total number of respondent parents of children with disabilities	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
526.00	1420.00	35.73%	38.12%	37.04%

Since the State did not report preschool children separately, discuss the procedures used to combine data from school age and preschool surveys in a manner that is valid and reliable.

Vermont's data from this survey, separated by preschool and school age, follows, along with combined result.

PART B Preschool Special Education

Percent at or above: 600 52% (SE of the mean = 2.2%)

Number of Valid Responses: 169 Measurement reliability: 0.88-0.94

Mean Measure: 622 Measurement SD 157

PART B Grades K - 12

Percent at or above: 600 **34% (SE of the mean = 1.0%)**

Number of Valid Responses: 1,251 Measurement reliability: 0.91-0.95

Mean Measure: 560 Measurement SD 154

PART B ALL

Percent at or above: 600 **37.04% (SE of the mean = 0.7%)**

Number of Valid Responses: 1,420 Measurement reliability: .91-.95

Mean Measure: 560 Measurement SD 154

Describe how the State has ensured that any response data are valid and reliable, including how the data represent the demographics of the State.

To determine if the parents who responded to this survey were representative of the parents of all of the children receiving special education services, race/ethnicity, disability, gender, and age demographics of the children whose parents responded to the survey were compared with the same demographics of all of the children whose parents were mailed a survey.

The table below shows a comparison of population and respondent characteristics. The largest difference between population and respondents is 3.59%.

Demographic Characteristic	Count of Respondent Children	Percent of Respondent Children	Count of Eligible Children	Percent of Eligible Children	Over/Under Representation*
Race/Ethnicity					
Non-White**	94	6.62%	907	6.51%	0.11%
White	1326	93.38%	13030	93.49%	-0.11%
Totals	1420	100.00%	13937	100.00%	0.00%
Disability					
Autism Spectrum Disorder	153	10.77%	1001	7.18%	3.59%
Developmental Delay	290	20.42%	2637	18.92%	1.50%
Emotional Disturbance	199	14.01%	2014	14.45%	-0.44%
Hard of Hearing & Hearing Loss	11	0.77%	78	0.56%	0.21%
Intellectual Disability	69	4.86%	686	4.92%	-0.06%
Multiple Disabilities	33	2.32%	230	1.65%	0.67%
Other Health Impairment	216	15.21%	2199	15.78%	-0.57%

Specific Learning Disability	352	24.79%	3798	27.25%	-2.46%
Speech or Language Impairment	85	5.99%	1184	8.50%	-2.51%
All Other Disabilities***	12	0.85%	110	0.79%	0.06%
Totals	1420	100.00%	13937	100.00%	0.00%
Gender					
Female	487	34.30%	4801	34.45%	-0.15%
Male	933	65.70%	9136	65.55%	0.15%
Totals	1420	100.00%	13937	100.00%	0.00%
Age					
3 to 5	208	14.65%	1817	13.04%	1.61%
6 to 11	570	40.14%	5410	38.82%	1.32%
12 to 17	580	40.85%	6033	43.29%	-2.44%
18 to 21	62	4.37%	677	4.86%	-0.49%
Totals	1420	100.00%	13937	100.00%	0.00%

*Over/Under Representation is the percent of respondent children minus the percent of eligible population.

**Non-White includes Hispanic, African American, American Indian or Alaskan Native and Asian or Pacific Islander and multiracial.

***All Other Disabilities Includes: Deaf, Deaf-Blindness, Orthopedic Impairment, Traumatic Brain Injury and Visual Impairment.

Was sampling used? No

Was a collection tool used? No

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representations

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- (•) Number of districts in the State
- ( ) Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
11	0	59	0%	0%	0%

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State)] times 100.

A particular challenge for Vermont in defining disproportionate representation is the largely homogeneous nature of Vermont's student population. In both regular education and special education settings, at least 95 percent of the total student population has historically been reported as white. In addition, the counts of children receiving special education in each LEA are relatively small, averaging just over 200 students per LEA. Taken together, the homogeneity of the student population and relatively small child counts result in a situation where the addition of just one child into special education can create a large difference in the race/ethnicity composition of children receiving IDEA-B services in an LEA. To address these challenges, *Vermont created three criteria designed to provide a meaningful, valid and reliable methodology for identifying LEAs with disproportionate representation.*

(SPP 2005 pages 91-92) See below for full description of criteria.

Vermont has created three criteria to establish the definition of disproportionate representation:

Criterion 1:

LEA-level Weighted Risk Ratio > 3.0 or LEA-level Alternate Risk Ratio >3.0 or <.33 if the sum of the comparison group (all other race/ethnicity categories) used to calculate the Weighted Risk Ratio is <11.

Utilizing technical assistance documentation provided by Westat a weighted risk ratio was chosen for its common acceptance and flexibility in comparing the relative size of two risks[1]:

1) The LEA-level risk of a particular racial/ethnic group of students receiving special education services for a specific disability; and

2) The risk for all other students in the LEA of receiving special education services for a specific disability weighted for the racial/ethnic composition of the state.

3) When a weighted risk ratio is not appropriate because there are fewer than 11 students in the comparison group, Alternate Risk Ratios will be used as an appropriate alternative beginning in FFY 2006. The Alternate Risk Ratio is not weighted for the racial/ethnic composition of the state.

Criterion 2:

Greater than 10 students receiving special education services for a specific disability in the special education race/ethnicity category in the LEA of analysis when examining overrepresentation or, beginning in FFY 2006, an "expected count" of >10 students in the special education race/ethnicity category if examining underrepresentation.

Risk ratios can be substantively impacted by the addition of as a little as one student in a race/ethnicity category containing fewer than 11 students and become unreliable in identifying disproportionate representation[2]. Furthermore, the Vermont Agency of Education (VT AOE) "small 'n' rule" prohibits public reporting of potentially personally identifying information where the number of students being reported on is less than or equal to 10. For these reasons, any single cell used for risk ratio analysis must contain at least ten students when examining overrepresentation or an "expected count" of at least ten students when examining underrepresentation.

Criterion 3

The difference between the actual count of special education students with a specific disability in a race/ethnicity category and the expected count of special education students with a specific disability in the race/ethnicity category is >10 when examining either overrepresentation or underrepresentation using Weighted or Alternate Risk Ratios.

This criterion prevents spurious identification of an LEA for having disproportionate representation when a combination of "small 'n'" sizes across race/ethnicity categories causes both the Weighted Risk Ratio and Alternate Risk Ratio to be unreliable. As noted above and in the Westat technical assistance documentation, when working with small numbers of students, the addition or subtraction of even one student in a particular race/ethnicity category can cause dramatic fluctuations in risk ratios, making them very difficult to interpret meaningfully[1]. This criterion, in combination with the other two, provides a meaningful, valid and reliable methodology for identifying LEAs with disproportionate representation.

---

[1] Westat's technical assistance document, *Methods for Assessing Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education: A Technical Assistance Guide,* is available at www.IDEAdata.org.

---

[1] Westat's technical assistance document, *Methods for Assessing Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education: A Technical Assistance Guide,* is available at www.IDEAdata.org.

[2] ibid

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Actual Target Data for FFY 2014:

0% or 0 of 59 LEAs were determined to have a finding of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services resulting from

inappropriate identification. Target met.

Although no LEAs were found to have a finding of disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education resulting from inappropriate identification, 11 of 59 LEAs were identified for a review because their submitted Child Count demonstrated disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in their special education population. No LEAs were excluded due to Vermont's minimum "n" size of fewer than 11 students receiving special education services in any race/ethnicity category.

For a discussion of how Vermont determined that the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was *not* the result of inappropriate identification, please see the section below titled "Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2014."

For a complete discussion of the criteria utilized for defining disproportionate representation, please refer to pages 91-92 of the revised FFY 2005 SPP submitted to OSEP on February 1, 2010.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2014:

As noted in the target data section, eleven (11) LEAs were identified as having disproportionate representation by race or ethnicity in the special education population. In eight (8) LEAs, the racial and ethnic groups were underrepresented according to the number of students identified with a disability in contrast to the number expected to be identified given the LEAs census information. In eleven (11) LEAs, the racial and ethnic groups were overrepresented according to the number of students identified with a disability in contrast to the number expected to be identified given the LEAs census information.

In four (4) LEAs the Multi-Ethnic student's race/ethnicity category was the identified category underrepresented. In four (4) LEAs the Asian (1), Hispanic (1), Black (1) and White (1) student's race/ethnicity categories were underrepresented.

Within the same eleven (11) LEAs the following disproportionate representation by race/ethnic category were identified. In six (6) LEAs the lone overrepresentation was the White category. In two (2) LEAs the lone category of overrepresentation was the Black category. In one (1) other LEA the lone overrepresentation was the Native American category. In one (1) LEA overrepresentation was identified in both the White and Black categories, and in one (1) other district Native American and Black categories were overrepresented.

To determine whether the disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education was the result of inappropriate identification, the following activities, based on policies of the State of Vermont Agency of Education General Supervision and Monitoring Team (AOE GSM), were completed:

Activities:

Letters from the Vermont Agency of Education General Supervision and Monitoring Team were sent to the eleven (11) LEAs alerting them that their submitted Child Count data indicated suspected disproportionate underrepresentation within their special education population.

Copies of evaluations of those students impacted by the disproportionate representation as well as any information regarding LEA policies, procedures and practices were requested from the LEAs for review by the AOE GSM.

Review of LEA Student Files: A sampling of files for possible students impacted was reviewed by the AOE GSM in order to verify if inappropriate identification was occurring. Upon review of evaluations that were conducted within these eleven (11) LEAs, the Monitoring Team concluded that no students were deemed eligible for special education services as a result of inappropriate identification. Additionally, in all LEAs, appropriate consideration was given to the exclusionary factors (English proficiency, cultural and economic impacts and lack of instruction) cited in regulations regarding evaluations and disability determinations.

