

VT Part B

FFY2016 State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

58

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 Special Education Team provides technical assistance and support to schools, and carries out state and federal requirements for special education, assessment, and other direct support services.

Integrated Support for Learning: The Special Education Team focuses on building supervisory union/regional capacity for federal programs and state regulatory implementation, internal monitoring expertise, and problem solving to ensure sustained compliance. As part of the Special Education Team, AOE Special Education Program Coordinators serve as members of the Monitoring Team, interfacing with school administration to strengthen the effectiveness of preventive efforts, action planning and remediation. They also provide technical assistance for parents and professional learning.

Compliance Monitoring: Through document desk reviews, telephone interviews and school visits, the Monitoring Team reviews ten supervisory unions (SU) for special education compliance each year. Based on 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 in combination with 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 Special Education Monitoring Team is part of the WestEd Results Based Accountability Collaborative, working to move from compliance based focused monitoring to results driven accountability. The Special Education Program Manager is lead on developing the results based focused monitoring plan. Focused monitoring will employ a participatory evaluation model designed to increase data utilization and self-monitoring capacity in districts. The newly developed focused monitoring plan will be piloted in 2018 with at least one supervisory union/district, and rolled out in subsequent years.

To date, the Monitoring Team has developed a logic model, theory of change, draft monitoring plan, and initiated front-loading of professional development at the Agency and in selected supervisory unions/districts. In 2018, the monitoring team will work with stakeholders and the pilot supervisory union(s)/district(s) to finalize the monitoring plan, including the identifying selection criteria using a risk analysis model, plan the frequency of focused monitoring, finalize the structure of focused monitoring events, reporting, and follow up.

Corrective action plans resulting from 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.

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 mutually 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 Development Grant (SPDG). The State of Vermont was granted a five year SPDG in 2013. The projects delineated in that 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 th 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. Project components continue to leverage e Vermont Higher Education Collaborative, 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. This was funded through SPDG and is not continuing in 2018.

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. The State also receives monthly technical assistance from OSEP representative Marion Crayton.

In accordance with the State's determination Vermont sought TA center support both generally and on a few specific topics. To correct for Vermont not meeting valid and reliable in indicators 3 the Vermont Special Ed team and assessment team worked with the vendor to understand what data is available we learned they have data which tells them which students were set up in the system with accommodations. The group also learned from the Smarter Balanced Consortium that these data are what other consortium states have been submitting. That is the accommodation data that was submitted for 2017 and will be submitted going forward.

The Early Learning team has been working with Technical Assistance support and a Cohort group since its inception. In the spring of 2017 the cohort work was winding down. There was a request for more support in the spring to keep support active from TA centers specifically, DASYS and ECTA. That request was accepted and they have been working with our Early Learning team intensely since. There are monthly calls to support the work and keep the timeline for work moving forward. As a team, including a software vendor, DASYS/ECTA facilitated conversations around getting the programming clarified to match the expectations of data input and outcome output. As a group we worked together to problem solve any possible solutions from data entry to outcome measure reporting. From these meetings we set up plans to execute and correct for the coming years of data collection.

The team did a pre/post assessment to dictate the best approach to TA support and showed growth from the pre-assessment to the post-assessment. One of the important deliverables from this work was Early Childhood Outcome Practice and Procedures Manual to support quality data collection and reporting.

With the support and work from the TA centers the team identified and implemented technical changes to the data collection tool. This was done to facilitate better data submission ability for the field and data quality checks inside the data collection tool. As a result of this work Vermont received a valid and reliable score for Indicator 7 in FFY2016. As a team Vermont continues to utilize their support, expertise, and extensive resources in their work. Vermont also hired a new data manager as the one who was working on the data for the past 10 years retired. Since that transition the data manager has sought TA support with regularity. The current running TA support is involvement in monthly SEDMAG calls, bi-weekly data manager mentoring calls, attendance at the IDC Interactive Institute in February 2018, monthly calls to TA Susan Davis, and scheduled IDC meetings to begin mapping the States data processing toolkit.

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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 Superintendents Association, the Vermont Higher Education Collaborative 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.

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)
- 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 and The Center on Disability and Community Inclusion at the University of Vermont

The Agency of Education continues to solicit input and feedback from various stakeholders in the education community. Final copies of the 2016 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 2015 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 2015 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 2015 APR in 2017, is available.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Public reporting of the performance of SUs in relation to state SPP targets took place after this APR was submitted on February 1, 2017. In January 2018, we discovered that the APR was not on the VTAOE website. During the period prior to June 1, 2017, VTAOE was transitioning to a new website; in the course of that effort, many documents were moved and removed. It is likely that the APR was posted on time and later inadvertently removed. Reposting was completed on January 23, 2018, which was as soon as was possible following discovery of the omission. These reports 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/data-and-reporting/school-reports/special-education-reports>.

Attachments

File Name	Uploaded By	Uploaded Date
No APR attachments found.		

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

OSEP Response

States were instructed to submit Phase III Year Two of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP) by April 2, 2018. The State provided the required information.

In the FFY 2017 APR, the State must report FFY data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SIMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 2, 2018); and (3) a summary of the infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SIMR.

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 1: Graduation**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator:

Percent of youth with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) graduating from high school with a regular high school 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	2014
Target ≥			80.00%	80.00%		72.00%	86.00%	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%	70.26%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	86.00%
Data	79.85%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	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 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	Number of youth with IEPs graduating with a regular diploma	728	798
SY 2015-16 Cohorts for Regulatory Adjusted-Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C151; Data group 696)	10/12/2017	Number of youth with IEPs eligible to graduate	1,009	988
SY 2015-16 Regulatory Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate (EDFacts file spec C150; Data group 695)	10/12/2017	2014-15 Regulatory four-year adjusted-cohort graduation rate table	72.15%	Calculate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Explanation of Alternate Data

Vermont reports 4, 5 and 6 year graduation rate cohorts. The counts entered above are for the cohort with the highest graduation rate. The table below shows this information for the cohorts which ending in the 2015-2016 school year.

