

SPP Summary – Indicator C-10
Timeliness in the Completion of Complaint Investigations
CADRE, Richard Zeller and Aimee Taylor

This document summarizes indicator C-10 for Part C SPPs. The indicator is one of four potential* dispute resolution indicators for Part C. Indicator C-10 is:

“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.”

Data necessary to calculate this indicator were included in Attachment 1 of the SPP for school year 2004-05 and have been included in the two previous Annual Performance Reports (2002-03 and 2003-04 school years). Measurement of this indicator is defined, with the label and cell designations from Attachment 1, as:

$$\text{Percent} = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) \text{ divided by } (1.1)] \text{ times } 100$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} (1.1)(b) &= \text{“Reports within timelines”} \\ (1.1)(c) &= \text{“Reports within extended timelines”} \\ (1.1) &= \text{“Complaints with reports issued”} \end{aligned}$$

METHODOLOGY:

CADRE compiled and examined the Indicator 10 sections from the SPPs of all 50 states, DC, and 5 outlying areas (AS, CNMI, GU, PR and VI). For purposes of this report, these 56 entities are referred to in aggregate as “states.” Each state report was summarized to capture the following information:

- Baseline reported for Indicator C-10
- Number of years of data for Indicator C-10 reported in the SPP text
- Improvement/maintenance practices described (in many cases it is not possible to distinguish improvement from maintenance)
- Assertions of effectiveness regarding the state’s complaints system
- Description of the “measurable and rigorous target” for Indicator C-10

Two or more reviewers read and compiled data for each of the above elements for each state. Reviewers entered the resulting summaries into an Excel data base, with a focus

* Note: Indicator C-12 (Resolution Sessions) applies only in those states where the Part C program has adopted the State’s Part B Due Process Hearing procedures.

on capturing in brief the language each state used. The authors of this document then coded these summaries in order to categorize improvement or maintenance strategies, assertions of effectiveness, and measurable and rigorous target descriptions.

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:

2004-05 School Year Baseline Reported for Indicator C-10

Thirty (30) states reported having had at least one complaint in the text of their SPP. Twenty (20) states reported five or fewer complaints; 10 reported six or more complaints. One state reported 29 complaints. Of the states reporting any complaint activity, 27 reported a baseline value: 22 states report completing all complaints within required timelines, five states report less than a 100% completion rate, and three states report no complaints investigated. Eight states provided information on the use of extensions for completion; it appears that extensions have not been widely used, with most complaint reports issued within 60 days.

Number of Years of Data Reported in the SPP Text

The data necessary to calculate this performance indicator have been a part of the Annual Performance Report and now the SPP for three years. Dispute resolution activity varies considerably (from none to some) among Part C states, and across years. The vast majority of states, however, did not report baseline data beyond the single year covered by this SPP (2004-05).

Seven (7) states reported two or more years of data for this indicator; four of these states reported three or more years. Two states reported some complaint related data (e.g., number of complaints filed, reports issued) for more than one year, but did not report indicator performance for more than the single baseline year.

Improvement/Maintenance Practices Described

States varied widely in the level of practice descriptions they provided in the SPP. What states reported in the SPP is summarized here, although CADRE is aware of innovative and effective state practices that were not included in the SPPs. This summary is also limited by:

- States differing in their willingness to report non-required activities in the SPP;
- Difficulty to distinguishing improvement from maintenance activities;
- Differing terminology (e.g., states use “train, develop personnel, provide TA/ support, conduct annual conference” to describe similar activities);
- Sketchiness/Variability of reports (e.g., “annual training” v. “30 hours of mediation training & 24 hours IDEA update training”);
- Thirty-one states using a standard format for improvement activities; for these states, improvement activities for Indicators C-10 through C-13 differed mostly in terminology (e.g., “hearing officer training” v. “mediator training”);

- Part C programs providing minimal detail and reporting very few DR events.