Review of LEA Policies, Procedures and Practices: Policies, procedures and practices that may help to prevent inappropriate identification were examined in each LEA identified with disproportionate representation. Eleven of the eleven (11 of 11) LEAs had policies that reflected the use of reliable and valid diagnostic assessments, and that LEAs also had a policy that spoke directly to testing procedures or practices that would have a significant impact on disproportional representation by either race or ethnicity.

9.2.3 Two of the LEAs had been highly involved in a committee chaired by the Vermont Agency of Education (VT AOE) English Language Learners Consultant in cooperation with the New England Equity Assistance Center, Education Alliance at Brown University and the Northeast Regional Resource Center, Learning Innovations at WestEd to help develop policy and guidelines on the referral process for English Language Learners (ELLs). This committee developed a resource guide entitled *"English Language Learners in Vermont: Distinguishing Language Difference from Disability"* which was first published in 2010.

Vermont continues to be one of the least racially and ethnically diverse in the country. Three LEAs, all located within the same county in Vermont, identified much higher rates of diversity than is typical because of an active refugee resettlement program that places families in these communities. In 2013-14, 61.7% (767 students) of the state's English Language Learners resided within these three LEAs. At this time, these LEAs do not demonstrate a finding of disproportionate representation by either racial or ethnic groups as a result of inappropriate identification. A large percentage of the racially and ethnically diverse students in these Vermont schools are provided ELL services.

Progress or Slippage:

The VT AOE has shown continued compliance in meeting the requirements of this indicator through policies and procedures requiring the review of Child Count data, monitoring all data collected at the VT AOE as well as LEA-level policies, practices and procedures as described above. Even as population shifts and trends continually evolve within the state, VT AOE policies and procedures will continue to prevent an occurrence of either disproportionate over or underrepresentation that resulted from an inappropriate identification.

Identification and Correction of Noncompliance:

Because there have been *no findings of* noncompliance associated with this indicator since the baseline reporting year (FFY 2005 [July 1, 2005 - June 30, 2006]) and continuing

through FFY 2014 (July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2015), there have not been any findings, or corrections of findings within one year to report for this indicator. Data collected for this indicator for FFY 2014 (July 1, 2014 - June 30, 2015) were obtained from the Vermont Agency of Education December 1, 2014 Child Count data collection. This data collection is implemented each December to meet IDEA B 618 reporting requirements.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2014:

No revisions are planned at this time.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representations in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representations

Compliance indicator: Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(C))

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Please indicate the type of denominator provided

- (•) Number of districts in the State
- ( ) Number of districts that met the State's minimum n-size

Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories	Number of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
0	0	null	0%	0%	

☑ **All races and ethnicities were included in the review**

Define "disproportionate representation" and describe the method(s) used to calculate disproportionate representation

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of LEAs with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability groups that is the result of inappropriate identification) divided by the (# of LEAs in the State)] times 100

A particular challenge for Vermont in defining disproportionate representation is the largely homogeneous nature of Vermont's student population. In both regular education and special education settings, at least 95 percent of the total student population has historically been reported as white. In addition, the counts of children receiving special education services in each LEA are relatively small, averaging just over 200 students per LEA. Taken together, the homogeneity of the student population and relatively small child counts result in a situation where the addition of just one child into special education can create a large difference in the race/ethnicity composition of children receiving IDEA B services in an LEA. To address these challenges, Vermont uses two criteria described below.

(SPP 2005 pages 91-92) See below for full description of criteria.

Vermont has created the following criteria to establish the definition of disproportionate representation:

Criterion 1:
LEA-level Weighted Risk Ratio > 3.0 or, LEA-level Alternate Risk Ratio >3.0 or <.33 if the sum of the comparison group (all other race/ethnicity categories) used to calculate the Weighted Risk Ratio is <11.

Utilizing technical assistance documentation provided by Westat a weighted risk ratio was chosen for its common acceptance and flexibility in comparing the relative size of two risks[1]:

1) The LEA-level risk of a particular racial/ethnic group of students receiving special education services for a specific disability; and

2) The risk for all other students in the LEA of receiving special education services for a specific disability weighted for the racial/ethnic composition of the state.

3) When a weighted risk ratio is not appropriate because there are fewer than 11 students in the comparison group, Alternate Risk Ratios will be used as an appropriate alternative beginning in FFY 2006. The Alternate Risk Ratio is not weighted for the racial/ethnic composition of the state.

Criterion 2:
Greater than 10 students receiving special education services for a specific disability in the special education race/ethnicity category in the LEA of analysis when examining overrepresentation.

Risk ratios can be substantively impacted by the addition of as a little as one student in a race/ethnicity category containing fewer than 11 students and become unreliable in identifying disproportionate representation[2]. Furthermore, the Vermont Agency of Education (VT AOE) "small 'n' rule" prohibits public reporting of potentially personally identifying information where the number of students being reported on is less than or equal to 10. For these reasons, any single cell used for risk ratio analysis must contain at least ten students when examining overrepresentation or an "expected count" of at least ten students.

Criterion 3:
The difference between the actual count of special education students with a specific disability in a race/ethnicity category and the expected count of special education students with a specific disability in the race/ethnicity category is >10 when examining either overrepresentation or underrepresentation using Weighted or Alternate Risk Ratios.

This criterion prevents spurious identification of an LEA for having disproportionate representation when a combination of "small 'n'" sizes across race/ethnicity categories causes both the Weighted Risk Ratio and Alternate Risk Ratio to be unreliable. As noted above and in the Westat technical assistance documentation, when working with small numbers of students, the addition or subtraction of even one student in a particular race/ethnicity category can cause dramatic fluctuations in risk ratios, making them very difficult to interpret meaningfully[3]. This criterion, in combination with the other two, provides a meaningful, valid and reliable methodology for identifying LEAs with disproportionate representation.

---

[1] Westat's technical assistance document, *Methods for Assessing Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education: A Technical Assistance Guide,* is available at www.IDEAdata.org.

[2] ibid

[3] Westat's technical assistance document, *Methods for Assessing Racial/Ethnic Disproportionality in Special Education: A Technical Assistance Guide,* is available at www.IDEAdata.org.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
0	0	0	0

Indicator 11: Child Find

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Child Find

Compliance indicator: Percent of children who were evaluated within 60 days of receiving parental consent for initial evaluation or, if the State establishes a timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted, within that timeframe.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		69.74%	81.78%	90.84%	82.50%	84.46%	91.83%	95.52%	92.11%	97.71%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

(a) Number of children for whom parental consent to evaluate was received	(b) Number of children whose evaluations were completed within 60 days (or State-established timeline)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
197	194	97.71%	100%	98.48%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	3

Account for children included in (a) but not included in (b). Indicate the range of days beyond the timeline when the evaluation was completed and any reasons for the delays.

The number of days where the three evaluations exceeded 60 days were:

1 day, where no reason was given for the delay.

121 days, where the reason was the scheduling of an outside evaluator to attend the eligibility meeting and was, therefore, not an allowable reason under Vermont regulations.

129 days, where an evaluator had begun an evaluation in June despite an agreement by the parent to wait until the beginning of the next school year, which started the 60 day timeline and was not an allowable reason until Vermont regulations.

In all three cases, the initial evaluation was completed and the instances of non-compliance were corrected within the reporting year (FFY 2014) and the issue was not found to be systemic to the LEAs.

Indicate the evaluation timeline used

The State used the 60 day timeframe within which the evaluation must be conducted.

The State established a timeline within which the evaluation must be conducted.

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- (•) State monitoring
- ( ) State database that includes data for the entire reporting year

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

The current submission process, put in place in 2008, at least three times per year beginning each November, heightens the awareness of LEA staff to the time line requirements for initial evaluations, the target for their completion as well as the regulatory procedures to follow when the 60 day timeline cannot be made. The gains that were observed in both FFY 2010 (7.37%) and FFY 2011 (an additional 3.69%) can be attributed, in part, to this new monitoring process. In FFY 2012 this percentage slipped 1.48% but still represents a figure 9.56% above that seen in the last year of the old reporting system in FFY 2009. Results of the FFY 2013 submissions illustrate an increase of 5.60% over last year, and the highest percentage of compliance recorded to date. The FFY 2014 compliance rate of 98.48% represents Vermont's highest percentage recorded within its ten year SPP/APR reporting history.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
4	4	0	0

FFY 2013 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

Indicator 12: Early Childhood Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3, who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		86.44%	97.33%	99.27%	98.80%	99.70%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	36
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to third birthday.	2
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	34
d. Number for whom parent refusals to provide consent caused delays in evaluation or initial services or to whom exceptions under 34 CFR §300.301(d) applied.	0
e. Number of children who were referred to Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e)	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
Percent of children referred by Part C prior to age 3 who are found eligible for Part B, and who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays. [c/(a-b-d-e)]x100	34	34	100%	100%	100%

Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for eligibility determination that are not included in b, c, d, e	0

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- (•) **State monitoring**
- ( ) **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used

to collect these data.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Compliance indicator: Percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2009

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						22.60%	55.44%	94.44%	57.75%	74.04%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of youth aged 16 and above with IEPs that contain each of the required components for secondary transition	Number of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
113	152	74.04%	100%	74.34%

What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

- (•) **State monitoring**
- ( ) **State database that includes data for the entire reporting year**

Describe the method used to collect these data, and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data.

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student's transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached the age of majority) divided by the (# of youth with an IEP age 16 and above)] times 100.

Notification letters were sent to the ten LEAs slated for FFY 2014 Compliance Monitoring, which for this indicator, involves a desk

review of postsecondary transition plans using the NSTTAC checklist. The VTAOE requested the required number of postsecondary plans be submitted by three time periods over the school year; November 1, 2014, February 1, 2015 and April 1, 2015. A final submission date of June 1, 2015 was required of district that had not submitted 10 fully compliant transition plans through the April submission date or any correction of non-compliance submitted in the April submission.

