

Joint Session Small Group Discussions | 2010

	Challenges	Opportunities
Transition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff Turnover: confusion about roles due to turnover especially in remote and rural areasv • Introduction of new requirements in Transition FAQs • B staff accepting evaluations from Part C program • Timing of sharing information between C & B • Service gap between 3rd birthday and the start of school vv • Parent information being provided to Part B staff without parental consent – concern that school may treat child differently once they get the information that child was served by Part C.vv • Families don't know what expectations are around transition or understanding their rights around the process.v • Transition conferences aren't happening • Limited array of choices are presented to parents at the transition conference v • Least restrictive environment isn't in place – not many options except special education classroom • Head Start will not take children with significant developmental delays or disabilities • Philosophy between B & C is so different it hampers transition efforts • Ending Part C at 3 doesn't make sense • Data Collection and Sharing vvvv • Sustaining institutional changes in practice • Local Agreements with Head Start • Understanding all partners' regulatory requirements • Family-centered transition practices v 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kids used to get dropped but now improved since schools getting the information • Monthly meetings with staff from both B & C – good communication flow between programs • Development of Early Learning Modules with contributions from all players. • Alaska Transition training Initiative – great training resource especially effective for rural areas • Used parent educators in transition • Increased investment in TA, training and grantsv • Local interagency agreements between C and B • Stress process vs. paper • Collaborative training, face-to-face, simultaneous message • Transparent leadership of state offices@ local level • New evidenced-based research and practices • New technologies for training • Transition practices in interagency MOU • Family-centered transition practices and training for families • Align B & C eligibility • Family leadership • Unique child identifier • Parents asked to sign waiver for transition planning conference • Joint training for Part C and Bv • Combined communication • Remove ability for “opt-out”

	Challenges	Opportunities
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local vs State data needs • Not just C>B transition but prenatal to age 6 (mega transition at the local level) • Interpretations of different agencies of recent FAQ • Who is responsible for evaluation of a child between 90 and 45 days prior t child's 3rd birthday? • Clearly defined notification and referral • Medicaid and transition causes problems • What triggers data reporting – day IEP was developed or implemented • Do we include the same children in Indicator 11 and 12? • Building relationships • Special Quest • Time to move process • Part C and B eligibility not aligned vv <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Part B does not qualify based on diagnosed condition • Different interpretations of FAQ information • Terminology • Differences in infrastructure • Families of non-English speaking families fall through the cracks • Payment of providers an issue at transition meeting • Local district autonomy • Caseload sizev • Communication at different levels • Not dealing with root cause 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognition of importance of family outcomes • Unique identifiers •

	Challenges	Opportunities
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tracking children who are not eligible for 619 but show up later in special education • Compliance requirements are not necessarily conducive to supporting strong relationships at the local level • Timeline requirements do not support the notion of “quality” transition planning conference • ED leads do not necessarily mean seamless transition • Agenda for family may be broader than just Part B transition • Challenge of how to decide what services should be provided to the child • Part C needs to be aware of the need for evidence based practices • Getting school involved early enough • If state narrows eligibility what will happen to children who don't get Part C services? • Too tied up with compliance and not getting to quality • FERPA 	
Early Childhood Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very large states and programs may be more challenged in getting all the players to the table. • Collaboration often occurs around one hot topic rather than system issues • New acronyms – “who’s on first?” • Part C costs increasing – Part C pull-out of some collaborative early childhood initiatives • Sharing assessment results for outcomes • Understanding data needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single lead agency contributes to good collaboration • Small number of staff in both programs makes collaboration across programs easier • ICC includes representatives from most or all early childhood stakeholders – promotes collaboration • MI Early Childhood Investment Corporation –

Joint Session Small Group Discussions | 2010

	Challenges	Opportunities
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training for sustainability and implementation • Early learning standards for birth to 3 are limited • Braiding funds across fund sources at the state level • Special Quest • Time to move process • Complicated fractured silo funding v • Flexibility of work hours, school days • Children with disabilities lost in the larger early childhood world vv 	<p>large entity to coordinate early childhood programs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interagency MOU with migrant Head Start • Part C representation on Child Care Advisory Council • Continuity of IDEA and ECAC state staff • Sharing assessment costs • Sharing data with Head Start as needed • Help Me Grow • Local agreements between Part C and Early Head Start • Collaborative training sponsored by DOE/Part B and 619 for birth to 21v • Broad collaboration on training initiatives • Children's cabinet via Governor's office • Infant Mental Health • Relationships – know people for many years, more with child care • ELAC and SICC can align • Integration of EI and child care • CAPTA collaboration • Home Visiting • ECCS Grant • Birth to 5 early childhood center includes all state agencies • Regularly scheduled meetings • Common training vv/vv • ICC birth -5 •