4 Year Cohort

Graduate Count Adjusted Cohort Count Graduation Rate
728 1009 72.15%

5 Year Cohort

Graduate Count Adjusted Cohort Count Graduation Rate
806 1018 79.17%

6 Year Cohort

Graduate Count Adjusted Cohort Count Graduation Rate
798 988 80.77%

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
 FFY 2016 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 2015 Data	FFY 2016 Target	FFY 2016 Data
798	988	79.85%	86.00%	80.77%

Graduation Conditions

Choose the length of Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate your state is using: Extended ACGR

Provide the number of years

Provide a narrative that describes the conditions youth must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma and, if different, the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet in order to graduate with a regular high school diploma. If there is a difference, explain.

Vermont provides guidance to LEAs in developing local graduation requirements. The information below is extracted from Section 2120.7 of the Education Quality Standards, which deals with Graduation Requirements:

A student meets the requirements for graduation when the student demonstrates evidence of proficiency in the curriculum outlined in 2120.5, and completion of any other requirements specified by the local board of the school attended by the student.

For students eligible for special education services under IDEA or protected by Section 504 of the federal Rehabilitation Act, the student shall meet the same graduation requirements as nondisabled peers in an accommodated and/or modified manner. These modifications will be documented in each student's Personalized Learning Plan.

Are the conditions that youth with IEPs must meet to graduate with a regular high school diploma different from the conditions noted above? No

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target ≤			4.00%	3.50%		3.25%	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%	3.36%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	3.25%
Data	3.45%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	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.

Please indicate whether you are reporting using Option 1 or Option 2.

- Option 1
- Option 2

Has your State made or proposes to make changes to the data source under Option 2 when compared to the information reported in its FFY 2010 SPP/APR submitted on February 1, 2012? No

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
82	4,520	3.45%	3.25%	1.81%

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 6-21) 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.

Provide a narrative that describes what counts as dropping out for all youth.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Vermont defines a drop out as follows:

Students who were enrolled at the start of the reporting period, were not enrolled at the end of the reporting period, and did not exit special education through any of the other exit reasons. This includes dropouts, runaways, expulsions, status unknown, and students who moved and are not known to be continuing in another educational program. Include students with 10 consecutive days of unexcused absences.

Is there a difference in what counts as dropping out for youth with IEPs? No

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level 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	2014
Reading	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			98.50%			99.00%	99.25%	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%	95.25%
Math	A Overall	2005	Target ≥			96.70%			99.00%	99.25%	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%	94.40%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	99.25%
		Data	96.07%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	99.25%
		Data	96.22%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

	FFY	2016	2017	2018
Reading	A ≥ Overall	99.25%	99.25%	99.25%
Math	A ≥ Overall	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, were 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.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C188; Data Group: 589) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Reading assessment participation data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	986	952	1047	1104	1069	1017	n	n	800	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	584	529	628	555	542	508			478		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	304	337	308	439	425	415			192		
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Reading assessment participation data by grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	66	67	81	77	56	53			43		

Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C185; Data Group: 588) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Math assessment participation data by grade

Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs	986	953	1046	1104	1069	1017	n	n	798	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations	696	521	538	555	552	524			496		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations	192	349	400	441	407	399			163		
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards	67	64	81	77	58	53			42		

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Reading Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	6,975	6,687	96.07%	99.25%	95.87%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data: Math Assessment

Group Name	Number of Children with IEPs	Number of Children with IEPs Participating	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	6,973	6,675	96.22%	99.25%	95.73%

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?%2FPublic%2FSmarter+Balanced+Assessment+by+Grade+Report>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Here is a link to a report of number of children that participated in regular assessment as well as the special education children that participated: <http://edw.vermont.gov/ReportServer/Pages/ReportViewer.aspx?%2FPublic%2FParticipation%20Report>

Regarding the accommodation disaggregation, we have a plan to post a report with our other special education data. We have built a plan to work with our data, FERPA suppression rules, the statute above, and IDC TA center to build this report by the end of the year.

The link renders best with Internet Explorer.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2015. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2016 in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 OSEP response

Vermont was cited by OSEP for non-compliance in our State Determination for not reporting students receiving accommodations on SBAC Assessment. After working with our vendor to understand what data is available we learned they have data which tells them which students were set up in the system

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

with accommodations. We also learned from the Smarter Balanced Consortium that these data are what other consortium states have been submitting. That is the accommodation data that was submitted for 2017 and will be submitted going forward.

OSEP Response

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the participation of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported the number of children with disabilities participating in regular assessments, and the number of those children who were provided accommodations (that did not result in an invalid score) in order to participate in those assessments at the State, district and school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.

Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2018 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2016, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2017.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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. Indicator 3A -- Reserved
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level 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	2014
Reading	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			27.00%			27.00%	27.00%	28.00%	28.00%	28.00%	12.13%
			Data		17.81%	21.41%	18.58%	25.65%	26.62%	21.91%	24.70%	23.83%	22.97%	12.13%
Math	A Overall	2014	Target ≥			20.00%			24.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	25.00%	7.21%
			Data		19.10%	21.80%	14.89%	22.39%	22.60%	17.46%	18.37%	17.68%	17.14%	7.21%

	Group Name	FFY	2015
Reading	A Overall	Target ≥	12.13%
		Data	14.16%
Math	A Overall	Target ≥	7.21%
		Data	9.25%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

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, were 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.

