

INDICATORS B12 & C8

EARLY CHILDHOOD
TRANSITION

AGENDA

- Overview of early childhood issues identified in Part C
- Overview of early childhood issues identified in Part B
- What OSEP wants to know
- Technical Assistance Information

PART C INDICATOR 8

- 23 of 57 States/territories reported issues with early childhood transition
- Of the 23 – most showed progress overall
- Of the 23 – most had only partial correction of noncompliance
- A few States did not make findings and progress was not able to be determined
- There was more information for 8C

PART B INDICATOR 12

- 23 States/territories had issues with this indicator that factored in their determination status
- 14 States reported progress, 5 reported slippage, 3 were not able to compare data, and 1 was not able to report on this indicator

PROGRESS – PART C

- Preparing families ahead of time
- IFSPs online, can't finish entry without including transition steps
- Collaborative relationships among EI, HS and LEA
- Training on meaningful and timely transition conferences
- Training on timely and appropriate service coordination
- Ongoing guidance
- New staff required orientation include transition requirements

PROGRESS - PART B

- Data system now captures data needed for APR measurement
- SEA schedules monthly targeted TA to LEAs
- Staff development
- Additional funds to conduct preschool assessments (implying that there are more evaluators and assessments more timely)

SLIPPAGE- PART C

- Scheduling difficulties including limited days offered by LEA and coordinating of schedules among all involved
- Refusals and hesitation by families
- Late referrals
- Family cancel or no show because reasons other than family circumstances
- Staff changes and lack of training or awareness of previous guidance
- Lack of oversight
- If child remain through school year, waiting on notification and conference
- Cancel conference if Part B unable to attend and not rescheduling

SLIPPAGE – PART B

- Incorrect data reporting (LEA level)
- Availability of evaluation staff during entire calendar year (e.g.; school year differs)
- Lack of communication with Part C to schedule transition conferences
- LEAs not adhering to policies and procedures
- Scheduling conflicts
- Evaluations extended beyond the third birthday (why?)
- Late referrals to Part C

ACTIVITIES- PART C

- Corrective Action or IA Plans
- Quarterly or monthly internal data audits, reporting, status checks, feedback on use of database to identify and address NC
- Guidance and TA including some targeted TA including joint guidance doc. With SEA for 8C and policy memos
- Follow up monitoring (focused, intensive)
- Changes such as restructure staff, replace administrators at local level or contract with new provider agency and limited sanctions

ACTIVITIES – PART B

- Develop Technical Assistance (TA) and corrective action plans
- Targeted TA
- On-site TA or intensive monitoring activities
- Review LEA policies, practices and procedures

OSEP'S REVIEW RESULTS

- Low compliance data (below 95%)
- States did not report noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 was corrected in a timely manner
- Data were not valid and/or reliable
- Program-specific corrective activities were not identified

WHAT OSEP WANTS TO KNOW

- Was progress a result of improvement and/or enforcement activities and/or other factors?
- Can the State be more specific in reporting slippage?
- Is slippage attributed to just 1 or 2 programs or LEAs and if so why? Are there Statewide issues that can be analyzed?

WHAT OSEP WANTS TO KNOW

- Are the IAs, enforcement activities based on the reasons for slippage or progress?
- How does the State use data reviews to identify noncompliance for these indicators?
- Is correction just completing activities? Or is the State able to measure correction by the data?

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

DETERMINATION LETTERS TO STATES
INCLUDES TA WEBSITE

- rrfcnetwork.org

Who to contact for further information

- kimberly.mitchell@ed.gov
- virginia.sheppard@ed.gov
- nancy.treusch@ed.gov