

Vermont Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma compared to percent of all youth in the State graduating with a regular diploma.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 80.62%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 78.20%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 80%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school compared to the percent of all youth in the State dropping out of high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 3.71%. These data represent progress the FFY 2006 data of 3.82%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 3.5%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts that have a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size meeting the State’s AYP objectives for progress for disability subgroup.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>Although the targets are less rigorous than the previous targets, the State explained that it has completed the transition from the New Standards Reference Exam (NSRE) to the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP), and was able to report on the disability subgroup in all grade levels using a unified testing program. For this reason, the prior baseline and targets are no longer consistent with the current assessment data. The new targets do include a final target above the new baseline data. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 14.89%. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage, or whether or not the State met its target, because the FFY 2007 data represent new baseline data for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>Although the targets are less rigorous than the previous targets, the State</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due</p>

Vermont Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>B. Participation rate for children with IEPs in a regular assessment with no accommodations; regular assessment with accommodations; alternate assessment against grade level standards; alternate assessment against alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>explained that it has completed the transition from the New Standards Reference Exam (NSRE) to the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) and was able to report on the disability subgroup in all grade levels using a unified testing program. For this reason, the prior baseline and targets are no longer consistent with the current assessment data. The new targets do include a final target above the new baseline data. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 96.37% for reading and 96.23% for math. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage, or whether or not the State met its target, because the FFY 2007 data represent new baseline data for this indicator.</p>	<p>February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level standards and alternate achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the baseline, targets, and improvement activities for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>Although the targets are less rigorous than the previous targets, the State explained that it has completed the transition from the New Standards Reference Exam (NSRE) to the New England Common Assessment Program (NECAP) and was able to report on the disability subgroup in all grade levels using a unified testing program. For this reason, the prior baseline and targets are no longer consistent with the current assessment data. The new targets do include a final target above the new baseline data. The State indicated that stakeholders were provided an opportunity to comment on the revised targets.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 18.58% for reading and 14.89% for math. OSEP was unable to determine whether there was progress or slippage, or whether or not the State met its target, because the FFY 2007 data represent new baseline data for this indicator.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>A. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 1.67%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>OSEP's June 6, 2008 FFY 2006 SPP/APR response table required the State to include in the FFY 2007 APR, due February 2, 2009, the results of the State's examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008) and</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p> <p>As noted in the revised Part B Indicator Measurement Table, in reporting on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must again</p>

Vermont Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps															
<p>children with disabilities for greater than 10 days in a school year; and</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>describe the review, and if appropriate, revision, of policies, procedures and practices relating to the development and implementation of IEPs, the use of positive behavioral interventions and supports, and procedural safeguards to ensure compliance with the IDEA for the LEAs identified with significant discrepancies in FFY 2005 and FFY 2006, as required by 34 CFR §300.170(b). The State provided the requested information. The State did not identify any noncompliance as a result of this review.</p>	<p>describe the results of the State’s examination of data from FFY 2007 (2007-2008).</p>															
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>B. Percent of districts identified by the State as having a significant discrepancy in the rates of suspensions and expulsions of greater than 10 days in a school year of children with disabilities by race and ethnicity.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>															
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21:</p> <p>A. Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day;</p> <p>B. Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day; or</p> <p>C. Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="541 951 1383 1406"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>FFY 2006 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Data</th> <th>FFY 2007 Target</th> <th>Progress</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.</td> <td align="center">71.15</td> <td align="center">69.95</td> <td align="center">78.5</td> <td align="center">-1.20%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.</td> <td align="center">10.14</td> <td align="center">9.47</td> <td align="center">7.5</td> <td align="center">0.67%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress	A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	71.15	69.95	78.5	-1.20%	B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	10.14	9.47	7.5	0.67%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2007 Data	FFY 2007 Target	Progress													
A. % Removed from regular class less than 21% of the day.	71.15	69.95	78.5	-1.20%													
B. % Removed from regular class greater than 60% of the day.	10.14	9.47	7.5	0.67%													