As of June 1, 2015 all instances of non-compliance were subsequently corrected by the LEA and no remaining compliance issues remained for for FFY 2014. The final percentage of IEPs that contained 100% compliant postsecondary transition plans was 74.34%, up slightly (0.30%) from the previous submission for FFY 2013. The itemized compliance, according to the 24 point checklist developed by NSTTAC and used by VTAOE to assess compliance for the 152 postsecondary transition plans submitted, was 3517 out a possible 3648 items for a compliance percentage of 96.41%.

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2013

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
null	null	null	0

Indicator 14: Post-School Outcomes

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition

Results indicator: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:

A. **Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.**
B. **Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.**
C. **Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.**

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

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
A	2009	Target ≥							24.25%	24.25%	24.25%	24.25%
		Data						24.22%	16.36%	17.56%	15.34%	50.38%
B	2009	Target ≥							56.50%	56.50%	56.50%	56.50%
		Data						56.40%	48.33%	48.29%	47.72%	70.61%
C	2009	Target ≥							72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%
		Data						71.97%	57.25%	65.85%	59.66%	77.48%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	24.25%	24.25%	24.25%	24.25%	24.25%
Target B ≥	56.50%	56.50%	56.50%	56.50%	56.50%
Target C ≥	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

See Indicator 1.

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	225.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	110.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	30.00
3. Number of respondent youth enrolled in some other postsecondary education or training program within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education or competitively employed)	13.00
4. Number of respondent youth who are in some other employment within one year of leaving high school (but not enrolled in higher education, some other postsecondary education or training program, or competitively employed).	12.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	110.00	225.00	50.38%	24.25%	48.89%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	140.00	225.00	70.61%	56.50%	62.22%
C. Enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment (1+2+3+4)	165.00	225.00	77.48%	72.00%	73.33%

Was sampling used? No

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 15: Resolution Sessions

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			56.00%	57.00%	58.00%	59.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%
Data		55.00%	25.00%	33.33%	83.33%	66.67%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Vermont's Stakeholder Group for the APR is the Vermont Special Education Advisory Council. Proposed targets, along with performance history, was reviewed with that group, as well as with the Executive Board of the Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA). Both groups have concurred with the proposed targets for all Indicators.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	6	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/5/2015	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	6	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
6	6	100%	60.00%	100%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 16: Mediation

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / General Supervision

Results indicator: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

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

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Target ≥			70.00%	73.00%	76.00%	79.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%
Data		63.00%	90.91%	88.89%	80.00%	87.50%	86.45%	72.34%	86.67%	76.00%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline Blue – Data Update

FFY 2014 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%	82.00%

Key:

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Vermont's Stakeholder Group for the APR is the Vermont Special Education Advisory Council. Proposed targets, along with performance history, was reviewed with that group, as well as with the Executive Board of the Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators (VCSEA). Both groups have concurred with the proposed targets for all Indicators.

Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	15	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	15	null
SY 2014-15 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/5/2015	2.1 Mediations held	36	null

FFY 2014 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Mediations held	FFY 2013 Data*	FFY 2014 Target*	FFY 2014 Data
15	15	36	76.00%	82.00%	83.33%

Actions required in FFY 2013 response

None

Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

Monitoring Priority: General Supervision

Results indicator: The State's SPP/APR includes a State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) that meets the requirements set forth for this indicator.

Reported Data

Baseline Data: 2014

FFY	2013	2014
Target ≥		17.00%
Data	18.00%	6.70%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline
Blue – Data Update

FFY 2015 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	6.70%	6.70%	7.20%	7.70%

Key:

Description of Measure

Description of Data Sources

The Vermont Agency of Education (AOE) utilizes a number of different databases across multiple programs to meet its 618 and annual performance reporting requirements. These databases and the associated collection processes have been standardized by the Vermont Agency of Education Data Management and Analysis Team into "Core Data Collections." These include collections of student censuses, discipline data, budget data, special education child counts, educator censuses and teacher and staff surveys. These core data collections share many mechanisms to provide for consistent, valid and reliable data. To meet reporting requirements for "Child Count," Vermont completes counts of students ages 3 through 21 receiving special education and related services on December 1 of each year. Information gathered includes the ages, disabilities, race/ethnicity, and settings in which children receive Part B services. The Child Count collection is completed electronically, each Local Education Agency (LEA) submitting their Child Count to the Vermont AOE by December 15th of the reporting year, ending December 1st. The Student Educator Course Transcript Data Collection was also reviewed in anticipation of utilizing graduation outcomes for a measurable result. The SECT data collection asks for student course information including the educator teaching the class, type of class, marks earned, and other related information. This information was dissagregated for students with disabilities and for those without, and results suggested that the state did not have enough need to choose graduation results as a SIMR. In turn, additional data related to assessment outcomes and identification rates for students with disabilities was reviewed in order to determine other possible targets for improvement.

Description of Measure

Staff at the Vermont Agency of Education reviewed the data and developed targets that are measurable and rigorous for each of the five years from FFY 2014 through FFY 2018, with the FFY 2018 target reflecting measurable improvement over the FFY 2013 baseline data. Scores from the Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBAC) will be used to determine academic achievement in the content area of math for students with emotional disabilities in grades 3, 4, and 5. Due to a transition from NECAP to SBAC, the VT AOE will use the 2013/14 NECAP scores as a baseline and adjust accordingly after receiving results from the SBAC assessment in the spring of 2015. It is anticipated that there will be a in scores due to the transition from NECAP to SBAC. Our baseline target of 18% in FFY 2013 is higher than the targets for FFY

2014-2016 (17%). However, we expect that with the implementation of our improvement plan, these scores will rise and be at a 20% proficiency rate by FFY 2018.

The VT AOE SIMR is aligned to the State Personnel Developent Grant (SPDG) MTSS project and the math and behavior components within PBIS, (MTSS-Math and MTSS - Behavior). The scores from the particpating VT MTSS schools will serve as the baseline and progress measure for the SIMR target. A list of potential participating schools is attached (SSIP Pilot School Info).

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

The Monitoring Team of the General Supervision and Monitoring Department began reviewing data for the allowable APR indicators in late 2013. In January 2014, the SSIP format was introduced to the State Advisory Council. Staff attended OSEP training in March 2014. Further monthly meetings were held with the Advisory Council and additional representatives of LEAs and outside agencies involved with stuents with disabilities. The Data Manager provided in-depth information about each of the areas to the State Advisory Council in June, 2014 including school administrators, parents of students with disabilities, legislators, individuals with disabilities and representatives of higher education.

An agency based steering committee consisting of Division Directors (3), Data Manager, State Director of Special Education, Project Manager and additional staff as needed was implemented to continue the review process. In discussions and analysis of data that followed, the group asked about the inclusion of post secondary outcomes and their imporatnce in reviewing graduation rates. Further discussion revolved around the various course offerings throughout the state which assisted or impeded graduation. (SECT data) Review of the Vermont State Board of Education Rules and Statutes showed that graduation requirements are locally developed to meet the credit criteria for graduation rather than instructional criteria. This process renders any conclusion about graduation rates murky at best and most likely moot. Based upon that review and findings, the steering committee conducted additional data review for potential SIMRs.

During this additional review, data illustrated that the number of students in Vermont identified as Emotionally Disabled was significantly above the national average (16.03% vs. 6.31% for FYY 2012-13). Vermont ranked #1 in the country. It was also noted that students in this category were scoring significantly below proficiency levels on the statewide math assessments (87.1% of students with ED scored below proficient on the statewide assessment in FYY 2013-14). Further discussions followed in order to narrow the focus to a cohort of students who needed the most support and for whom interventions would have the most impact. Results of the data analysis revealed that students with emotional disabilities in grades 3-4-5 would be most impacted as a focus area. A SIMR was then formulated to reflect that finding. A presentation was made to the expanded Special Education Advisory Council, the regional special education meetings, the Vermont Council of Special Education Advisors, and AOE special education staff for their input and approval. These groups all concurred with the choice of the SIMR.

Overview

Data Analysis

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance. The description must include information about how

the data were disaggregated by multiple variables (e.g., LEA, region, race/ethnicity, gender, disability category, placement, etc.). As part of its data analysis, the State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns. Finally, if additional data are needed, the description should include the methods and timelines to collect and analyze the additional data.

Introduction

Prior to and after the OSEP Summer Technical Assistance meeting of August 2014, the State Systemic Improvement Plan information was shared with administration and staff at the Vermont Agency of Education (VT AOE), additional state agencies and the field. The plan was discussed at a VT AOE leadership meeting and with staff from the General Supervision and Monitoring and Integrated Support for Learning teams so that Vermont Agency staff would be familiar with the requirements and process. Additionally, information about the plan was shared with the directors of the Vermont Family Network, the Vermont Principals Association, the Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators, and members of the Vermont Special Education Advisory Council. Follow up meetings were held with members of each organization.
An overview of the plan was presented at regional special education administrators meetings in September 2013 with updated information continuing through June 2014. The meetings were attended by special education administrators from the majority of school districts in the state and representatives of the Agency. Attendees were asked significant questions and to contribute to plan development.
The Vermont Special Education Advisory Council dedicated half their meeting days in November 2013 and January, March, April, October and November 2014 to discuss the SSIP data, potential, and final SIMR and activities. Council members offered critical questions and made suggestions for targets and outcomes.