Because Improvement strategies for many states followed a common format across dispute resolution indicators, the summary below lists types of improvement strategies and the number of states that included them in their SPPs under *All Indicators* and under *Indicator 10*:

Improvement Strategies	All Indicators	Indicator 10
• Training (Agency Staff, Providers, or Families)	43	34
• Collect Data and Track System Performance	35	25
• Publish/Disseminate Awareness/Rights Booklets	33	23
• Conflict Prevention or Other ADR Approaches	25	20
• Revise Current Rules and Procedures	20	12
• Satisfaction Measures, Parent Surveys	16	11
• Act on Informal Concerns/Issues	13	12
• Staff - Expand/Assign to DR Activities	11	8
• PTI Partnership (Training/Advocacy/ADR Promotion)	11	9

Most of the above activities would seem to be basic components of a state system. The absence of reporting, however, does not necessarily indicate an absence of activity. Many states indicated “training” without further specification. Some states emphasize training in rights and procedural safeguards, while others focus on specific communications skills and dispute resolution approaches. The latter seem critical to CADRE if states hope to avoid the escalation of concerns or questions to formal complaints.

Speculations of Effectiveness Regarding the State’s Complaints System

CADRE identified references to effectiveness about the complaints management systems in 17 states. In most instances, specific supporting data were not provided beyond the number of complaints (few or none). Only a few states provided data in other forms (parent survey results showing parents understand their rights and dispute resolution options). Eight states attributed the low formal complaint activity to their support of a range of dispute prevention and dispute resolution activities (training, parent rights materials and training, staff training, and multiple avenues for quickly resolving informal concerns before they become formal complaints). Several states indicated that they collect data on these informal issues and analyze them for patterns.

Description of the “Measurable and Rigorous Target” for Indicator C-10

For most states, the target statement took this form: “100% resolved within 60-day timeline, or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.” Almost no states provided any other target, measurable or otherwise. A few states set targets for tracking and ensuring corrective actions that are required in complaint reports (often, 100% within one year). Similarly, some states

indicated that they strive to resolve all or most formal complaints by supporting early resolution activities, but these were not stated in measurable terms.

CADRE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR COMPLAINTS SYSTEMS

- Improve documentation of the connection between assertions about effective practices and supporting data;
- Establish integrated dispute resolution data systems for formal complaints, due process, resolution session, mediations, other dispute resolution approaches, and for tracking of expressed parent concerns;
- Establish and use performance indicators for all dispute resolution system management beyond the four required performance indicators;
- Support early and informal dispute resolution options (e.g., 48 hour response to expressed parent concerns, facilitated IFSPs for complex issues);
- Provide training for staff and parents focused on dispute resolution options and on effective collaborative working relationships;
- Develop parent/provider surveys to measure awareness of DR options, understanding of rights, and satisfaction with EI services and dispute resolution processes.

SPP Summary – Indicator C-11
Timeliness in the Adjudication of Due Process Hearings
CADRE, Richard Zeller and Aimee Taylor

This document summarizes indicator C-11 for Part C SPPs. The indicator is one of four potential* dispute resolution indicators for Part C. Indicator C-11 is:

“Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.”

Data necessary to calculate this indicator were included in Attachment 1 of the SPP for school year 2004-05 and have been included in the two previous Annual Performance Reports (2002-03 and 2003-04 school years). Measurement of this indicator is defined, with the label and cell designations from Attachment 1, as:

$$\text{Percent} = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) \text{ divided by } (3.2)] \text{ times } 100$$

where,

$$(3.2)(a) = \text{“[Hearing] Decisions within timeline”}^{**}$$

* Note: Indicator C-12 (Resolution Sessions) applies only in those states where the Part C program has adopted the State’s Part B Due Process Hearing procedures.

(3.2)(b) = “[Hearing] Decisions within extended timeline”
(3.2) = “Hearings (fully adjudicated)”

METHODOLOGY:

CADRE compiled and examined the Indicator 11 sections from the SPPs of all 50 states, DC, and 5 outlying areas (AS, CNMI, GU, PR and VI). For purposes of this report, these 56 entities are referred to in aggregate as “states.” Each state report was summarized to capture the following information:

- Baseline reported for Indicator C-11
- Number of years of data for Indicator C-11 reported in the SPP text
- Improvement/maintenance practices described (in many cases it is not possible to distinguish improvement from maintenance)
- Assertions of effectiveness regarding the state’s complaints system
- Description of the “measurable and rigorous target” for Indicator C-11

Two or more reviewers read and compiled data for each of the above elements for each state. Reviewers entered the resulting summaries into an Excel data base, with a focus on capturing in brief the language each state used. The authors of this document then coded these summaries in order to categorize improvement or maintenance strategies, assertions of effectiveness, and measurable and rigorous target descriptions.