Vermont Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps												
	C. % Served in public or private separate schools, residential placements, or homebound or hospital placements.	6.35	6.48	4.0	-0.13%												
<p>6. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who received special education and related services in settings with typically developing peers (i.e., early childhood settings, home, and part-time early childhood/part-time early childhood special education settings).</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>These data represent progress for 5B and slippage for 5A and 5C from the FFY 2006 data.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>States were not required to report on this indicator for FFY 2007.</p>				<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>												
<p>7. Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);</p> <p>B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and</p> <p>C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported progress data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="541 1105 1409 1481"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="541 1105 968 1279">07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data</th> <th data-bbox="974 1105 1125 1279">Social Emotional</th> <th data-bbox="1131 1105 1266 1279">Knowledge & Skills</th> <th data-bbox="1272 1105 1409 1279">Appropriate Behavior</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="541 1284 968 1349">a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.</td> <td data-bbox="974 1284 1125 1349">4.23</td> <td data-bbox="1131 1284 1266 1349">4.41</td> <td data-bbox="1272 1284 1409 1349">4.59</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="541 1354 968 1481">b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.</td> <td data-bbox="974 1354 1125 1481">4.23</td> <td data-bbox="1131 1354 1266 1481">5.11</td> <td data-bbox="1272 1354 1409 1481">4.76</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior	a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	4.23	4.41	4.59	b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	4.23	5.11	4.76	<p>The State reported the required progress data and improvement activities. The State must provide baseline data, targets and improvement activities with the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
07-08 Preschool Outcome Progress Data	Social Emotional	Knowledge & Skills	Appropriate Behavior														
a. % of preschoolers who did not improve functioning.	4.23	4.41	4.59														
b. % of preschoolers who improved but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers.	4.23	5.11	4.76														

Vermont Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
[Results Indicator]	c. % of preschoolers who improved to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it.	41.80	40.39	32.27	
	d. % of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers.	36.16	40.74	38.10	
	e. % of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers.	13.58	9.35	20.28	
	Total (approx. 100%)	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	
<p>8. 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.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 34.13%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 34.02%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 32.12%.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>9. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported the actual number of districts determined in FFY 2007 to have disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 0%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having disproportionate representation of racial or ethnic groups in specific</p>				<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

Vermont Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>identification. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>disability categories based on the State's calculation of the data.</p>	
<p>11. Percent of children with parental consent to evaluate, who were evaluated within 60 days (or State-established timeline). [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 90.84%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 81.78%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2006, the State reported that it made no FFY 2006 findings of noncompliance related to this indicator. The State reported that, starting in FFY 2006, the State changed its monitoring system from an on-site monitoring review to a desk review compliance monitoring process. Prior to FFY 2006, the State conducted monitoring visits to selected LEAs and made findings of noncompliance during the same FFY as the monitoring visit. Accordingly, findings based on FFY 2005 data were made in FFY 2005, and the State reported their timely correction in the FFY 2006 APR, submitted on February 1st, 2008.</p> <p>The State also reported that one consequence of the desk review compliance monitoring process is that the State does not and will not receive any data for Indicator 11 for the monitoring year until the following year. The State reported that it received FFY 2006 data for Indicator 11 in the fall of 2007 and completed its analysis of the data in January 2008. The State made 17 written findings of noncompliance for this indicator based on FFY 2006 data in April and May 2008. As a result, the findings made in April and May 2008 are considered findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2007.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that the State is in compliance with the timely initial evaluations requirements in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(10).</p> <p>The State must demonstrate in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has completed the initial evaluation, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008 (OSEP Memo 09-02).</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>12. 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. [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 99.27%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 97.33%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2006, the State reported that it made no FFY 2006 findings of noncompliance related to this indicator.</p> <p>The State reported that it conducted a statewide information collection for every LEA in the State for this indicator. The State reported that it</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b).</p> <p>The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has</p>