A description of how the State identified and analyzed key data, including data from SPP/APR indicators, 618 data collections, and other available data as applicable, to: (1) select the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities, and (2) identify root causes contributing to low performance.
In March 2014, agency staff attended the RCC training for a better understanding of the process and activities involved in developing the SSIP. Following this training, the AOE steering committee reviewed additional APR indicators (#3) and narrowed data to reflect the most needy areas of that indicator. Based upon that review, staff chose to review additional data surrounding each of the potential SIMRs to determine the most appropriate. Throughout 2014, data was reviewed with the internal steering committee, the Special Education Advisory Committee, data staff, and the local RRC representative to support the choice of the final SIMR.
As part of this broad data analysis, staff and stakeholders reviewed the following:

1. APR and 618 data on allowable indicators 1, 2, and 14 for consideration of a preliminary SIMR beginning in January 2014 with constituencies within and outside the AOE.
2. Upon review of the SECT data and graduation data, the steering committee revisited the Annual Performance Report and focused on Indicator 3, Math Assessment outcomes for students identified as ED.

The State used multiple data sources in its data analysis to identify root causes contributing to low performance. For preliminary discussion and final choice of a SIMR, the following data sources were used as illustrated by the attached charts:

1. Placement data;
2. Assessment performance data;
3. Primary disability assessment data;
4. Geographic data

Data was disaggregated and reviewed by the steering committee and agency staff across multiple variables including:

1. Graduation rates by cohort;
2. geographic area across the state;
3. disability category;

4. gender;
5. participation and proficiency rates

The State reviewed data that would inform potential SIMRs for compliance and potential influence on improvement. Questions regarding applicability, validity, and reliability were addressed. Targets and accompanying data which did not meet SSIP criteria were eliminated.

The State reviewed initial root causes. These included items germane to the special education process (possible over-identification), curriculum, instruction, teacher quality, parenting skills, professional learning, geography, poverty, and integration with other state agencies or community service groups. It was determined that additional data on root causes is required to fully assess causal factors affecting students identified in the SIMR. The plan and timelines for collecting this additional data is to construct, distribute and analyze surveys sent to partners during 2015 to obtain additional qualitative and quantitative data on root causes at the state and local level. This information will be analyzed and appropriate improvement plans drawn mid-2015 based upon the analysis of those findings and to report those results in Phase II, due February 1, 2016.

The State should also consider compliance data and whether those data present potential barriers to improvement. In addition, if the State identifies any concerns about the quality of the data, the description must include how the State will address these concerns.

In the consideration of compliance data, no potential barriers to improvement are seen as we do not have any compliance data which relates to this SIMR. Data is continually being reviewed for quality. One issue which arose is that the proportion of IEP students reported as proficient for 2013-14 was incomplete due to the lack of data reported by schools which piloted the SBAC during sy 2013. Therefore, results were skewed positively. To adjust for this and provide a more accurate representation of math assessment results, AOE incorporated additional data from the 2012-13 school year. The State of Vermont will be utilizing SSIS as the reporting group for SBAC.

Analysis of State Infrastructure to Support Improvement and Build Capacity

A description of how the State analyzed the capacity of its current infrastructure to support improvement and build capacity in LEAs to implement, scale up, and sustain the use of evidence-based practices to improve results for children with disabilities. State systems that make up its infrastructure include, at a minimum: governance, fiscal, quality standards, professional development, data, technical assistance, and accountability/monitoring. The description must include current strengths of the systems, the extent the systems are coordinated, and areas for improvement of functioning within and across the systems. The State must also identify current State-level improvement plans and initiatives, including special and general education improvement plans and initiatives, and describe the extent that these initiatives are aligned, and how they are, or could be, integrated with, the SSIP. Finally, the State should identify representatives (e.g., offices, agencies, positions, individuals, and other stakeholders) that were involved in developing Phase I of the SSIP and that will be involved in developing and implementing Phase II of the SSIP.

Vermont considered all of the major initiatives across the state in order to analyze its current infrastructure. A description of those that are directly related to the Vermont SSIP/SIMR is included here. Documents related to those initiatives are attached.

The purpose of the Vermont Education Quality Standards (EQS) is to "ensure that all students in Vermont public schools are afforded educational opportunities that are substantially equal in quality, and enable them to achieve or exceed the standards approved by the State Board of Education. These rules are designed to ensure continuous improvement in the student performance, instruction and leadership to enable students to attain rigorous standards in high quality programs." There is an intentional shift from inputs to outcomes; from a focus on courses and Carnegie units to a focus on proficiency. Sections of EQS related to and aligned with the Vermont SSIP/SIMR include but are not limited to: (see the attached EQS document for details)

2120 Curriculum and Instruction: Section 2120.1 Classroom practices shall include a range of research-based instructional practices that most effectively improve student learning, as identified by national and Vermont guidance and locally collected and analyzed student data.

2121 Professional Resources: Section 2121.5 Describes a tiered system of support: "…each school shall ensure that a tiered system of academic and behavioral supports is in place to assist all students in working toward attainment of the standards.

2122 Learning Environment: Section 2122.1 Each school shall maintain a safe, orderly, civil, flexible and positive learning environment, which is free from hazing, harassment and bullying, and based on sound instructional and classroom management practices and clear discipline and attendance policies that are consistently and effectively enforced.

2123 State and Local Comprehensive Assessment System: 2123.2(f) Each supervisory union shall develop, and each school shall implement, a local comprehensive assessment system that provide data that informs decisions regarding instruction, professional learning, and educational resources and curriculum.

2124 Reporting of Results: Teachers shall have access to data on individual students whom they teach and aggregate data on student and system performance results.

2125 Continuous Improvement Plan: A continuous improvement plan shall be developed and implemented in each public school district. The plan shall be designed to improve the performance of all students enrolled in the district.

2126 System for Determining Compliance with EQS: As required, every two years, the Secretary shall determine whether students in each Vermont public school are provided educational opportunities substantially equal to those provided in other public schools.

Vermont is currently in year 3 of the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) 4. Vermont has been implementing MTSS through the SPDG 4 since October 2012. It will run through September 2017 with the anticipation of an approved no cost one year carryover. Vermont is well positioned due to the confluence of the implementation and scaling up of the Early/K-12 (SPDG 3) and the current Early/K-12 MTSS projects (SPDG 4). It has specifically focused on the Foundations of Early Learning, VEL, K-12 RTI and ViiM (VT Integrated Instructional Model). Early in 2012, Vermont recognized the need for a systemic and sustainable state personnel development plan. A plan was developed which identified and addressed the state and local needs for personnel preparation and learning, and met the requirements of IDEA section 612(a/(14) and section 635(a)(8) and (9). It was specifically based on the assessment of state and local needs that identified critical aspects and areas in need of improvement related to the ongoing preparation, training, and professional learning needs of personnel. The VT MTSS project demonstrated the following priority requirements: 1) the use of evidence-based professional learning strategies that will support the implementation of evidence-based practices and result in improved outcomes for students with disabilities; 2) the provision of ongoing assistance to personnel receiving professional learning that supports the implementation of evidence-based practices with fidelity; and 3) use of technology to more efficiently and effectively provide ongoing professional learning to personnel, including personnel in rural areas. Building on the successes of the current SPDG pilot sites and the assessed needs of the state, the VT AOE is continuing the VT MTSS initiative but is broadening its scope and scale up to include math as a content area and increase and improve the family engagement component. These two areas are directly connected to and aligned with improving math learning outcomes for students with an emotional disability.

The VT MTSS professional learning model will focus on five critical elements: 1) ensuring that there is sufficient capacity to provide evidence-based professional learning at early childhood, SU/SD and school levels; 2) providing local and regional TA and coaching based on data-driven needs; 3) utilizing innovative technology and distance learning to increase opportunities for TA and the development if professional learning communities (PLC); 4) aligning the SPDG professional learning system with other AOE initiatives; and 5) employing implementation science principles as the core of the vtMTSS model. These critical elements align with the Vermont SIMR. See the attached MTSS Field Guide for details.

In Vermont, there are currently eleven schools in four supervisory unions that are participating in the School Wide Integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT). The SWIFT domains and features are the building blocks of effective inclusive education. The domains of SWIFT (Administrative Leadership, Multi-tiered Systems of Support, Integrated Educational Framework, Family and Community Engagement, and Inclusive Policy Structure and Practice) and its features directly support the work of improving math learning outcomes for students with emotional disabilities. Implementation science drives the work of the SWIFT Center by promoting research-based approaches to achieve improved academic and social outcomes for all students.

An MTSS framework should be used to guide instruction, by using effective general education strategies with all students and increasing the level of support for some students based on needs identified through screening and progress monitoring. (Copeland & Cosbey, 2008; Sailor, 2009a, 2009b)

Implementing School-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) resulted in decreases in office discipline referrals, suspensions, and disruptive behaviors and increases in pro-social behavior (Bradshaw, Mitchell, & Leaf, 2010; Sailor, Wolf, Choi, & Roger, 2009; Sailor, et all, 2006)

Vermont is in its seventh year of implementing Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). Since 2007, the VTPBIS State Team has collaborated to support schools in PBIS implementation and sustainability. PBIS is a framework for preventing and responding to problem behavior within a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) to meet the learning needs of all students within a positive school climate. Vermont schools implementing MTSS align their systems, data and practices to promote both behavioral and academic success. The goal of PBIS in Vermont is to provide high quality professional learning opportunities to improve school climate and support positive educational outcomes for all students.

Since 2007, the VTPBIS State Team has built capacity for PBIS implementation and sustainability through a system of support and feedback loops between schools, SU/SDs, and the state. Additional sustainability efforts include:

• Actively promoting this framework and its alignment with multi-tiered systems of support for academics;

• Committing personnel and financial resources to professional learning;

• Recognizing schools for achieving exemplar distinction;

• Utilizing online data systems for analysis and decision making; and

• Collaborating with the Vermont Agency of Human Services to promote the integration of mental health supports within a multi-tiered framework for behavior.

The Vermont SIMR is fully supported by the braiding of PBIS and MTSS. Students with emotional disabilities in grades 3-5 will be the focus and the strategies for improving their behavior, emotional, and academic needs will be implemented with fidelity.