Would you like to use the assessment data below to automatically calculate the actual data reported in your FFY 2013 APR by the grade groups you provided on the Reporting Group Selection page? yes

Would you like the disaggregated data to be displayed in your final APR? yes

Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Reading (EDFacts file spec C178; Data Group: 584) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	954	933	1017	1071	1023	976	n	n	713	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	77	62	88	73	62	57			60		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	30	23	35	33	30	27			15		

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Reading proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	39	45	44	44	19	18			9		

Data Source: SY 2016-17 Assessment Data Groups - Math (EDFacts file spec C175; Data Group: 583) **Date:** 12/14/2017

Math proficiency data by grade											
Grade	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	HS
a. Children with IEPs who received a valid score and a proficiency was assigned	955	934	1019	1073	1017	976	n	n	701	n	n
b. IEPs in regular assessment with no accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	106	88	60	43	36	34			9		
c. IEPs in regular assessment with accommodations scored at or above proficient against grade level	23	21	18	18	16	6			n		
d. IEPs in alternate assessment against grade-level standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
e. IEPs in alternate assessment against modified standards scored at or above proficient against grade level											
f. IEPs in alternate assessment against alternate standards scored at or above proficient against grade level	15	19	16	17	5	11			5		

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	6,687	890	14.16%	12.15%	13.31%

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A Overall	6,675	568	9.25%	7.25%	8.51%

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?%2fPublic%2fSmarter+Balanced+Assessment+by+Grade+Report>

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

The data and link for the alternate assessment results are currently be loaded to Vermont's Assessment reporting portal. This work is expected to be done by May 7th, 2018. The link to the alternative assessment results data is here: <http://education.vermont.gov/data-and-reporting/educational-performance> under "Historical NECAP, DLM and VTAAP Assessment Reports".

The links render best with Internet Explorer.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2015. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2016 in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 OSEP response

Vermont was cited by OSEP for non-compliance in our State Determination for not reporting students receiving accommodations on SBAC Assessment. After working with our vendor to understand what data is available we learned they have data which tells them which students were set up in the system with accommodations. We also learned from the Smarter Balanced Consortium that these data are what other consortium states have been submitting. That is the accommodation data that was submitted for 2017 and will be submitted going forward.

OSEP Response

The State did not provide a Web link demonstrating that the State reported publicly on the performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments with the same frequency and in the same detail as it reports on the assessments of nondisabled children, as required by 34 CFR §300.160(f). Specifically, the State has not reported, compared with the achievement of all children, including children with disabilities, alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards, at the State, district and or school levels. The failure to publicly report as required under 34 CFR §300.160(f) is noncompliance.

Required Actions

Within 90 days of the receipt of the State's 2018 determination letter, the State must provide to OSEP a Web link that demonstrates that it has reported, for FFY 2016, to the public, on the statewide assessments of children with disabilities in accordance with 34 CFR §300.160(f). In addition, OSEP reminds the State that in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must include a Web link that demonstrates compliance with 34 CFR §300.160(f) for FFY 2017.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target ≤			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		1.67%	1.67%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015
Target ≤	0%
Data	0%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≤	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, were 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 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

Number of districts that have a significant discrepancy	Number of districts in the State	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	58	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 2015-2016" (Table 5, in Section A, Column 3B), submitted to OSEP on November 1, 2016. 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, 2016. Additional information on these reports may be found at ideadata.org.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

During the 2015 - 2016 school year, only 5 of Vermont's then 58 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 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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 2015

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

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data						0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	58	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.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

FFY 2015 Identification of Noncompliance

Review of Policies, Procedures, and Practices (completed in FFY 2016 using 2015-2016 data)

Provide a description of the review of policies, procedures, and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards.

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 2015

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

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
A	2005	Target ≥			78.00%	78.50%	78.50%	79.00%	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%	74.93%
B	2005	Target ≤			8.00%	7.50%	7.50%	7.00%	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%	6.29%
C	2005	Target ≤			4.04%	4.00%	4.00%	3.85%	3.75%	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%	5.77%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	79.00%
	Data	75.76%
B	Target ≤	7.00%
	Data	5.72%
C	Target ≤	3.75%
	Data	5.94%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	79.00%	79.00%	79.00%
Target B ≤	7.00%	7.00%	7.00%
Target C ≤	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, were 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 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	12,477	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	9,579	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	643	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c1. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in separate schools	606	null

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Source	Date	Description	Data	Overwrite Data
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c2. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in residential facilities	138	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C002; Data group 74)	7/13/2017	c3. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 in homebound/hospital placements	11	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

	Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served	Total number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
A. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	9,579	12,477	75.76%	79.00%	76.77%
B. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	643	12,477	5.72%	7.00%	5.15%
C. Number of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements [c1+c2+c3]	755	12,477	5.94%	3.75%	6.05%

Reasons for C Slippage

A combination of 34 more students "... with IEPs aged 6 through 21 inside separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements" and 348 more students "With IEPs aged 6 through 21" resulted in a 0.11% increase.

(Changes by category: c1 + 31, c2 + 3, c3 0, for a net gain of 34 students in these categories.)

We are seeing an increase in emotionally disturbed students exhibiting the most severe behaviors. These students require change of placements into separate schools and residential facilities, accounting for increases in those placement categories.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 6: Preschool Environments**

Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE

Results indicator: Percent of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5 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	2014
A	2011	Target ≥									71.78%	71.78%	71.78%
		Data								71.58%	73.68%	76.17%	76.58%
B	2011	Target ≤									6.19%	6.19%	6.19%
		Data								6.39%	4.81%	2.19%	2.53%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	71.78%
	Data	76.44%
B	Target ≤	6.19%
	Data	1.80%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target A ≥	71.78%	71.78%	71.78%
Target B ≤	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, were 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 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	Total number of children with IEPs aged 3 through 5	1,893	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	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	1,435	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b1. Number of children attending separate special education class	16	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b2. Number of children attending separate school	n	null
SY 2016-17 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups (EDFacts file spec C089; Data group 613)	7/13/2017	b3. Number of children attending residential facility	n	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

10/17/2018	Number of children with IEPs	Total number of children with IEPs	FFY 2015	FFY 2016	FFY 2016
------------	------------------------------	------------------------------------	----------	----------	----------