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:

2004-05 School Year Baseline Reported for Indicator C-11

Forty-two (42) states reported no due process requests for 2004-05 in the text of their SPP. Seven states reported one or two due process filings, but no complaints held (resolved through mediation or some other mechanism); seven states reported one or more hearings held. States with only one or two hearings tended to complete them after applicable timelines expired; two larger states that held a total of 20 hearings completed all of them within 30 days. States with more experience may have procedures more clearly in place to meet timelines.

Number of Years of Data Reported in the SPP Text

The data necessary to calculate this performance indicator has been a part of the Annual Performance Report and now the SPP for three years. Dispute resolution activity varies considerably (from none to some) among Part C states, and across years. The vast majority of states, however, did not report baseline beyond the single year covered by this SPP (2004-05).

** “Decisions within timeline” can be either within 30 days, if the State’s Part C program has not adopted Part B due process procedures, or within 45 days if they have.

Only three (3) states reported three or more years of data for this indicator. None of these states actually had any due process hearing requests for 2004-05. While due process hearing activity in Part C is infrequent, data from the first two APRs suggests that some states have continuing activity and could have reported more than one year of data on this indicator.

Improvement/Maintenance Practices Described

States varied widely in the level of practice descriptions they provided in the SPP. What states reported in the SPP is summarized here, although CADRE is aware of innovative and effective state practices that were not included in the SPPs. This summary is also limited by:

- States differing in their willingness to report non-required activities in the SPP;
- Difficulty distinguishing improvement from maintenance activities;
- Differing terminology (e.g., states use “train, develop personnel, provide TA/ support, conduct annual conference” to describe similar activities);
- Variability in descriptive detail (e.g., “annual training” v. “30 hours of mediation training & 24 hours IDEA update training”);
- Thirty-one states using a standard format for improvement activities; for these states, improvement activities for Indicators C-10 through C-13 differed mostly in terminology (e.g., “hearing officer training” v. “mediator training”);
- Part C programs providing little detail and reporting very few DR events.

Because improvement strategies for many states followed a common format across dispute resolution indicators, the summary below lists types of improvement strategies and the number of states that included them in their SPPs under *All Indicators*, and specifically under *Indicator 11*:

<u>Improvement Strategies</u>	<u>All Indicators</u>	<u>Indicator 10</u>
• Training (agency staff, providers, or families)	43	32
• Collect Data and Track System Performance	35	20
• Publish/Disseminate Awareness/Rights Booklets	33	25
• Conflict Prevention or Other ADR Approaches	25	12
• Revise Current Rules and Procedures	20	13
• Satisfaction Measures, Parent Surveys	16	9
• Act on Informal Concerns/Issues	13	5
• Staff - Expand/Assign to DR Activities	11	8
• PTI Partnership (Training/Advocacy/ADR Promotion)	11	8

Most of the above activities would seem to be basic components of a state system; the absence of reporting, then, does not necessarily indicate an absence of activity. Many states indicated “training” without further specification. Nine states specify “Hearing Officer training,” although only two of these states actually had hearing requests. Other states promote training for families and providers on procedural safeguards and on alternative dispute resolution approaches, in some cases in conjunction with the PTI.

Revision of Parent brochures (on procedural safeguards and ADR options) were noted by many states under this indicator. States that have adopted Part B procedures anticipate revision of Due Process materials, including resolution session guidance, as the final regulations are issued.

Assertions of Effectiveness Regarding the State's Due Process Hearings System

CADRE identified references to effectiveness about the Due Process Hearings management systems in 13 states. In no case were specific data provided to support the assertion. In two states, the absence of or low number of hearings was presented as evidence that the system effectively addressed parent concerns. Eight states attributed the low formal complaint activity to their support of a range of dispute prevention and dispute resolution processes available to parents (non-required formal or informal approaches to quickly resolving concerns). Several states indicated that they collect and analyze data on the use of these processes and the issues addressed.