Phase I of the SSIP involves several representatives.
Vermont Part C partners will align their work (social and emotional development) with the Part B implementation of the SSIP. Both Part B and Part C teams will attend the IDC conference in late April to plan for the transition of students from Part C to Part B through the lens of improving outcomes for students with emotional disabilities.

Agency of Education staff have been involved in the determination of the SIMR. AOE Math and Behavior consultants have been involved in meetings and will be instrumental in supporting the work of improving math outcomes for students with emotional disabilities. Data experts from AOE have also added valuable input toward the selection of the SIMR.

The Vermont Special Education Advisory Council has been involved in discussions of the SSIP and have supported the work in determining the SIMR.

The Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators has also been brought into the SIMR discussions and has provided feedback around the target. They intend to be involved with the SSIP as plans for implementation are scaled up.

The Vermont Family Network is involved in the choosing of the SIMR. They will continue as stakeholders. Their specific role will be determined as Vermont moves ahead with implementation plans.

Children's Mental Health staff have had input on the selection of the SIMR. Their involvement will be

increased as Vermont moves into Phase II of the SSIP.

Integrated Family Services will be involved in the implementation of SSIP.

Potentially, as Vermont moves forward with plans for the SSIP, more stakeholders will be added to the plan. The deeper data analysis and root cause analysis will likely support the need for a larger group of stakeholders who can help with the details of improving outcomes for students with disabilities.

State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities

A statement of the result(s) the State intends to achieve through the implementation of the SSIP. The State-identified result(s) must be aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator. The State-identified result(s) must be clearly based on the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses and must be a child-level outcome in contrast to a process outcome. The State may select a single result (e.g., increasing the graduation rate for children with disabilities) or a cluster of related results (e.g., increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate for children with disabilities).

Statement

To improve proficiency of math performance for students identified as having an emotional disability in grades 3-5. The SIMR is aligned with APR Indicator #3 Math proficiency. It is intended that throughout the life of the SSIP and through the employment of coherent improvement strategies, the math proficiency levels for students in grades 3, 4, and 5, identified as having an emotional disability, will increase to 20%, as measured by the SBAC, by 2018.

Description

The State has a SIMR and the SIMR is aligned to an SPP/APR indicator or a component of an SPP/APR indicator:

Vermont SIMR: To improve proficiency of math performance for students identified as having an emotional disability in grades 3-5. The SIMR is aligned with APR Indicator #3 Math proficiency. It is intended that throughout the life of the SSIP and through the employment of coherent improvement strategies, the math proficiency levels for students in grades 3, 4, and 5, identified as having an emotional disability, will increase to 20%, as measured by the SBAC, by 2018.

Background Information

The number of students with emotional disabilities in the state of Vermont is significantly above the national average of 6.31% at 16.03%. The proficiency rates on the math assessment for this group of students is significantly low with only 12.96% of students with ED proficient on the statewide math assessment. The SIMR will target math proficiency outcomes for those students identified as having an emotional disability and will impact outcomes for those students over the life of the SSIP. Data reviewed illustrated flat or declining trends in overall math proficiency for this group: high 17.16% in 2009-10 with unreliable data continually decreasing to a low of 12.96% in 2013 with reliable data for students identified as ED across all grade levels in the state. The selection of this SIMR was due to the high need of improvement for this population of students in the content area of math. The SIMR is in harmony with the AOE commitment to equity, education, and improvement for all students and its commitment to activities and programs that increase positive outcomes in the area of mathematics for all students.

As part of the broad data analysis, each stakeholder group reviewed APR and 618 data, evaluated current activities, proposed enlarged staff meetings, and determined potential SIMRs. Those potential SIMRs included high school graduation rates, the use of Personalized Learning Plans (PLP), post school outcomes, and assessment outcomes of both math and reading. Further data analysis and discussion ruled out PLP's and post school outcomes due to the lack of current baseline data and full implementation not beginning for another 2 years.

Further review of state trends over time, local programs, and national trends revealed that improving proficiency rates in the area of mathematics was the more significant need. As Vermont has the highest percentage in the nation of students

identified as ED, the data for this disability category surrounding student achievement in math was of particular interest. Continued data analysis indicated that students with disabilities identified as ED have a high need for improvement of their math outcomes on standardized assessments at grades 3 through 8 and 11. Root cause investigation for this finding would require further in-depth qualitative analysis, continued quantitative analysis and significant coordination with the field over a substantial period of time. It is anticipated that other sources of data will be used to evaluate the progress of students in both academic and behavioral areas.

Selection of Coherent Improvement Strategies

An explanation of how the improvement strategies were selected, and why they are sound, logical and aligned, and will lead to a measurable improvement in the State-identified result(s). The improvement strategies should include the strategies, identified through the Data and State Infrastructure Analyses, that are needed to improve the State infrastructure and to support LEA implementation of evidence-based practices to improve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities. The State must describe how implementation of the improvement strategies will address identified root causes for low performance and ultimately build LEA capacity to achieve the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

The improvement strategies for Vermont were selected based on current initiatives and their goals as they relate to the SIMR. Please refer to the attached VT AOE SSIP Implementation Framework document for descriptions of how the improvement strategies were selected and details of how the work will focus on the content area of math for students with emotional disabilities in grades 3-5 as they relate to the SSIP/SIMR.

Goal #2 of the SPDG is intended to scale up implementation of a coordinated, system of school-age personnel development that will increase the capacity of school personnel to establish and use a multi-tiered model of evidence-based instruction, intervention, and assessment to improve the progress and performance of all students, including those with disabilities. Professional learning is based on the implementation science research, adult learning principles, and Professional Learning Standards developed by Learning Forward.

Vermont has begun to work on the root causes for the high rate of students with emotional disabilities and their related low performance scores in the area of math. Initial results reveal that further work needs to be done to determine why these rates are at these levels but also to determine how best to improve student outcomes for this specific population of students. The Vermont AOE will coordinate this work with Children's Mental Health agency, Integrated Family Services, Vermont Part C partners, administrators, teachers and parents.

Theory of Action

A graphic illustration that shows the rationale of how implementing the coherent set of improvement strategies selected will increase the State's capacity to lead meaningful change in LEAs, and achieve improvement in the State-identified Measurable Result(s) for Children with Disabilities.

theory of Action graphic illustrationtheory of Action graphic illustration

Provide a description of the provided graphic illustration (optional)

Description of Illustration

Cascades A and B reflect Vermont's logic model or practice-policy communication loop. They are based on Implementation Science and illustrate how the state plans to implement and sustain evidence-based innovations that will improve the math skills of students with Emotional Disabilities in grades 3-5. Moreover, the support and feedback loops summarize how the state intends to support continuous improvement

cycles for the effective implementation of these evidence-based practices.

Cascade A, Support Theory of Action, illustrates how Vermont's Agency of Education and the Agency of Human Services will collaborate at a policy level so that local mental health agencies and Vermont Supervisory Unions and School Districts (SU/SD) can work together to embed evidence-based mental health supports into our schools. More specifically, the support loops illustrate the levels at which supports for effective practices will be provided so as to facilitate fidelity of implementation. The feedback loops illustrate how feedback and data on implementation efforts will make their way from children and families back up to policy-makers.

Likewise, Cascade B, Program Theory of Action, illustrates how the Vermont Agency of Education will work with national and state level content experts to train internal coaches at the SU/SD level in the evidence-based math innovations and practices, and how those SU/SD level coaches will then work with school leaders to embed the practices into classrooms to support students. The feedback loops serve to provide data and feedback at each level of the cascade.

Infrastructure Development

(a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support EIS programs and providers to implement and scale up EBPs to improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and other early learning initiatives and programs in the State, including Race to the Top-Early Learning Challenge, Home Visiting Program, Early Head Start and others which impact infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.
(d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the State Lead Agency, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

Phase I for the Vermont Statewide Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) includes a Statewide Identified Measurable Result (SIMR) that focuses on improving learning outcomes in the content area of math for students in grades 3, 4, and 5, who have an emotional disability. The original plan was focused on those students in the 78 schools already implementing the Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS). Upon further review, help from technical assistance organizations, and with input from a large stakeholder group, it was decided that Vermont should focus on a much smaller group of students in order to focus on those evidence-based practices and strategies that are successful in improving outcomes for this specific population of students. After implementation of the SSIP in a group of up to 4 pilot schools, data would be analyzed to identify the reasons for each school's success. Those practices and strategies would then be used to support other schools in their goal to improve math outcomes for students with emotional disabilities in grades 3, 4, and 5.

Phase II of the SSIP in Vermont is described in detail in the following pages. The plan will describe how the infrastructure of the Agency of Education has collaborated to support the schools to be chosen for implementation, how the Agency will support the implementation of evidence-based practices within those Vermont schools, and how the Agency will know that their efforts are making changes for students with disabilities through the development of an outside evaluation plan.

Phase II Component #1: Infrastructure Development

Component #1 Elements

1(a) Specify improvements that will be made to the State infrastructure to better support LEAs to implement and scale up EBPs to improve the SIMR for children with disabilities.

The Vermont State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) Leadership Team has been working with several other teams both within and outside of the Agency of Education (AOE) in order to develop a solid state infrastructure that will support and maintain the implementation of the SSIP for many years to come. A close and detailed look at other Vermont statewide initiatives has enabled the team to consider the alignment of those evidence-based practices already in place.

The current work in Vermont includes the implementation of Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS), Statewide Integrated Framework for Transformation (SWIFT), Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS), Universal Design for Learning (UDL), Trauma-informed Schools, Act 264 (Coordination of Educational & Social Services), and math instruction/interventions that specifically align with the goals of the Vermont SSIP. These systems, which are already in place, will be integrated with and supported by the SSIP to confirm that the pilot schools are developing coherent and integrated approaches to the systemic implementation of these practices.