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

	aged 3 through 5 attending	aged 3 through 5	Data*	Target*	Data
A. A regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program	1,435	1,893	76.44%	71.78%	75.81%
B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility	19	1,893	1.80%	6.19%	1.00%

Use a different calculation methodology

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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))

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Historical Data

	Baseline Year	FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
A1	2014	Target ≥						92.88%	92.88%	92.88%	92.88%	92.88%	86.63%
		Data					92.38%	89.91%	89.90%	91.14%	87.52%	89.13%	86.63%
A2	2014	Target ≥						53.34%	53.34%	53.34%	53.34%	53.34%	40.91%
		Data					52.84%	48.75%	52.30%	48.50%	48.80%	68.00%	40.91%
B1	2014	Target ≥						91.21%	91.21%	91.21%	91.21%	91.21%	87.30%
		Data					90.71%	89.32%	91.10%	92.69%	86.16%	90.68%	87.30%
B2	2014	Target ≥						50.03%	50.30%	50.03%	50.03%	50.03%	32.49%
		Data					49.53%	46.36%	49.80%	48.20%	39.60%	56.00%	32.49%
C1	2014	Target ≥						93.27%	93.27%	93.27%	93.27%	93.27%	86.00%
		Data					92.77%	91.30%	92.20%	90.55%	87.83%	91.46%	86.00%
C2	2014	Target ≥						61.23%	61.23%	61.23%	61.23%	61.23%	54.71%
		Data					60.73%	58.31%	62.50%	59.43%	56.75%	64.00%	54.71%

	FFY	2015
A1	Target ≥	86.63%
	Data	85.17%
A2	Target ≥	40.91%
	Data	51.06%
B1	Target ≥	87.30%
	Data	84.44%
B2	Target ≥	32.49%
	Data	39.44%
C1	Target ≥	86.00%
	Data	79.27%
C2	Target ≥	54.71%
	Data	61.27%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

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, were 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 2016 SPP/APR Data

Number of preschool children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs assessed	96.00
--	-------

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)

	Number of Children	Percentage 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	14.00	14.58%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	16.00	16.67%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	30.00	31.25%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	36.00	37.50%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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)	46.00	60.00	85.17%	86.63%	76.67%
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)	66.00	96.00	51.06%	40.91%	68.75%

Reasons for A1 Slippage

The total number of exits is not what we expected for the year. Please see the required actions section to understand how we will be addressing this.

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

	Number of Children	Percentage 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	18.00	18.75%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	22.00	22.92%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	53.00	55.21%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	3.00	3.13%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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)	75.00	93.00	84.44%	87.30%	80.65%
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)	56.00	96.00	39.44%	32.49%	58.33%

Reasons for B1 Slippage

The total number of exits is not what we expected for the year. Please see the required actions section to understand how we will be addressing this.

Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs

	Number of Children	Percentage 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	12.00	12.50%
c. Preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	11.00	11.46%
d. Preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	25.00	26.04%
e. Preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	48.00	50.00%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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)	36.00	48.00	79.27%	86.00%	75.00%
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)	73.00	96.00	61.27%	54.71%	76.04%

Reasons for C1 Slippage

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The total number of exits is not what we expected for the year. Please see the required actions section to understand how we will be addressing this.

Does the State include in the numerator and denominator only children who received special education and related services for at least six months during the age span of three through five years? Yes

Was sampling used? No

Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary (COS) process? Yes

List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.

ECO entry, exit and progress data is determined and collected by school district IEP teams through the IEP process. In 2013, AOE began to implement the use of the integrated ECO IEP.

Instruments used to gather ECO entry, exit and progress data is a local IEP decision, however Teaching Strategies Gold is the state approved universal PreK progress monitoring assessment that is required two times per year. ECO data is collected via Child Count data collection two times per year.

VT's ECO Practice and Procedures Manual provides step guidance for IEP teams to make determinations and reporting.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

The State did not provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2015. The State must provide valid and reliable data for FFY 2016 in the FFY 2016 SPP/APR.

Responses to actions required in FFY 2015 OSEP response

In FFY2015, there was a bug in the reporting mechanism. The error checking script had an incorrect data range for EEE ECSE (Early Childhood Special Education) entry. The AOE identified this bug and made technical corrections to the ECO data collection tool to ensure identified errors would allow the field to load reliable and complete ECO data for FFY 2016.

In FFY 2016, we had fewer students than previous years entered for outcomes data. The AOE is looking into the reason for this change. The AOE is making technical optimizations to the data collection tool to prompt administrators--through both soft and critical errors--to enter outcome data for EEE ECSE students before completing the data submission process.

In conjunction with this technical optimization, AOE worked with our student system vendors to better align with Vermont's final data collection tool. Vermont made it a priority to systemically approach how to obtain complete and accurate ECO data. Over the past two years the AOE Early Learning team worked with two national TA centers, the Early Childhood Technical Assistance Center (ECTA) and the Center for IDEA Early Childhood Data Systems (DaSy) to produce comprehensive guidelines for generating, analyzing and reporting the required outcome data for 3-5 year old children who receive special education services. As a result of this technical assistance [Vermont's Early Childhood Outcomes Practice and Procedures Manual](#) was developed and disseminated to the field. In 2017, with the assistance of ECTA and DaSy the AOE conducted 5 day long early childhood outcome "data days" for early childhood special educators and administrators across the state to share the new guidelines and support these educators in improving this data collection. The result of this work will be improved reliable and valid ECO data about the progress of 3-5 year olds who receive special education and related services.

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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? No

Historical Data

Baseline Data: 2005

FFY	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Target ≥			30.12%	32.12%	34.12%	36.12%	38.12%	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%	37.04%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	38.12%
Data	36.08%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	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, were 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 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
423.00	1151.00	36.08%	38.12%	36.75%

The number of parents to whom the surveys were distributed.	8.32%	13842.00
---	-------	----------

The percentage shown is the number of respondent parents divided by the number of parents to whom the survey was distributed.