Description of the "Measurable and Rigorous Target" for Indicator C-11

For most states, the target statement took this form: "100 percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests will be fully adjudicated within the applicable time frame." Depending on whether the state has adopted Part B due process procedures or not, the "applicable time frame" may be either 30 days or 45 days with an extension when appropriate. Not all states indicated whether they were operating under the 30 or 45 day standard. No state provided any other target, measurable or otherwise, related to this indicator. Two states indicated that no target was set because they understood OSEP to require targets only when the number of hearing requests was 10 or more in a year.

CADRE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DUE PROCESS HEARINGS SYSTEMS

- Improve documentation of the connection between assertions about effective practices and supporting data;
- Develop guidance/standards/formats for documenting and justifying extensions of hearing timelines;
- Establish integrated dispute resolution data systems for formal complaints, due process, resolution session, mediations, other dispute resolution approaches, and for tracking of expressed parent concerns;
- Support early and informal dispute resolution options (e.g., guidance on how to facilitate an effective resolution session, other early resolution/pre-filing processes);
- Provide training for hearing officers on effective hearings, timelines, IDEA legal updates;
- Develop parent/provider surveys to measure awareness of DR options, understanding of rights, and satisfaction with EI services and dispute resolution processes.

SPP Summary – Indicator C-12
Effectiveness of Resolution Sessions in Reaching Settlement Agreements
CADRE, Richard Zeller and Aimee Taylor

This document summarizes indicator C-12 for Part C SPPs. This indicator is one of four potential dispute resolution indicators for Part C. Indicator C-12, however, applies only in those states where the Part C program has adopted the State's Part B Due Process Hearing procedures. Indicator C-12 is:

“Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).”

This is a new requirement under IDEA 04, effective July 1, 2006. As a result, data necessary to calculate this indicator were not included in Attachment 1 of the SPP for school year 2004-05. The first year of data (2005-06 school year) and the establishment of baselines for this indicator will be reported in the Annual Performance Report due February 1, 2007. Measurement of this indicator is defined, with the label and cell designations from Attachment 1, as:

$$\text{Percent} = [3.1(a) \text{ divided by } (3.1)] \text{ times } 100.$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} (3.1)(a) &= [\text{resolution session}] \text{ “Settlement agreements”} \\ (3.1) &= \text{“Resolution sessions” [held]} \end{aligned}$$

METHODOLOGY:

CADRE compiled and examined the Indicator 12 sections from the SPPs of all 50 states, DC, and 5 outlying areas (AS, CNMI, GU, PR and VI). For purposes of this report, these 56 entities are referred to in aggregate as “states.” Each state report was summarized to capture the following information:

- Baseline reported for Indicator C-12
- Improvement/maintenance practices described (in many cases it is not possible to distinguish improvement from maintenance)
- Description of the “measurable and rigorous target” for Indicator C-12

Two or more reviewers read and compiled data for each of the above elements for each state. Reviewers entered the resulting summaries into an Excel data base, with a focus on capturing in brief the language each state used. The authors of this document then coded these summaries in order to categorize improvement or maintenance strategies, assertions of effectiveness, and measurable and rigorous target descriptions.

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:

Baseline to be Reported for Indicator C-12

Eight states indicated that targets will be provided in the APR due February, 2007. Eighteen (18) states indicated that this indicator was not applicable because they have not adopted Part B due process procedures (and are thus exempt from resolution session requirements). Thirty-one (31) states indicated something to this effect: "No hearing requests and, thus, no resolution sessions." Some of these states may have adopted Part B procedures, although that is not always clear from the SPP text, nor is the "SELECT timeline used" portion of Attachment 1 item 3.2(a) uniformly completed. Some states may be unclear about applicable timelines, because they have had no Part C due process hearing requests.

Improvement/Maintenance Practices Described

For this indicator, most states did not include any improvement or maintenance strategies. For the 14 states that did include improvement strategies, seven indicated they intended to conduct training on resolution sessions, "collaborative decision making," etc. Eight states indicated that they have established data collection systems to track the use and effectiveness of resolution sessions.