Improvement 1 – Leverage the Agency's current MTSS technical assistance: Vermont will be integrating MTSS and SWIFT tools and protocols to create a uniform research-based approach to the MTSS framework and infrastructure development in Vermont schools. This will ensure that the research behind Implementation Science is integrated into MTSS training and coaching support for schools in Vermont. Vermont's MTSS External Systems Coaches, the Agency's technical assistants working with sites to fully implement VT MTSS, will work with the Agency to support those MTSS schools involved in the work of the State Identified Measurable Result (SIMR). By working with the MTSS External Systems Coaches, the State can then build on existing relationships, communication, designated meetings, and previous professional learning opportunities to extend its capacity.

Improvement 2 – Focus and integrate Act 46: Another area of integration will be through Act 46 which requires the Secretaries of Education and Human Services to develop a plan for maximizing collaboration and coordination between the agencies in delivering social services to Vermont public school students and their families. This scope of the work will

be narrowed to support students with emotional disabilities (ED) as a statewide identified priority for Vermont schools.

Improvement 3 – Enhance coaching system and integrate it with other initiatives and systems: The Agency will support an embedded coaching model to achieve the sustainable learning and support needed to fully integrate the strategies outlined in the SSIP for each identified school. More specifically, the collaboration between the Agency of Education staff and the MTSS External System Coaches will facilitate the integration of professional learning opportunities and a school's access to statewide content focused coaches. This plan will guide the infrastructure development, personnel and leadership capacity development at the local school level for SSIP identified research-based practices in math, UDL and PBIS. Schools will be supported in the content areas identified as critical for the SSIP implementation through embedded professional coaching experts.

Improvement 4 – Whole system engagement for PIP-PEP: Key leadership individuals, working on behalf of Superintendents, Curriculum and Assessment Directors, Special Education Administrators, and Principals, will continue to work closely together through stakeholder input opportunities to ensure a coherent understanding and execution of the SSIP strategies in Vermont schools. These communication channels will pay particular attention to how (formative) lessons from the SSIP implementation effort may be harnessed to enhance ongoing/future SSIP implementation efforts and to capturing lessons for Policy-enabled Practice and Practice-informed Policy improvements.

1(b) Identify the steps the State will take to further align and leverage current improvement plans and initiatives in the State, including general and special education, which impact children with disabilities.

Vermont has, and always will, strive to increase both academic and behavioral outcomes for all students. Given the task of improving outcomes for students with disabilities through the SSIP, Vermont looked carefully at data, met with internal AOE staff, and gathered input from stakeholders to determine how to better align the current improvement plans and initiatives across the state. It was decided that Vermont would draw upon the many frameworks already in place. These include: MTSS, PBIS, SWIFT, UDL, the Vermont Education Quality Standards (EQS), Personalized Learning and Flexible Pathways. It became the explicit intention to align the SSIP with the research based work of MTSS and PBIS that was already being implemented across the state.

To promote students' social/emotional/behavioral success, many Vermont schools are implementing PBIS, a framework for preventing and responding to problem behavior, within a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS). Vermont is now in its 10th year of implementing PBIS and in its 3rd year of implementing MTSS. The PBIS State Leadership Team supports 132 schools in the sustained implementation of PBIS while the MTSS State Leadership Team supports 109 schools across Vermont.

Vermont aims to improve the scale-up, comprehensiveness, fidelity, outcomes, and sustainability of their MTSS and PBIS schools. With improvements in each of these areas, Vermont will further align and leverage current improvement plans and initiatives to both general and special education that will impact students with Emotional Disabilities.

In order to achieve the expected outcomes of the SSIP, this team will develop a collaboration for supporting professional learning activities provided through the SPDG with particular attention to math and behavior interventions at each of the pilot schools. This will be accomplished by attending meetings, staying in communication, and collaborating with the State Personnel Development Grant (SPDG) Management Team to reach the SSIP goals. We will need the support of the Agency School Effectiveness Coordinators (SEC) and External System Coaches at each pilot school. We will also need to determine the resources that will support individual schools as they implement their schoolwide plans to improve math outcomes for all students.

Support with data collection is another area of need for Vermont. The SSIP Leadership team and stakeholders have considered the types of data needed to demonstrate progress for students with Emotional Disturbance (ED). The team will need to develop a consistent method for capturing data that could be used across schools in order to determine the most effective and efficient instructional strategies for teachers and students. (See the steps for further alignment below.)

INFRASTRUCTURE CHANGE	RESOURCES NEEDED	EXPECTED OUTCOMES	TIMELINES	NOTES
SSIP Leadership Team formation & integration with SPDG Leadership Team	-Attendance at meetings -Staying in communication -Collaborating -Reporting and communication from School Effectiveness Coordinators and External System Coaches at each pilot site	-Coordinated leadership and TA across initiatives -Prioritized TA activities (including PD) matched to pilot site needs	-Happening now and will be ongoing through the duration of the SSIP	
Data Collection	-Evaluator -Logic Model -MTSS External System Coaching support to design the local school data plan development and the use of the collaborative problem solving protocol	-A consistent method for capturing data that could be used across schools. -Data analysis that is comprehensive, reflective and strategic for decision making.	Clear, effective, efficient approach to Data collection and determination of impact: Year 1 - data plan design Year 2-5 - data collected, reflection analysis, plan developed for strategic intervention, implementation, and progress monitoring to achieve second order systemic change.	

1(c) Identify who will be in charge of implementing the changes to infrastructure, resources needed, expected outcomes, and timelines for completing improvement efforts.

The Vermont SSIP Leadership Team will be the coordinating body, working with other Teams and offices, for the SEA infrastructure changes. This Leadership Team is made up of several Agency employees and an SSIP Project Manager. The team is also integrated into the SPDG Leadership Team which consists of Agency personnel, External System Coaches, and the Vermont SWIFT Coordinators. Members include:

Cindy Moran, *State Director of Special Education,* Sue Cano, *SSIP Lead/Project Coordinator,* Tracy Harris, *Coordinator of Behavioral Supports*, Tracy Watterson, *Elementary*

Math Consultant, Tonya Rutkowski, S*pecial Education Consultant*, and Laura Baker, *Consultant for Learning Disabilities* Megan Grube, *AOE SWIFT Coordinator*, Meg Porcella, *SPDG Co-Director*. Although not members of the state leadership, the team is supported by technical assistance from Michael McSheehan, *SWIFT Vermont Liaison*, Susan Hayes, *NCSI*, and Susan Davis, *IDC*.

The SSIP Leadership team and stakeholders have considered the types of data needed to demonstrate progress for students with Emotional Disturbance (ED). We need to develop a consistent method for capturing data that could be used across schools in order to determine the most effective and efficient instructional strategies for teachers and students. Data points considered include attendance in school, office visits, time in class, teacher training specific to the Vermont Mathematics Initiative (VMI), expulsion/seclusion, time on task, functional behavior analysis (FBA) results, basic math skills proficiency, etc.

1(d) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the SEA, as well as other State agencies and stakeholders in the improvement of its infrastructure.

In order to improve the infrastructure of the agency, the SSIP will bring together many and various stakeholders within the State Education Agency (SEA) and among other state agencies.

Members within the agency will include: Mike Bailey, Special Education Data Manager, Tracy Watterson-Elementary Mathematics Assessment Coordinator, Sue Cano-VT SSIP Project Coordinator, Laura Baker, Learning Disabilities Consultant, Megan Grube, SWIFT Coordinator and School Effectiveness Coordinator, Cindy Moran, State Director of Special Education, Karin Edwards, Director of Integrated Support for Learning, Meg Porcella, SPDG Co-Coordinator, Ernie Wheeler, Special Education Monitor, Debbie Lesure, Assistant Director of Integrated Support for Learning (ISL), Tracy Harris, Coordinator for Behavioral Supports, Tonya Rutkowski, Special Education Monitor, Kate Rogers, 619 Coordinator, Deb Quackenbush, Director General Supervision & Monitoring.

Other stakeholders from outside agencies include: Jo-Anne Unruh, VT Council of Special Education Administrators, Michael McSheehan, SWIFT Center Facilitator for Vermont, Charlie Bliss-Department of Mental Health, Danielle Howes- Part C Director, Department of Children and Families, Jeff Francis, Executive Director of the Vermont Superintendents' Association, Ken Page, Executive Director of the Vermont Principals Association, Sherry Schoenberg, PBIS/BEST Coordinator, Susan Hayes, TA from NCSI, Karen Price, Director of the Vermont Family Network

The State will use several different mechanisms in order to involve these different stakeholders in the coming together to work collaboratively around the SSIP goals. These will include face to face workgroup meetings, sharing of documents in a Google Drive folder, arranging of stakeholder meetings on a regular basis, a quarterly newsletter, responding to surveys, and telecommuting via skype or gotomeeting.

Vermont held a stakeholder meeting on March 8, 2016, in order to communicate the goals of the plan and to solicit input for moving forward. We invited 39 stakeholders and had a showing of 45 people that included AOE staff who had an interest in their connection with the work. The feedback indicated: "the meeting was well organized," "facilitation of the meeting was great," "the collaborative dialogue was appreciated," "a broad representation of participants," etc. A follow-up survey provided valuable information that included responses to what will schools need from this plan, what would incentivize a school to participate in SSIP, and input to the logic model. Much of the SSIP plan is directed by their responses.

Support for EIS programs and providers Implementation of Evidence-Based Practices

(a) Specify how the State will support EIS providers in implementing the evidence-based practices that will result in changes in Lead Agency, EIS program, and EIS provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies, including communication strategies and stakeholder involvement; how identified barriers will be addressed; who will be in charge of implementing; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.
(c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the Lead Agency (and other State agencies such as the SEA) to support EIS providers in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the evidence-based practices once they have been implemented with fidelity.

2(a) Specify how the State will support LEAs in implementing the EBPs that will result in changes in LEA, school, and provider practices to achieve the SIMR(s) for children with disabilities.