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: 600/550 51%/62% (SE of the mean = 2.7%)
 Number of Valid Responses: 135 Measurement reliability: 0.88-0.94
 Mean Measure: 620 Measurement SD 146

PART B Grades K - 12

Percent at or above: 600/550 34%/44% (SE of the mean = 1.0%)
 Number of Valid Responses: 1,016 Measurement reliability: 0.92-0.95
 Mean Measure: 550 Measurement SD 155

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Percent at or above: 600/550 36%/46% (SE of the mean = 0.6%)

Number of Valid Responses: 1,151 Measurement reliability: 0.91-0.95

Mean Measure: 558 Measurement SD 156

The demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services. Yes

Include the State's analyses of the extent to which the demographics of the parents responding are representative of the demographics of children receiving special education services.

To determine if the parents who responded to this survey were representative of the children receiving special education services, the **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 4.18%.

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**	77	6.69%	1043	7.53%	-0.84%
White	1074	93.31%	12800	92.47%	0.84%
Totals	1151	100.00%	13843	100.00%	0.00%
Disability					
Autism Spectrum Disorder	118	10.25%	1031	7.45%	2.80%
Developmental Delay	239	20.76%	2541	18.36%	2.41%
Emotional Disturbance	152	13.21%	2040	14.74%	-1.53%
Intellectual Disability	45	3.91%	661	4.77%	-0.87%
Multiple Disabilities	22	1.91%	232	1.68%	0.24%
Other Health Impairment	204	17.72%	2355	17.01%	0.71%
Specific Learning Disability	296	25.72%	3832	27.68%	-1.97%
Speech or Language Impairment	62	5.39%	1000	7.22%	-1.84%
All Other Disabilities***	13	1.13%	151	1.09%	0.04%
Totals	1151	100.00%	13843	100.00%	0.00%
Gender					
Female	398	34.58%	4773	34.48%	0.10%
Male	753	65.42%	9070	65.52%	-0.10%
Totals	1151	100.00%	13843	100.00%	0.00%
Age					
3 to 5	182	15.81%	1610	11.63%	4.18%
6 to 11	451	39.18%	5664	40.92%	-1.73%
12 to 17	472	41.01%	5938	42.90%	-1.89%
18 to 21	46	4.00%	631	4.56%	-0.56%
Totals	1151	100.00%	13843	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, Hard of Hearing & Hearing Loss, Orthopedic Impairment, Traumatic Brain Injury and Visual Impairment.

Was sampling used? No

Was a survey used? Yes

Is it a new or revised survey? No

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

Indicator 9: Disproportionate Representation

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
9	0	58	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

Define “disproportionate representation.” Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

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.

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]:

- The LEA-level risk of a particular racial/ethnic group of students receiving special education services for a specific disability; and
- 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.
- When a weighted risk ratio is not appropriate because there are fewer than 11 students in the comparison group, Alternate Risk Ratios was first used in Vermont 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.
10/17/2018 Page 30 of 60

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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^[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.IDEData.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.IDEData.org.

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate representation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services was the result of inappropriate identification.

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 Special Education Monitoring Team (AOE), were completed:

Activities:

9.1 Letters from the Vermont Agency of Education General Supervision and Monitoring Team were sent to the nine (9) LEAs alerting them that their submitted Child Count data indicated suspected disproportionate underrepresentation within their special education population.

9.2 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.

9.2.1 Review of LEA Student Files: A sampling of files for possible students impacted by this indicator were reviewed by the AOE in order to verify if inappropriate identification was occurring. Upon review of evaluations that were conducted within these nine (9) LEAs, AOE 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.

9.2.2 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. Nine of the LEAs had policies that reflected the use of reliable and valid diagnostic assessments, and 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 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.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

OSEP Response

Required Actions

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Indicator 10: Disproportionate Representation in Specific Disability Categories

Monitoring Priority: Disproportionate Representation

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	2014
Target			0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Data		0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	

FFY	2015
Target	0%
Data	0%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	0%	0%	0%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

Has the State Established a minimum n-size requirement? Yes No

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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	58	0%	0%	0%

Were all races and ethnicities included in the review? Yes No

Please specify in your definition: 1) the calculation method(s) being used (i.e., risk ratio, weighted risk ratio, e-formula, etc.); and 2) the threshold at which disproportionate representation is identified. Also include, as appropriate, 3) the number of years of data used in the calculation; and 4) any minimum cell and/or n-sizes (i.e., risk numerator and/or risk denominator).

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.

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]:

- The LEA-level risk of a particular racial/ethnic group of students receiving special education services for a specific disability; and
- 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.
- When a weighted risk ratio is not appropriate because there are fewer than 11 students in the comparison group, Alternate Risk Ratios was first used in Vermont 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 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.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

Actual Target Data for FFY 2016:

0% or 0 of 58 LEAs were determined to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories resulting from inappropriate identification. Target met.

No LEAs were identified from their submitted Child Count data as having disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups within a specific disability category within their special education population. Therefore, no LEAs were determined to have disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups receiving special education services for a specific disability resulting from an inappropriate identification. No LEAs were excluded from analysis of race/ethnicity categories.

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

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

Describe how the State made its annual determination as to whether the disproportionate overrepresentation it identified of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories was the result of inappropriate identification.

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Vermont is going to work with IDC on May 30-31, 2018 to formalize our process for Indicator 10. In this process formalization we intend to clarify the data used and the narrative we use to report Indicator 10.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target			100%	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%	98.48%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	97.89%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
177	173	97.89%	100%	97.74%

Number of children included in (a), but not included in (b) [a-b]	4
---	---

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.

Four students did not have an initial evaluation that was completed within 60 days of date consent for the evaluation was received by the LEA. Three of these evaluations ranged from 1 to 7 days and were due to 1) a clerical error by the special education case manager that resulted in a lapse of 1 day; 2) two instances where the parents asked for a delay in the eligibility decision meeting but the request was not documented using the appropriate state form and 3) a delay of 41 days due to an interruption in availability of the student (summer vacation) that was also not documented by use of the appropriate state form. In the case of the last three examples, appropriate use of the state form for evaluation delays (parent or child centered reasons for delays) may have resulted in no findings of non-compliance.