Vermont Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
	<p>received the FFY 2006 data for Indicator 12 in the fall of 2007 and completed its analysis of the data in January 2008. The State made four written findings of noncompliance for this indicator based on FFY 2006 data in April and May 2008. These findings are considered findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2007.</p>	<p>verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed and implemented the IEP, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>If the State is unable to demonstrate compliance in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary to ensure compliance.</p>
<p>13. Percent of youth aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes coordinated, measurable, annual IEP goals and transition services that will reasonably enable the student to meet the postsecondary goals.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 54.08%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 34.54%.</p> <p>The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>Although the State reported less than 100% compliance for this indicator for FFY 2006, the State reported that it made no FFY 2006 findings of noncompliance related to this indicator. The State reported that, starting in FFY 2006, the State changed its monitoring system from an on-site monitoring review to a desk review compliance monitoring process. Prior to FFY 2006, the State conducted monitoring visits to selected LEAs and made findings of noncompliance during the same FFY as the monitoring visit. Accordingly, findings based on FFY 2005 data were made in FFY 2005, and the State reported their timely correction in the FFY 2006 APR, submitted on February 1st, 2008.</p> <p>The State also reported that the State does not and will not receive any data for Indicator 13 for the monitoring year until the following year. The State reported that it received FFY 2006 data for Indicator 13 in the fall of 2007 and completed its analysis of the data in January 2008. The State made 17 written findings of noncompliance for this indicator based on FFY 2006 data in April and May 2008. These findings made in April are considered findings of noncompliance made in FFY 2007.</p>	<p>Although the State is not required to report data for this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, the State must report on the timely correction of the noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR.</p> <p>The State reported that it made findings of noncompliance in April and May 2008 based on FFY 2006 data for this indicator. The State must report, in its FFY 2008 APR due February 1, 2010, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance reported by the State under this indicator in the FFY 2007 APR: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements; and (2) has developed an IEP that includes the required transition content for youth, unless the youth is no longer within the jurisdiction of the LEA, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p>

Vermont Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>14. Percent of youth who had IEPs, are no longer in secondary school and who have been competitively employed, enrolled in some type of postsecondary school, or both, within one year of leaving high school.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 87.36%. The State did not meet its FFY 2007 target of 88%.</p> <p>The State reported that the data for this indicator were collected from a response group that was not representative of the population. The State provided strategies to address this issue. The State noted that "to increase the representativeness of the respondent population in future years, these data suggest that an increased focus on students who drop out of school will be necessary. To help increase the response rates for students who drop out of school, efforts to increase the validity of contact information received for students by the Department will continue."</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>15. General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2006 data of 96.72%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 35 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 were corrected in a timely manner. The State noted that none of the findings were related to SPP priority monitoring areas, but included findings related to SPP non-priority monitoring areas and dispute resolution findings.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in timely correcting noncompliance identified under this indicator in accordance with 20 U.S.C. 1232d(b)(3)(E) and 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600 and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>However, although the State's FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%, and the State's FFY 2006 data for this indicator are 96.72%, OSEP is concerned about the delay between the collection of data and the determination of noncompliance, and the subsequent delay in making findings of noncompliance related to Part B under Indicators 11, 12, and 13.</p> <p>Pursuant to 34 CFR §300.149, the State must ensure that each educational program for children with disabilities administered within the State meets the requirements of Part B of IDEA. In order to comply with this requirement, as part of its general supervision responsibilities, the State must make findings of noncompliance in a</p>

Vermont Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP’s Frequently Asked Questions Regarding Identification and Correction of Noncompliance and Reporting on Correction in the SPP and APR, dated September 3, 2008, states in response to Question 7 that “[w]ritten notification of findings needs to occur as soon as possible after the State concludes that the LEA . . . has noncompliance. Generally, we would expect that written findings be issued less than three months after discovery.”</p> <p>In the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must provide information demonstrating that it makes findings of noncompliance in a timely manner.</p> <p>In reporting on correction of noncompliance, the State must report that it has: (1) corrected all instances of noncompliance (including noncompliance identified through the State’s monitoring system, through the State’s data system and by the Department); and (2) ensured that each LEA with identified noncompliance is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>In addition, in responding to Indicators 11, 12, and 13 in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010, the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator</p>

Vermont Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		15 Worksheet.
<p>16. Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>
<p>17. Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data are based on one due process hearing. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2006 data of 100%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the due process hearing timeline requirements in 34 CFR §300.515.</p>
<p>18. Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 33.3%. The State reported that two of six resolution sessions resulted in settlement agreements.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2007. The State is not required to provide targets or improvement activities until any FFY in which ten or more resolution sessions were held.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State’s data in the FFY 2008 APR, due February 1, 2010.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 88.89%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2006 data of 90.91%.</p> <p>The State met its FFY 2007 target of 73%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2007 reported data for this indicator are 100%. OSEP notes that the State reported data for the submission of timely and</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts in achieving compliance with the timely and</p>

Vermont Part B FFY 2007 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>accurate 618 data does not match what was reported by the Data Accountability Center (DAC). This can be attributed to the State’s small “n” size suppression policy, which has resulted in data considered by DAC to be incomplete. However, this policy has been the subject of discussions between the State and the U.S. Department of Education. Because this issue remains unresolved, OSEP is accepting the State reported data for FFY 2007 as complete.</p>	<p>accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b).</p> <p>In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2008 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.</p>