MTSS/PBIS/SWIFT are frameworks that have all been implemented at some degree across the state. In choosing pilot schools for model demonstration sites, Vermont will invite those schools that meet the following criteria:

- MTSS/PBIS is being used as a framework schoolwide
- There are four (4) or more enrolled students with an emotional disturbance in the identified grade levels
- Math is a focus of their content instruction

Vermont's Phase I plan indicated that the SSIP would involve all 78 of the MTSS schools. Based on stakeholder recommendations and leadership consideration of data, those choices were reconsidered. It was decided that only four (4) schools would be chosen at this early date. These will be the SSIP implementation pilot schools. Other schools will be added incrementally over time with the intent of scaling up to all students with ED in grades 3, 4, and 5. This narrowing of school choice will provide the SSIP leadership team the opportunity to examine the research based practices currently being used in each of the pilot schools and further determine the reason for their success. Based on data and what is learned from these schools already working on their system of support, the SSIP leadership team will then develop a plan for scale up across the state.

It is the expressed intent of the SSIP, that by working with a narrower group of pilot schools that have already begun the process of building systems of support with fidelity, the knowledge gained can be scaled up to other schools that are prepared and willing to improve learning outcomes for all students.

These pilot schools will be required to submit an application that indicates their readiness and "buy in" for the work. Upon acceptance, the schools will be further supported with a menu of options to include (but not limited to):

<u>High Quality Academic Instruction</u>

Math curriculum and instructional strategies

Strategies for students with ED

UDL

Data Literacy

Service Delivery Models and Staffing Patterns

High Expectations and Growth Mindset in Math

High Quality Behavioral Support

- Tiered instructional and behavioral support approaches
- Trauma and its effect on learning
- Data literacy

Service Delivery Models and Staffing Patterns

Parent Engagement

- High Expectations and Growth Mindset

Data-Based Decision Making

- PBIS
- MTSS
- Academic Assessment
- Use of fidelity and outcome measures
- Data Literacy

Capacity Building

- Coaching systems
- High Expectations and Growth Mindset

Participation as a pilot school will include a plan for reviewing their MTSS Implementation data, PBIS implementation data, local/state assessment system data, and determining what supports and enhancements the school will need to make to improve outcomes for students. Each school will be involved in a visioning process to determine how they will meet their individual goals for student progress. The data collection process will be designed to align with the school's desired outcome. This system evaluation done at the beginning of the project will then be used as a tool to evaluate implementation progress and effectiveness along the way.

In order to effect this change at the LEA, school and classroom level, Vermont will support the competency of highly qualified special and general teachers of math by providing training and resources at the SEA level and individualized content and systems coaching at the school/Supervisory Union level. Schools will need to organize and plan for daily scheduled time for interventions and time for coaches to plan with the general education math and special education teachers. The leadership at each school will need to recognize the priority of time for teachers to participate in the necessary professional training networks and collaborations. There will need to be clearly defined expectations for teachers to collect, reflect upon, and use a variety of data types and sources to guide instructional decision making.

A collaboration with parents and community members to support students will be expected. Effective communication strategies must be developed to ensure a coherent understanding of the SSIP practices and a belief that these practices are necessary for academic success for all students.

The technical assistance and professional development for adoption, implementation, and sustainability of the selected coherent improvement strategies and evidence based practices will include coaching support from the MTSS external systems coaches, coaching support from content specialists, and professional development opportunities for school staff and parents, specific to behavior and the content area of math. (See Menu for professional learning, above). Coaching forums for school based coaches to guide the professional learning and implementation practices will assist them in learning how to effectively coach adults within the school setting. Additionally, tools from the SWIFT Center to assist with stage-based implementation planning will be available. (MTSS coaches are currently being trained on the use of the SWIFT Center's technical assistance practices. Training and coaching to the MTSS Systems coaches from the SWIFT Center is scheduled through October, 2017.)

2(b) Identify steps and specific activities needed to implement the coherent improvement strategies.
Include communication strategies, stakeholder involvement, how identified barriers will be addressed; and who will implement activities and strategies; how the activities will be implemented with fidelity; the resources that will be used to implement them; and timelines for completion.

We expect that it will take time for teachers to learn how to engage and include students with ED in their general education classrooms. We also expect that students with ED will

need time to learn effective strategies for engaging in math instruction. When students have access to and are engaged in good first instruction, their learning potential increases. Our goal is to train and support teachers as they learn to teach these students within the general education curriculum. By implementing behavioral and content specific tiers of support, we expect that student academic progress will increase. However, we know that students must have access to this instruction for it to make a difference in learning outcomes. Students with ED, in particular, often have limited access to first good instruction due to their lack of appropriate behavioral skills and frustrations with deficits in basic math skills that cause them to act out or escalate within the classroom. We want to be able to demonstrate that while academic progress might be slow, these students are making progress in maintaining appropriate behavior within the classroom. Indicators such as time in class, reduction in office referrals and suspensions, attendance, and other behavioral data will be collected to indicate progress in this area. Given time, access to first good instruction, and academic supports within the classroom, improvement of math knowledge and skills is expected to increase.

In order to effectively implement the coherent improvement strategies for the Vermont SSIP, the leadership team will need to consider the following:

1.Communication strategies:

Vermont plans to hold face-to-face meetings with its stakeholders at least every 6 months. Other communication will occur over webinars, through newsletters, and surveys will be sent out when specific feedback is needed on a particular issue. Other statewide communication will be delivered via the state's Weekly Field Memo that reaches all audiences including superintendents, principals, curriculum coordinators, special education administrators, and teachers. A listserv to specific groups of teachers can also be accessed at any time. Consideration of a google drive for documents has been discussed.

2.Stakeholder involvement:

The Vermont SSIP stakeholder group includes many and various personnel from around the state. The members involved are from the Department of Mental Health, the Department of Children & Families, the Vermont Council of Special Education Administrators, The Vermont Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health, The Vermont Family Network, the Vermont Center on Disability and Community Inclusion, the Vermont Principals Association, the Vermont Superintendents Association, and Washington County Children, Youth, and Family Services. Other members include both general and special education teachers, special education administrators, psychologists, and math content specialists. It is a dynamic group that has provided much valuable and experiential knowledge to the SSIP leadership team. Stakeholders will continue to be included in the ways mentioned above as the Vermont moves forward with the SSIP goals.

3. Barriers to implementation at the local level (from Phase I):

Each implementation team at each level of the cascading team model will utilize a Plan-Do-Study- Act (PDSA) or similar problem solving cycle for identifying short and long term barriers and engaging in barrier busting activities. Any barriers identified that are not in the immediate control of that team communication and feedback loop will be used in the cascading support model to address the barrier.

4. Who is responsible for implementation at LEA/School level:

The state will continue to work with the leadership team at each school through their MTSS external systems coach in order to provide on-going embedded professional learning in each school.

5. How the short and long term activities will be implemented with fidelity:

Vermont intends to use the Logic Model to develop a long range plan for implementation of the SSIP. It will require the use of a research based approach to systems change to achieve fidelity that includes the plan, do, study and act improvement cycle. This research based systems change methodology is currently required by schools in Vermont that are implementing SWIFT, MTSS and PBIS. The systems change science of the model has also been included in the development of the UDL professional development and follow up support for creating UDL coaches at the local school level. The Agency has not always used this approach to their work and has not yet effectively integrated the work happening in schools for these initiatives. However, the goal of SSIP will be to demonstrate the use of the model from the Agency level through the Supervisory Union down to the individual local schools and into the classroom where students receive their instruction in mathematics.

Achieving the goal above will require some joint professional development for external systems coaches and content specific coaches that will be working with the pilot schools. It will be necessary for all support coaches to model the use of the practice and guide pilot schools with the implementation of the philosophy so that the school culture functions in this way as their common everyday practice. This will be the second order change necessary to achieve so that we can be assured academic and social/behavioral interventions are being moved to a higher level of fidelity over the course of this project.

6. Resources and timelines for completion:

Currently, Vermont has a number of highly qualified SWIFT Coaches, MTSS External Systems Coaches and PBIS Statewide experts who serve as coaches for pilot schools and/or guide the hiring of individuals to fill this role. SWIFT, MTSS and PBIS schools have specific tools to gather information on an established schedule to assess fidelity of practice and implementation impact for the work. The schedules for when schools engage in these activities will need to be decided through the pilot process. This process will determine the frequency of data collection and analysis required to adequately respond to progress monitoring which will guide the continuous improvement planning. Local assessment and other data collected will also need to be aligned with the SWIFT, MTSS and PBIS data to ensure schools are able to reflect on all the system data holistically to guide goal setting for their work. The timeline to dig into this task will be the first year of the pilot.

Based on what is learned through the short term process outlines above, we will create mid and long term implementation and impact targets for the subsequent years of the project.

2(c) Specify how the State will involve multiple offices within the SEA (and other State agencies) to support LEAs in scaling up and sustaining the implementation of the EBPs once they have been implemented with fidelity.

The coming together of multiple offices and agencies both within and outside of the SEA has been most beneficial to the goals of the SSIP. Agencies that have been invited to this work include PBIS, SPDG, SWIFT, MTSS, mental health, the AOE assessment coordinator, data coordinator, representatives from the BEST Institute, Act 230, a higher education collaboration, and several math initiatives across the state. These offices make both unique and common contributions to scale up and sustain implementation of EBPs which has allowed the AOE to consider other resources and areas of support toward the goal of improving math proficiency for students with ED. Objectives and timelines for this work will be monitored through the logic model and evaluation of goals.

Evaluation

(a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP and its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.
(b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
(c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving intended improvements in the SIMR(s).
(d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation; assess the State's progress toward achieving intended improvements; and to make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

3(a) Specify how the evaluation is aligned to the theory of action and other components of the SSIP and the extent to which it includes short-term and long-term objectives to measure implementation of the SSIP. Specify its impact on achieving measurable improvement in SIMR(s) for children and youth with disabilities.

