

**Vermont Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
<p>1. Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 71.53%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 68.85%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 86%.</p> <p>The State reported the required graduation rate calculation and timeline established by the Department under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This means that the State submitted the most recent graduation data that the State reported to the Department as part of its Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR).</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR, due February 1, 2013.</p> <p>In reporting data for this indicator in the FFY 2011 APR, States must use the same data they used for reporting to the Department under Title I of the ESEA, using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the ESEA.</p>
<p>2. Percent of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 3.15%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 3.61%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 3.25%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: A. Percent of the districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State's minimum "n" size that meet the State's AYP targets for the disability subgroup. [Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 18%.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments: B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 98.18% for reading and 97.70% for math. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 97.68% for reading and 96.95% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 99.25%.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>

**Vermont Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
[Results Indicator]		
<p>3. Participation and performance of children with disabilities on statewide assessments:</p> <p>C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 21.91% for reading and 17.46% for math. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 26.62% for reading and 22.62% for math. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 targets of 27% for reading and 25% for math.</p> <p>The State provided a Web link to 2010 publicly-reported assessment results.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State’s data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that it does not use a minimum “n” size requirement.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts to improve performance.</p>
<p>4. Rates of suspension and expulsion:</p> <p>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</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported its definition of “significant discrepancy.”</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified as having a significant discrepancy, by race or ethnicity, in the rate of suspensions and expulsions of greater than ten days in a school year for children with IEPs.</p> <p>The State reported that 27 of 60 LEAs did not meet the State-established minimum “n” size of four or more long-term suspensions and expulsions for one or more race or ethnicities.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

**Vermont Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps																				
procedural safeguards. [Compliance Indicator]																						
<p>5. Percent of children with IEPs aged 6 through 21 served:</p> <p>A. Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day;</p> <p>B. Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day; or</p> <p>C. In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="552 431 1583 906"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day</td> <td align="center">72.21</td> <td align="center">74.01</td> <td align="center">79</td> <td align="center">1.80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day</td> <td align="center">8.14</td> <td align="center">7.14</td> <td align="center">7</td> <td align="center">1.00%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements</td> <td align="center">6.28</td> <td align="center">6.14</td> <td align="center">3.75</td> <td align="center">0.14%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet any of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	72.21	74.01	79	1.80%	B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8.14	7.14	7	1.00%	C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	6.28	6.14	3.75	0.14%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>																		
A. % Inside the regular class 80% or more of the day	72.21	74.01	79	1.80%																		
B. % Inside the regular class less than 40% of the day	8.14	7.14	7	1.00%																		
C. % In separate schools, residential facilities, or homebound/hospital placements	6.28	6.14	3.75	0.14%																		
<p>6. Percent of children aged 3 through 5 with IEPs attending a:</p> <p>A. Regular early childhood program and receiving the majority of special education and related services in the regular early childhood program; and</p> <p>B. Separate special education class, separate school or residential facility.</p> <p>[Results Indicator; New]</p>	<p>The State is not required to report on this indicator in the FFY 2010 APR.</p>	<p>The State must provide FFY 2011 baseline data, an FFY 2012 target, and improvement activities through FFY 2012 in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>																				
<p>7. Percent of preschool children age 3 through 5 with IEPs who</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating</p>																				

Vermont Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues				OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
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. [Results Indicator]	<b><u>Summary Statement 1</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>	improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.  The State must report progress data and actual target data for FFY 2011 with the FFY 2011 APR.
	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	89.91	89.8	92.88	
	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	89.32	91.1	91.21	
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	91.30	92.2	93.27	
	<b><u>Summary Statement 2</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></b>	<b><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></b>	
	<b>Outcome A:</b> Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships) (%)	48.57	52.5	53.34	
	<b>Outcome B:</b> Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication) (%)	46.36	49.8	50.03	
	<b>Outcome C:</b> Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs (%)	58.31	62.5	61.23	
	These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data. The State met part of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.				
	8. Percent of parents with a child receiving special education services who report that schools facilitated	The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 37.04%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 34.56%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 38.12%.			