The Vermont AOE is aware, based upon the submission of the LEA, that all four evaluations, although late, have been completed.

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 information submitted in this report marks the seventh submission from LEAs under the system devised by the Vermont Agency of Education General Supervision and Monitoring (AOE GSM) team with assistance from the OSEP verification team.

Previously, LEAs were asked to submit school-year referral and evaluation information at the end of each school year. This former process did not draw the attention of LEA staff to timeline deficiencies until well after the defined due dates. The new submission process, at least three times per year beginning each November, and again in February and April, heightens the awareness of LEA staff to the timeline 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. In FFY 2016 this compliance percentage for the 10 LEAs sampled slipped slightly by 0.15% from the FFY

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

2015 percentage but still represents a figure 13.28% above that seen in the last year of the old reporting system in FFY 2009. Nine LEAs in this submission were 100% in compliance with this indicator and the lone percentage of the remaining LEA was 74.43% (10 of 14 evaluations).

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
5	5	0	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

To measure the 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)) we collect data through the state data system at 3-4 points in the year. The four points in the year are Nov, Feb, Apr, and June if necessary. This data collection structure allows us the opportunity to closely monitor compliance of the IEPs created throughout the school year. If IEPs are turned in out-of-compliance at any of the 4 data collection points we notify the LEA in writing of the issue(s). Subsequent to an LEA's non-compliance, we verify in the following submissions that non-compliant behaviors are not repeated.

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

For each of the 5 cases of non-compliance, we used the 3-4 points of data collection to verify that non-compliance action was corrected in the following submissions. The specific reasons for going beyond 60 day window for evaluations and reparative actions that occurred were the following:

- Lack of report from outside evaluator was explained to the LEA that turned in this paperwork and that IEP was corrected in the subsequent submissions from that specific LEA. (1 incidence)
- Miscalculations of 60 days were explained clearly to the LEAs, and the state monitoring team verified that the subsequent IEPs sent by these LEAs used the correct calculation of 60 days. (3 incidence)
- Started in June, near the end of school, but did not finish until school started back up in September without proper documentation. The state monitoring team educated that LEA of the correct paperwork to use for this kind of delay and subsequently monitors submissions for this LEA accounts for end of school year delays with the correct paperwork. (1 incidence)

We believe these reasons are not systemic and have be corrected for each offending LEA for going forward with focused reminders regarding rules and documentation procedures.

FFY 2014 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

OSEP Response

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that the remaining three uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 and each LEA with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2014: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction. If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

Required Actions

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data		86.44%	97.33%	99.27%	98.80%	99.70%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	100%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

a. Number of children who have been served in Part C and referred to Part B for Part B eligibility determination.	61
b. Number of those referred determined to be NOT eligible and whose eligibility was determined prior to their third birthdays.	3
c. Number of those found eligible who have an IEP developed and implemented by their third birthdays.	51
d. Number of children 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 determined to be eligible for early intervention services under Part C less than 90 days before their third birthdays.	7
f. Number of children whose parents chose to continue early intervention services beyond the child's third birthday through a State's policy under 34 CFR §303.211 or a similar State option.	0

	Numerator (c)	Denominator (a-b-d-e-f)	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 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. $[c/(a-b-d-e-f)] \times 100$	51	51	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, or f	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.

Notification letters were sent to the nine LEAs slated for FFY 2016 Compliance Monitoring which for this indicator involves the LEA completion of an AOE-developed spreadsheet. The AOE requested from each LEA the child's name, date birth, the date of referral to Part B, date of the transition meeting, as well as the date an IEP was developed and the date of parental consent for the provision of the IEP services, to be submitted at three time periods over the course of the school year. These submissions were due specifically on November 1, 2016, February 1, 2017 and April 1, 2017.

As we have seen for several years now (since FY 2010), the percentage of children referred to Part B from Part C, despite some referrals from Part C being considered late in the process, were 100% compliant with having an IEP in place by the child's third birthday.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

The range of days was 0 beyond the third birthday because we had no children that fell into this category.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

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

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target			100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data						22.60%	55.44%	94.44%	57.75%	74.04%	74.34%

FFY	2015
Target	100%
Data	91.49%

Key: Gray – Data Prior to Baseline Yellow – Baseline

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target	100%	100%	100%

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
103	117	91.49%	100%	88.03%

Reasons for Slippage

This year's sampling of secondary transition plans from 10 supervisory unions included one supervisory union that does not operate a public high school but has an independent high school to which the majority of the high school students from that supervisory union attend. It was highly apparent from their first submission (7 of 9 plans did not meet the target of 100% compliance, or 50%, 7 of the 14 secondary transition plans identified as not 100% compliant in this year's review) that the special education staff at the independent high school required targeted technical assistance for this indicator area. With the assistance of the Director of Special Education Services for the supervisory union, AOE staff provided an unprecedented online webinar for the independent high school special education staff regarding secondary transition plan requirements. As a result of this effort, for the two submission periods following the webinar, this training resulted in 8 out of 8 plans submitted to be 100% in compliance with secondary transition plan requirements.

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 nine LEAs slated for FFY 2016 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, 2016, February 1, 2017 and April 1, 2017. Non-compliance identified in any of these submission periods is reported to the LEA and corrections are submitted in the following submission period to assure that all instances of non-compliance have been corrected. A final submission date of June 1, 2017 was required of LEAs that had not submitted 10 fully compliant transition plans through the April submission date or had any correction of non-compliance that needed to be submitted from their April submission.