The Vermont AOE has contracted with an outside evaluator to assist with the evaluation of the SSIP through its many stages of development and implementation. A Request for Proposal was posted and the AOE chose the contractor that best matched the criteria of the proposal. Work with the contractor will begin April 22, 2016.

Without the direct assistance of the outside evaluator, the team has developed a draft evaluation plan. The Vermont SSIP Leadership Team will be assisted by the NCSI and IDC TA centers in conjunction with the evaluator through the refinement of the evaluation plan. Further details will be added after the evaluator begins work with the AOE. The work will be divided into three (3) tasks:

1. Meetings and Reporting;
2. Refinement of the Evaluation Plan;
3. Data Collection, Instrumentation, and Analysis

The evaluation plan will include evaluation methods that are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the SSIP goals, objectives, and SIMR. The methods will examine the effectiveness of project implementation strategies, include the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the SIMR and produce quantitative and qualitative data to the extent possible. The methods will be based on the SSIP requirements, provide performance feedback, and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes.

The evaluator will meet with the VT SSIP leadership team to review the VT SSIP Theory of Action and refine a logic model and evaluation questions to guide the development of the evaluation plan. In order to enhance the plan, other AOE staff not currently on the leadership team with expertise in assessment, will be invited to participate. This will include Michael Hock, Testing Director and Glenn Bailey, Assessment Data Manager. The plan will also involve external stakeholders in the analysis of data returned by evaluation activities so that a diverse range of perspectives and viewpoints can inform the actions are taken based on that data. Stakeholders will be critical members of the state's SSIP work moving forward.

After this initial meeting, the evaluation team will incorporate the feedback from the VT SSIP leadership team and refine the plan and timelines for activity completion. This plan will be based on the SSIP Logic Model (attached) and serve as the roadmap throughout the course of the evaluation. It will be reviewed periodically and revised as needed. The resulting evaluation plan will be aligned to the VT SSIP Implementation Framework and other SSIP documents so that the evaluation is an integral part of implementing the SSIP activities.

The evaluation plan below will be refined as needed. Activities, evaluation methods, data collection, and timelines are indicated.

VT SSIP Critical Component: Competency

Increased access to rigorous instructional practice in Mathematics and Behavior for students

with emotional disabilities in grades 3-5 in the model demonstration sites.

Activity to Meet Outcomes	Evaluation Methods/Data Collection	Timelines/Benchmarks

Recruit and train a cadre of State level MTSS Math and Behavior content experts to provide coaching and technical assistance to SU/district/school-based personnel to impact the general math achievement and proficiency for students with emotional disabilities in grades 3-5.	• Training survey administered to participants to assess quality, relevance and usefulness of training and knowledge gained. • Document review/progress checklist to determine whether adequate numbers of cadre members are recruited/trained. • Observation of coaching and technical assistance to assess fidelity of support to cadre across the demonstration sites.	Years 2-3 of SSIP

VT SSIP Critical Component: Organization

With support and technical assistance from the state and local level math and behavior content experts, participating schools will select and begin implementation of the appropriate research-based math and behavioral practices that address the needs of students with emotional disabilities and provide adequate evidence that selected practices address relevant goals.

Data is used with integrity. Consistent expectation that data is collected, analyzed and used to inform instructional and behavioral decisions at all levels, including local mental health agencies, of the organizational structure, SU/SD to school.	Survey/interview with demonstration site staff to address the extent to which data is being used for instructional and behavioral decision making. • Document review/protocol applied to demonstration site team meetings and supporting documents (e.g., data reports generated).	Year 2-5 of SSIP

A majority of the proposed scope of work falls under Task 3. Each of the subcomponents is described below.

Review and develop data collection instruments: The evaluator will work in collaboration with the

VT SSIP Leadership Team to develop data collection instruments needed to document the SSIP implementation toward meeting performance measures as outlined in the evaluation plan, and the extent to which SSIP activities are implemented with fidelity. These measures will be based on the SSIP logic model. All instruments will be carefully selected to ensure they are grounded in research. The evaluator will balance the need for the data with the demands on the participant in order to keep participant burden low. Specific instruments developed may include brief, online surveys prior to (PRE) and/or immediately following (POST) training activities to address satisfaction and initial competency, observation protocols to address fidelity of coaching for math instruction at the demonstration sites, and interviews with key informants to assess the quality of professional development and coaching, as well as challenges and supports to providing effective math instruction and behavioral supports to students at the selected SSIP sites. The evaluator will work with the project staff from the VT SPDG and PBIS initiatives to align efforts and/or share data at the selected sites as appropriate.

Implement data collection: The evaluator will collect data from SSIP staff and participating demonstration sites and ensure accurate and reliable data are collected. The evaluator will review school calendars and current data collection and reporting timelines to avoid undue burden on SSIP project staff and to ensure timely collection of the data for meeting the OSEP reporting requirements.

Analyze & report the data: The evaluator will analyze the data sets that will serve as the basis for regular reports to SSIP staff and to OSEP (e.g., APR). Reports will include data summaries, trends and recommendations for changes or mid-course corrections, if warranted. The data will be displayed in ways that maximize understanding and interpretation by SSIP staff and stakeholders.

3(b) Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.

The original group of stakeholders included an array of personnel from within and outside of the agency. In the initial stages of the development of the SSIP, this group was supportive of the broader plan for improving math learning outcomes for students with ED in grades 3, 4, and 5. Over time, it was decided that a new and more robust group of stakeholders should be involved in refining the plan and aligning their work with the goals of the SSIP would help to drive the plan toward implementation in a more efficient way. This diverse group was convened in March 2016 and expressed a strong commitment and interest in the work. Because the evaluation plan will assess the progress and demonstrate the effectiveness of the coherent improvement strategies, initial evaluation results will be shared with this group. Their input will be critical to the process of strategizing with the SSIP leadership team in support of any mid-course corrections, should they be needed.

It is expected that communication between the stakeholders and the leadership team will occur in various formats to include face-to-face meetings, surveys, and distance meetings. Communication will occur at least quarterly. In the event that more information or input is needed to move to the next step of any process more often than quarterly, stakeholder input will be collected through any of the above mentioned methods within a reasonable time frame.

3(c) Specify the methods that the State will use to collect and analyze data to evaluate implementation and outcomes of the SSIP and the progress toward achieving SIMR(s).

Vermont is recognized as a SWIFT state. We currently have two (2) supervisory unions and 8 schools participating in SWIFT. Our liaison, Michael McSheehan, is part of our stakeholder group and has been instrumental in assisting us with aligning the work of MTSS with SWIFT. That work will allow the SSIP Leadership team to use many of the valid and reliable SWIFT tools for assessing progress of the SSIP work, including universal screeners and other progress monitoring tools. These will be used over the life of the SSIP as support for those schools who do not have tools or other assessment protocols in place. Our work with the evaluator will help to match our logic model with data collection at the local level. At the local level, the evaluation will include a survey to the local implementation team which will include feedback related to the technical assistance they are receiving and questions about the actual work that is happening at the school level. Data will be analyzed by the SSIP leadership team and opportunities for stakeholders will be created to include input into the analysis process.

Because students in the target group are already members of a set criteria described in Phase II Component 2.2(a) above, it is assumed that all students will be receiving similar instruction in content as well as behavioral supports through the existing MTSS/PBIS framework. When data is collected for the targeted population, it is the intention that any improved outcomes would be indicative of all students with access to good first evidence based instruction and coherent improvement strategies. SSIP will focus first on the schools that have these systems of support in place and then scale up to schools that are underperforming in the area of math for students with ED in grades 3, 4, and 5. The SEA will be analyzing the change in student results over time (interim and summative state assessments) and how those results change from year to year.

3(d) Specify how the State will use the evaluation data to examine the effectiveness of the implementation, assess the progress toward achieving intended improvements, and make modifications to the SSIP as necessary.

Data will be reviewed a minimum of 2x per year by the SSIP evaluator in conjunction with the SSIP leadership team. The team will review and adjust implementation and improvement strategies as needed based upon annual data reviews.

Because the SEA is using a menu of options for TA and PD, effectiveness will be measured on a school by school basis. If the TA and/or PD chosen by that school proves to be ineffective, the SEA will suggest other activities from the menu of options based upon measured success in other participating schools.

The state will use the data review, reports from participating schools, stakeholder input and support from Susan Hayes, NCSI, and Susan Davis, IDC, to make modifications as necessary. OSEP will be kept apprised throughout the process for all modifications deemed necessary and appropriate.

Technical Assistance and Support

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include: Infrastructure development; Support for EIS programs and providers implementation of EBP; Evaluation; and Stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Describe the support the State needs to develop and implement an effective SSIP. Areas to consider include:

Infrastructure development; support for LEA implementation of EBPs; evaluation; and stakeholder involvement in Phase II.

Vermont is part of the Math Learning Collaborative. The membership in this group will benefit the Agency in its ability to access the many resources and personnel that will help guide Vermont in its goal to improve math outcomes for students with emotional disabilities. The first gathering of the Collaborative was very informative and helped the Vermont SSIP leadership team make connections with other states who are also focused on improving math outcomes for students with disabilities. Vermont will benefit from more research focused on math teaching strategies that work with elementary age students with ED within an MTSS framework.

Vermont has also had the opportunity to be assisted by Susan Hayes from NCSI and Susan Davis from IDC. These two resources have been most supportive of Vermont's SSIP in providing documents, templates, facilitation of meetings, participating as thought partners, and assisting in moving forward in the development of our Phase II of the SSIP.

Vermont will continue to need this support as implementation of SSIP begins. Data collection will be a major focus and any assistance in that area will be invaluable.

Certify and Submit your SPP/APR

This indicator is not applicable.