**Vermont Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>parent involvement as a means of improving services and results for children with disabilities.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the State addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p>	<p>the FFY 2011 APR.</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 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that five districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services. The State also reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services that was the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>OSEP notes that the State included five references to specific disability categories in its description, on pages 62-63 of the FFY 2010 APR, of the method it used to calculate disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services.</p> <p>The State reported that no LEAs were excluded due to Vermont’s minimum “n” size of more than 10 students receiving special education services in any race/ethnicity category.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p> <p>In order to ensure accurate public reporting of its FFY 2010 APR, as required in 34 CFR §§300.601(b) (1) and 300.602(b)(1)(i)(B), the State must delete all references to specific disability category in its description of the method it used to calculate disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in special education and related services and post the revised FFY 2010 APR on the SEA’s Web site.</p>
<p>10. Percent of districts with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories that is the result of inappropriate identification.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 0%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 0%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 0%.</p> <p>The State reported that no districts were identified with disproportionate representation of racial and ethnic groups in specific disability categories.</p> <p>The State provided its definition of “disproportionate representation.”</p> <p>The State reported that no LEAs were excluded because they did not meet Vermont’s minimum “n” size of more than 10 students receiving special education services for a specific disability in any race/ethnicity category.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts regarding this indicator.</p>

**Vermont Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>11. 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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State revised the improvement activities for FFY 2011 for this indicator and OSEP accepts those revisions.</p> <p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 91.83%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 84.46%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 85 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>The State reported that all 610 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 based on FFY 2008 data for this indicator were corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that all 535 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 based on FFY 2007 data for this indicator were corrected.</p> <p>The State reported that all 785 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 based on FFY 2006 data for this indicator were corrected.</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State is in compliance with the timely initial evaluation requirement in 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p> <p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.301(c)(1) (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 completed the evaluation, although late, for any child whose initial evaluation was not timely, 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). In the FFY 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p>

**Vermont Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.
<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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 100%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 99.7%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that the one finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator was corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP's FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, required the State to clarify whether each of the six LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (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. The State did not provide the required information.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the early childhood transition requirements in 34 CFR §300.124(b).</p> <p>The State must clarify in the FFY 2011 APR whether each of the six LEAs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 is correctly implementing 34 CFR §300.124(b) (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.</p>
<p>13. 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.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 57%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 22.6%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that all 13 of its findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 for this indicator were corrected in a timely manner.</p> <p>OSEP's FFY 2009 SPP/APR Response Table, dated June 20, 2011, required the State to: (1) demonstrate that the remaining 13 uncorrected findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 based on FFY 2006 data were corrected; and (2) report that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2007 based on FFY 2006 data is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data</p>	<p>The State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2011 APR, that the State is in compliance with the secondary transition requirements in 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b). Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2010, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator.</p>

**Vermont Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>															
<p>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.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system.</p> <p>The State provided the required information. The State reported that all 13 remaining instances of noncompliance based on FFY 2006 data and all 17 remaining instances of noncompliance based on FFY 2007 data for this indicator were corrected. The State reported that each LEA with noncompliance was correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (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.</p>	<p>When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in its FFY 2011 APR, that it has verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing 34 CFR §§300.320(b) and 300.321(b) (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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary.</p>															
<p>14. Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:</p> <p>A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school;</p> <p>B. Enrolled in higher education or</p>	<p>The State's reported data for this indicator are:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1268 1583 1502"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><u>FFY 2009 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Data</u></th> <th><u>FFY 2010 Target</u></th> <th><u>Progress</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. % Enrolled in higher education</td> <td align="center">24.22</td> <td align="center">16.36</td> <td align="center">24.25</td> <td align="center">-7.86%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. % Enrolled in higher education or</td> <td align="center">56.40</td> <td align="center">48.33</td> <td align="center">56.50</td> <td align="center">-8.07%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>	A. % Enrolled in higher education	24.22	16.36	24.25	-7.86%	B. % Enrolled in higher education or	56.40	48.33	56.50	-8.07%	<p>OSEP looks forward to the State's data demonstrating improvement in performance in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
	<u>FFY 2009 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Data</u>	<u>FFY 2010 Target</u>	<u>Progress</u>													
A. % Enrolled in higher education	24.22	16.36	24.25	-7.86%													
B. % Enrolled in higher education or	56.40	48.33	56.50	-8.07%													