As of June 1, 2017 all instances of non-compliance were subsequently corrected by the LEA and no remaining compliance issues remained for for FFY 2016. The final percentage of IEPs that contained 100% compliant postsecondary transition plans was 88.03%, down slightly from the previous submission (91.49%) 10/17/2018

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

for FFY 2015. The itemized compliance, according to the 24 point checklist developed by NSTTAC and used by VTAOE to assess compliance for the 117 secondary transition plans submitted, was 2754 out of a possible 2808 items for a compliance percentage of 98.08%, down slightly from FFY 2015's percentage of 98.92%. Again, as mentioned in the slippage portion of this report, the supervisory union that does not operate a public high school had the greatest impact on this percentage. Of the 54 instances where AOE staff identified noncompliance with the NSTTAC checklist, 35 (64.81%) were from the early submissions of the independent high school within this supervisory union.

Do the State's policies and procedures provide that public agencies must meet these requirements at an age younger than 16?

Yes No

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

Note: Any actions required in last year's response table that are related to correction of findings should be responded to on the "Correction of Previous Findings of Noncompliance" page of this indicator. If your State's only actions required in last year's response are related to findings of noncompliance, a text field will not be displayed on this page.

Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2015

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
8	8	0	0

FFY 2015 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

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

To measure the percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals--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 (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B)) we collect data through the state data system at 3-4 points in the year. The four points in the year are Nov, Feb, Apr, and June if necessary. This data collection procedure allows us the opportunity to closely monitor compliance of the IEPs created throughout the school year, and ask for resubmission when non-compliant. If secondary plans are turned in out-of-compliance at any of the 4 data collection points we notify the LEA in writing of the issue(s). Subsequent to an LEA's non-compliance, we ask them to resubmit that specific plan. Before the data collections start, Vermont hosts a webinar in September to help LEAs understand the NSTTAC checklist. Points of non-compliance of the previous year drive the subject matter highlighted in the webinar.

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

For each of the 8 cases of non-compliance, we used the 3-4 points of data collection to verify that non-compliance action was corrected in following submissions. Rarely do we find a systemic issue within the LEA to be the cause for non-compliance, but rather a failure of the IEP case manager to adhere to the NSTTAC checklist guidelines in documenting the 24 compliance areas correctly.

The specific reasons for the 8 cases of non-compliance and reparative actions that occurred were the following:

- It was not documented why an outside agency was not invited to IEP meeting (2 incidences). Identified the issue to the LEAs in writing, and they subsequently corrected the issue in their subsequent re-submission to the VT-AOE.
- Assessment did not identify a specific vocational interest - too vague (2 incidences). Identified the issue to the LEAs in writing, and they subsequently corrected the issue in their subsequent re-submission to the VT-AOE.
- Post-Secondary goal is for current state rather than after graduation (Post-Secondary aspiration reflected current not future) (2 incidences). Identified the issue to the LEAs in writing, and they subsequently corrected the issue in their subsequent re-submission to the VT-AOE.
- Goals did not include criteria to determine successful completion (1 incidence). Identified the issue to the LEAs in writing, and they subsequently corrected the issue in their subsequent re-submission to the VT-AOE.
- Post-Secondary goal is for current state for independent living, not future aspiration (1 incidence). Identified the issue to the LEAs in writing, and they subsequently corrected the issue in their subsequent re-submission to the VT-AOE.

We believe these reasons are not systemic and can be corrected for going forward with reminders of how to approach the detailed checklist.

FFY 2014 Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected

OSEP Response

The State did not demonstrate that the LEA corrected the findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 because it did not report that it verified correction of those findings, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. Specifically, the State did not report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2015: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2016, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the 8 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2015 and the remaining 39 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2014 were corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each LEA with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016, FFY 2015, and FFY 2014: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016, although its FFY 2016 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2016.

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
A	2009	Target ≥							24.25%	24.25%	24.25%	24.25%	24.25%
		Data						24.22%	16.36%	17.56%	15.34%	50.38%	48.89%
B	2009	Target ≥							56.50%	56.50%	56.50%	56.50%	56.50%
		Data						56.40%	48.33%	48.29%	47.72%	70.61%	62.22%
C	2009	Target ≥							72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%	72.00%
		Data						71.97%	57.25%	65.85%	59.66%	77.48%	73.33%

	FFY	2015
A	Target ≥	24.25%
	Data	38.79%
B	Target ≥	56.50%
	Data	69.63%
C	Target ≥	72.00%
	Data	80.84%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

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

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, were 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 2016 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	108.00
1. Number of respondent youth who enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school	24.00
2. Number of respondent youth who competitively employed within one year of leaving high school	46.00
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)	5.00
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).	5.00

	Number of respondent youth	Number of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
--	----------------------------	--	----------------	------------------	---------------

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

		had IEPs in effect at the time they left school			
A. Enrolled in higher education (1)	24.00	108.00	38.79%	24.25%	22.22%
B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school (1 +2)	70.00	108.00	69.63%	56.50%	64.81%
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)	80.00	108.00	80.84%	72.00%	74.07%

Please select the reporting option your State is using:

- Option 1: Use the same definition as used to report in the FFY 2015 SPP/APR, i.e., competitive employment means that youth have worked for pay at or above the minimum wage in a setting with others who are nondisabled for a period of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This includes military employment.
- Option 2: Report in alignment with the term "competitive integrated employment" and its definition, in section 7(5) of the Rehabilitation Act, as amended by Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), and 34 CFR §361.5(c)(9). For the purpose of defining the rate of compensation for students working on a "part-time basis" under this category, OSEP maintains the standard of 20 hours a week for at least 90 days at any time in the year since leaving high school. This definition applies to military employment.

Reasons for A Slippage

In years past we have supplemented our low response rate for enrolled in higher education with National Student Clearinghouse data. We did not have access to that data in time to calculate to supplement this year.

Was a survey used? No

Was sampling used? No

Are the response data representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school? Yes

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Vermont attempted to contact ALL students who left special education for the reported timeframe. The size of this group rarely goes over 1,000 students, so we try to collect every response we can.