Description of the "Measurable and Rigorous Target" for Indicator C-12

Almost all states indicated that a target at this point was not applicable, either because the indicator wasn't applicable (e.g., they have not adopted Part B due process timelines), or because they would not set a target until they report baseline data in the first APR due February 2007. One state indicated that the goal would be for 100% of resolution sessions to reach agreement. One other state reported on data from past experience in resolving disputes prior to hearing, indicating that about 65% of hearing requests were resolved short of a hearing. Other states might consider such an indicator of past experience as they set targets in the 2005-06 APR.

CADRE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INDICATOR C-12

- Establish integrated dispute resolution data systems for formal complaints, due process, resolution session, mediation activity, and for tracking of expressed parent concerns;
- Establish procedures to ensure that LEAs meet timelines for "convening" resolution sessions and that data on the sessions and any resulting settlement agreements are collected by the SEA;
- Support other early and informal dispute resolution options (e.g., 48 hour response to expressed parent concerns, facilitated IFSPs for complex issues);

- Train staff and parents with a focus on dispute resolution options and effective collaborative working relationships, whether in resolution sessions or in other venues;
- Develop Parent/provider surveys to measure awareness of DR options, understanding of rights, and satisfaction with EI services and dispute resolution processes.

SPP Summary – Indicator C-13
Effectiveness of Mediation in Reaching Mediation Agreements
 CADRE, Richard Zeller and Aimee Taylor

This document summarizes indicator C-13 for Part C SPPs. The indicator is one of four potential* dispute resolution indicators for Part C. Indicator C-13 is:

“Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.”

Data necessary to calculate this indicator were included in Attachment 1 of the SPP for school year 2004-05 and have been included in the two previous Annual Performance Reports (2002-03 and 2003-04 school years). Measurement of this indicator is defined, with the label and cell designations from Attachment 1, as:

$$[(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) \text{ divided by } (2.1)] \text{ times } 100.$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} (2.1(a)(i)) &= \text{“Mediations [held] related to due process”} \\ (2.1(b)(i)) &= \text{“Mediations [held] not related to due process”} \\ (2.1) &= \text{“Mediations [held]”} \end{aligned}$$

METHODOLOGY:

CADRE compiled and examined the Indicator 13 sections from the SPPs of all 50 states, DC, and 5 outlying areas (AS, CNMI, GU, PR and VI). For purposes of this report, these 56 entities are referred to in aggregate as “states.” Each state report was summarized to capture the following information:

- Baseline reported for Indicator C-13
- Number of years of data reported in the SPP text

* Note: Indicator C-12 (Resolution Sessions) applies only in those states where the Part C program has adopted the State’s Part B Due Process Hearing procedures.

- Improvement/maintenance practices described (in many cases it is not possible to distinguish improvement from maintenance)
- Assertions of effectiveness regarding the state's complaints system
- Description of the "measurable and rigorous target" for Indicator C-13

Two or more reviewers read and compiled data for each of the above elements for each state. Reviewers entered the resulting summaries into an Excel data base, with a focus on capturing in brief the language each state used. The authors of this document then coded these summaries in order to categorize improvement or maintenance strategies, assertions of effectiveness, and measurable and rigorous target descriptions.

SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS:

2004-05 School Year Baseline reported for Indicator C-13

Seventeen (17) states report having had at least one mediation request in the text of their SPP. Of these, 16 states report holding mediations; 12 of these states report 100% agreement rates, but in most cases those were in states where only a single mediation was held; four states report less than a 100% completion rate. For two large states that report more frequent mediations (nine in one state and 33 in the other), agreement rates were 52% and 82%, respectively. The other five largest states had only four mediations among them, three of which resulted in agreements.

Number of Years of Data Reported in the SPP Text

The data necessary to calculate this performance indicator has been a part of the Annual Performance Report and now the SPP for three years. Mediation activity, particularly in Part C, is highly variable (from none to some) among states. However, the vast majority of states did not report baseline beyond the single year covered by this SPP (2004-05). It is hard to determine, from the SPPs alone, whether mediation activity has occurred in more states over time.

Five states reported more than one year of data for this indicator, with all of these states reporting from three or more years. One state reported six years of mediation data, even though the frequency of use in that state was relatively small. Four of the states reporting multiple years of data held mediations during the 2004-05 school year.