**Vermont Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues					OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
<p>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.                      [Results Indicator]</p>	competitively employed					
	C. % Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed	71.97	57.25	72	-14.72%	
<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.                      [Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data. The State did not meet any of its FFY 2010 targets for this indicator.</p> <p>In its description of its FFY 2010 data, the addressed whether the response group was representative of the population.</p> <p>The State’s FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 94.74%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 36.3%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>The State reported that 126 of 133 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2009 were corrected in a timely manner and that the seven remaining findings were subsequently corrected by February 1, 2012.</p> <p>The State reported that the remaining 114 findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2008 and the remaining findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2006 and FFY 2007 related to Indicators 11 and 13 were corrected.</p> <p>OSEP notes that the State reported on page 108 of the State’s APR that it “identified 133 findings of noncompliance in FFY 2009 and all 133 findings of noncompliance were corrected within one year of identification. Target Met”. That statement is incorrect. Based on the information provided in the Indicator 15 worksheet, the State reported that 126 of 133 findings of noncompliance were corrected in a timely manner and the State’s FFY 2010 reported data are 94.74%.</p>					<p>OSEP appreciates the State’s efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State’s data demonstrating that the State timely corrected noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 in accordance with 20 U.S.C 1232d(b)(3)(E), 34 CFR §§300.149 and 300.600(e), and OSEP Memo 09-02.</p> <p>When reporting in the FFY 2011 APR on the correction of findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2010 July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011), the State must report that it verified that each LEA with noncompliance identified in FFY 2010: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data</p>

**Vermont Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

Monitoring Priorities and Indicators	Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues	OSEP Analysis/Next Steps
		<p>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 2011 APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.</p> <p>In addition, in reporting on Indicator 15 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 15 Worksheet</p> <p>Further, in responding to Indicators 11 and 13 in the FFY 2011 APR the State must report on correction of the noncompliance described in this table under those indicators.</p>
<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, or because the parent (or individual or organization) and the public agency agree to extend the time to engage in mediation or other alternative means of dispute resolution, if available in the State.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 100%. These data remain unchanged from the FFY 2009 data of 100%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts in achieving compliance with the timely complaint resolution requirements in 34 CFR §300.152.</p>

**Vermont Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
[Compliance Indicator]		
<p>17. Percent of adjudicated due process hearing requests that were adjudicated within the 45-day timeline or a timeline that is properly extended by the hearing officer at the request of either party or in the case of an expedited hearing, within the required timelines.</p> <p>[Compliance Indicator]</p>	<p>The State reported, as of January 31, 2012, that it did not have any fully adjudicated due process hearings during the reporting period.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's FFY 2011 IDEA section 618 data.</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 reported, as of January 31, 2012, the one resolution session resulted in settlement agreement.</p> <p>The State reported fewer than ten resolution sessions held in FFY 2010. The State is not required to meet its targets or provide improvement activities in any fiscal year in which fewer than ten resolution sessions were held.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>19. Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.</p> <p>[Results Indicator]</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator, as of January 31, 2012, are 86.4%. These data represent slippage from the FFY 2009 data of 87.5%. The State met its FFY 2010 target of 82%.</p> <p>Note that States are allowed to amend their FFY 2010 IDEA section 618 Dispute Resolution data until July 2012.</p>	<p>OSEP looks forward to reviewing the State's data in the FFY 2011 APR.</p>
<p>20. State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.</p>	<p>The State's FFY 2010 reported data for this indicator are 97.73%. These data represent progress from the FFY 2009 data of 97.37%. The State did not meet its FFY 2010 target of 100%.</p>	<p>OSEP appreciates the State's efforts and looks forward to reviewing in the FFY 2011 APR, the State's data demonstrating that it is in compliance with the</p>

**Vermont Part B FFY 2010 SPP/APR Response Table**

<b>Monitoring Priorities and Indicators</b>	<b>Status of APR Data/SPP Revision Issues</b>	<b>OSEP Analysis/Next Steps</b>
[Compliance Indicator]		timely and accurate data reporting requirements in IDEA sections 616 and 618 and 34 CFR §§76.720 and 300.601(b). If the State does not report 100% compliance in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must review its improvement activities and revise them, if necessary. In reporting on Indicator 20 in the FFY 2011 APR, the State must use the Indicator 20 Data Rubric.