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

In its description of its FFY 2016 data, the State did not address whether the response group was representative of demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect in effect at the time they left school. OSEP notes that the State did not describe the strategies to address this issue in the future.

Required Actions

In the FFY 2017 SPP/APR, the State must report whether the FFY 2017 data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and, if not, the actions the State is taking to address this issue. The State must also include its analysis of the extent to which the response data are representative of the demographics of youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school.

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target ≥			56.00%	57.00%	58.00%	59.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%	60.00%
Data		55.00%	25.00%	33.33%	83.33%	66.67%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	60.00%
Data	100%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	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, were 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 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	n	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section C: Due Process Complaints	11/1/2017	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	n	null

FFY 2016 SPP/APR Data

3.1(a) Number resolution sessions resolved through settlement agreements	3.1 Number of resolution sessions	FFY 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
0	0	100%	60.00%	0%

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2016. The State is not required to meet its targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.

--

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2014
Target ≥			70.00%	73.00%	76.00%	79.00%	82.00%	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%	83.33%

FFY	2015
Target ≥	82.00%
Data	70.00%

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

FFY 2016 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2016	2017	2018
Target ≥	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, were 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 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	6	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	27	null
SY 2016-17 EMAPS IDEA Part B Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/1/2017	2.1 Mediations held	36	null

FFY 2016 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 2015 Data*	FFY 2016 Target*	FFY 2016 Data
6	27	36	70.00%	82.00%	91.67%

Actions required in FFY 2015 response

none

OSEP Response

--

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
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	2015	2016
Target ≥		17.00%	6.70%	6.70%
Data	18.00%	6.70%	14.29%	13.04%

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

FFY 2017 - FFY 2018 Targets

FFY	2017	2018
Target ≥	7.20%	7.70%

Key:

Description of Measure

SEE ATTACHED

Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

SEE ATTACHED

Overview

SEE ATTACHED

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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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)

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 of 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 al, 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;

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

• 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.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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.

Submitted Theory of Action: No Theory of Action Submitted

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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

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, *Special 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

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):

High Quality Academic Instruction

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.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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

- 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.
- Specify how the evaluation includes stakeholders and how information from the evaluation will be disseminated to stakeholders.
- 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).
- 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.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

with emotional disabilities in grades 3-5.

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.	<p>Survey/interview with demonstration site staff to address the extent to which data is being used for instructional and behavioral decision making.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

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 intended improvements in the 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.

Phase III submissions should include:

- Data-based justifications for any changes in implementation activities.
- Data to support that the State is on the right path, if no adjustments are being proposed.
- Descriptions of how stakeholders have been involved, including in decision-making.

A. Summary of Phase 3

1. Theory of action or logic model for the SSIP, including the SIMR.
2. The coherent improvement strategies or principle activities employed during the year, including infrastructure improvement strategies.
3. The specific evidence-based practices that have been implemented to date.
4. Brief overview of the year's evaluation activities, measures, and outcomes.
5. Highlights of changes to implementation and improvement strategies.

FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)

See Attached Documents

B. Progress in Implementing the SSIP

1. Description of the State's SSIP implementation progress: (a) Description of extent to which the State has carried out its planned activities with fidelity—what has been accomplished, what milestones have been met, and whether the intended timeline has been followed and (b) Intended outputs that have been accomplished as a result of the implementation activities.
2. Stakeholder involvement in SSIP implementation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing implementation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing implementation of the SSIP.

See Attached Documents

C. Data on Implementation and Outcomes

1. How the State monitored and measured outputs to assess the effectiveness of the implementation plan: (a) How evaluation measures align with the theory of action, (b) Data sources for each key measure, (c) Description of baseline data for key measures, (d) Data collection procedures and associated timelines, (e) [If applicable] Sampling procedures, (f) [If appropriate] Planned data comparisons, and (g) How data management and data analysis procedures allow for assessment of progress toward achieving intended improvements
2. How the State has demonstrated progress and made modifications to the SSIP as necessary: (a) How the State has reviewed key data that provide evidence regarding progress toward achieving intended improvements to infrastructure and the SiMR, (b) Evidence of change to baseline data for key measures, (c) How data support changes that have been made to implementation and improvement strategies, (d) How data are informing next steps in the SSIP implementation, and (e) How data support planned modifications to intended outcomes (including the SiMR)—rationale or justification for the changes or how data support that the SSIP is on the right path
3. Stakeholder involvement in the SSIP evaluation: (a) How stakeholders have been informed of the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP and (b) How stakeholders have had a voice and been involved in decision-making regarding the ongoing evaluation of the SSIP

See Attached Documents

D. Data Quality Issues: Data limitations that affected reports of progress in implementing the SSIP and achieving the SiMR

1. Concern or limitations related to the quality or quantity of the data used to report progress or results
2. Implications for assessing progress or results
3. Plans for improving data quality

See Attached Documents

E. Progress Toward Achieving Intended Improvements

1. Infrastructure changes that support SSIP initiatives, including how system changes support achievement of the SiMR, sustainability, and scale-up
2. Evidence that SSIP's evidence-based practices are being carried out with fidelity and having the desired effects
3. Outcomes regarding progress toward short-term and long-term objectives that are necessary steps toward achieving the SiMR
4. Measurable improvements in the SiMR in relation to targets

See Attached Documents

F. Plans for Next Year

1. Additional activities to be implemented next year, with timeline
2. Planned evaluation activities including data collection, measures, and expected outcomes
3. Anticipated barriers and steps to address those barriers
4. The State describes any needs for additional support and/or technical assistance

See Attached Documents

OSEP Response

Required Actions

**FFY 2016 Part B State Performance Plan (SPP)/Annual Performance Report (APR)
Certify and Submit your SPP/APR**

I certify that I am the Chief State School Officer of the State, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

Selected: Designated by the Chief State School Officer to certify

Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part B State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.

Name: Cindy Moran

Title: State Director of Special Education

Email: cindy.moran@vermont.gov

Phone: 802-479-1432