Improvement/Maintenance Practices Described

States varied widely in the level of practice descriptions they provided in the SPP. We summarized only what states reported, although we know of innovative and effective state practices that were not included in the SPPs. This summary is also limited by:

- State orientations differing with respect to the risk of disclosure in the SPP;
- Difficulty distinguishing improvement from maintenance activities
- Differing terminology (e.g., states use "train, develop personnel, provide TA/ support, conduct annual conference" to describe similar activity);

- Variability in descriptive detail (e.g., “annual training” v. “30 hours of mediation skills training & 24 hours IDEA update training”);
- Part C programs providing minimal detail and reporting few DR events.

Because improvement strategies for many states followed a common format across dispute resolution indicators, the summary below lists types of improvement strategies and the number of states that included them in their SPPs under All Indicators, and specifically under Indicator 13:

<u>Improvement Strategies</u>	<u>All Indicators</u>	<u>Indicator 13</u>
• Training (agency staff, providers, or families)	43	28
• Collect Data and Track System Performance	35	15
• Publish/Disseminate Awareness/Rights Booklets	33	20
• Conflict Prevention or Other ADR Approaches	25	13
• Revise Current Rules and Procedures	20	10
• Satisfaction Measures, Parent Surveys	16	8
• Act on Informal Concerns/Issues	13	6
• Staff - Expand/Assign to DR Activities	11	4
• PTI Partnership (Training/Advocacy/ADR Promotion)	11	6

Most of the above activities would seem to be basic components of a state system. The absence of reporting, however, does not necessarily indicate an absence of activity. It is not clear from the SPPs the degree to which state systems have included a variety of strategies to promote mediation, prepare mediators, and structure the necessary supports for mediation and other ADR approaches to work in those states.

About one-third of state “training” activities were unspecified (e.g., “train staff and parents”). The other states in roughly equal proportion emphasize training in rights and procedural safeguards (across dispute resolution indicators) or focus on specific mediation skills and dispute resolution approaches. Rights brochures and booklets for parents are prominent dissemination strategies, with a number of states mentioning web publication. Only about 20% of states actually mention promotion of conflict prevention or other ADR approaches.

Assertions of Effectiveness Regarding the State’s Mediation system

CADRE identified references to effectiveness about mediation and other dispute resolution systems in 13 states. Specific supporting data were not provided. Among the reasons provided for low rates of dispute resolution activity were the support of formal or informal alternative dispute resolution options (e.g., resolution facilitators, “12 ways to solve problems” in the EI program), training aimed at joint problem solving, emphasis on early resolution options in the parent rights booklet and through training/orientation of families, etc. Some states argue that the very nature of “family-centered services” in EI solves problems at the lowest level so that formal procedures are unnecessary.

Description of the “Measurable and Rigorous Target” for Indicator C-13

Sixteen (16) states established mediation agreement rate targets, with six of those states setting the target at 100%. The 10 remaining states set targets ranging from a starting target as low as 50% and a final target (for 2010-2011) of 75% to 95%. The median target rate for these states was a starting target of 80% and a final target of 85%. Twenty-five (25) states indicated that no targets were provided, because the state had fewer than 10 mediations. Two states set provisional agreement rate targets in the event that they had more than 10 mediations. At least one state indicated a target other than one related to mediation agreement rates: that no mediations be held. This state argues that it actively supports early dispute resolution options and strives to solve problems early before they require more expensive, formal dispute resolution options.

CADRE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INDICATOR C-13

- Establish integrated dispute resolution data systems for formal complaints, due process, resolution session, mediation activity, and for tracking of expressed parent concerns;
- Support early and informal dispute resolution options (e.g., 48 hour response to parent concerns, facilitated IFSPs for complex issues);
- Training for staff and parents focused on dispute resolution options and on effective collaborative working relationships;
- Provide guidance to mediators, local providers and families on how to improve the quality and durability of mediation agreements;
- Develop parent/provider surveys to measure awareness of DR options, understanding of rights, and satisfaction with EI services and dispute resolution processes;
- Provide specific training on procedural safeguards, mediation skills, dispute resolution options, and collaborative decision making seem critical if are to avoid more contentious and formal dispute resolution options.