

## Part C State Performance Plan (SPP) for 2005-2010

### Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:

Virginia used a variety of mechanisms to ensure broad stakeholder awareness of and input into development of the State Performance Plan. The process of building awareness and seeking input began in May 2005 and included the following mechanisms:

- Part C technical assistance consultants shared initial information about the State Performance Plan with all local system managers through regional meetings in May and June. Updates on development of the plan were provided at subsequent regional meetings to keep local system managers informed.
- Information about the SPP was broadly disseminated through the bi-monthly Part C Update beginning in June. The Update is disseminated to local lead agencies, local system managers, Part C providers, families, and VICC members. All Part C Updates are also posted to the Infant & Toddler Connection of Virginia website.
- The Virginia Interagency Coordinating Council (VICC) provided advice and assistance to the Lead Agency in development of the SPP. This was accomplished through a regularly scheduled public meeting of the VICC, during which VICC members reviewed baseline data and made recommendations regarding the measurable and rigorous targets and improvement activities. Following that meeting, VICC members reviewed a second draft of the SPP and provided comments through a conference call.
- The draft SPP based on VICC input was posted on the Infant & Toddler Connection of Virginia website and stakeholders were notified in writing of the opportunity to review and comment on the draft.

The State Performance Plan will be publicly disseminated on the Infant & Toddler Connection of Virginia website and in printed materials following submission of the plan to OSEP in December 2005.

### Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments

#### Indicator 1 – Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

**Measurement: Percent = # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner divided by the total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs times 100**

#### Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:

Virginia began collecting data related to beginning services in a timely manner in 2001, through the Monitoring and Improvement Measurement System (MIMS). One of the indicators on the MIMS self-assessment reads: Eligible infants and toddlers and their families begin receiving their early intervention services in a timely manner following IFSP development. Responses to this indicator are reported in the following categories: always true (100% of the time), often true (60-99% of the time), sometimes true (30-59% of the time), rarely true (1-29% of the time), or never (0% of the time). Of the 13 local systems who participated in the 2001-2003 MIMS cycle, 31% reported that the indicator was always true, while 69% reported that it was often true. Four of the local systems who are participating in the 2003-2005 MIMS cycle completed the MIMS process by March 2005. Of those, 1 local system (25%) reported beginning services in a timely manner always, two (50%) did so often, and one (25%) did so rarely. Relying on the MIMS data regarding timely service provision had significant limitations, including the lack of a specific definition of timely (the guidance for this indicator only asks whether services began in accordance with the dates identified on the IFSP) and the low number of local systems who complete the MIMS process each year.

In order to address these data limitations, Virginia took the following steps in 2005:

- Added a component to the state monitoring system that requires all local systems to complete an annual record review process that randomly samples records (using a State-defined process) and determines whether supports and services listed on the IFSP begin in a timely manner following IFSP development; and

- Defined “timely” as 21 calendar days from the date of the IFSP meeting. Early intervention services may begin more than 21 days following the IFSP meeting if the IFSP team decides on and documents the reasons for a later start date in order to meet the individual needs of the child and family.

Initial analysis of a sample of record review data collected in January – February 2005 indicated a statewide average of 18.4 days between the date on the IFSP and the date supports and services began.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

As part of the state monitoring system, 38 of the 40 local systems were required to complete an annual record review in January – February 2005 to determine whether infants and toddlers begin receiving the services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. Two of the local systems were not required to complete the record review since they had recently completed their participation in the MIMS process (their data is not included in the baseline data since it was not collected using the same record review form used by the other 38 systems). Each local Part C system followed the same method for selecting records for the review, as follows:

- The number of records to be reviewed was based on the number of children in the local Part C system (December 1 count):
  - <50 children, select 50% of records (not less than 10 records)
  - 50 – 99 children, select 25% of records
  - 100 – 199 children, select 15% of records
  - 200 – 499 children, select 10% of records
  - 500 or more children, select not more than 60 records
- Once the number of records was determined, the exact records to be reviewed were selected based on a random number chart.

The State Lead Agency compiled a spreadsheet for each local system reflecting the data on “timely” submitted through record reviews completed in January – February 2005. The local system manager was required to compare the data in the spreadsheet with the data in the child’s record to confirm the accuracy and then submit corrections. The following baseline data reflects the confirmed and corrected record review data on timely start of services from 37 of the 38 local systems required to complete the record review (data from the other local system was not included due to errors in the data collection):

$$(505.32 \text{ children whose services began in a timely manner} / 700 \text{ children with IFSPs}) \times 100 = 72\%$$

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Virginia’s baseline data for FFY 2004 shows that 72% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs began receiving the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

The remaining 28% of children are accounted for across 36 of the 37 local systems, with compliance ranging from 35% to 96%. It is important to note that the record reviews upon which this baseline data is based were conducted prior to establishing Virginia’s specific definition of “timely.” Therefore, the record reviews did not include collection of mitigating circumstances when services began more than 21 calendar days after the initial IFSP meeting (some of these mitigating circumstances may represent appropriate reasons for delaying the start of services).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner
2006 (2006-2007)	100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner
2007 (2007-2008)	100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner

<p><b>2008</b> (2008-2009)</p>	<p>100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner</p>
<p><b>2009</b> (2009-2010)</p>	<p>100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner</p>
<p><b>2010</b> (2010-2011)</p>	<p>100% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner</p>

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

Activity	Timelines	Resources
<p>1. Provide each local system with a written report of their baseline status with regard to this indicator</p>	<p>October 21, 2005 – <i>(Completed)</i></p>	<p><u>Personnel:</u> State Part C staff</p>
<p>2. Provide individualized technical assistance to local systems based on their local status as documented in the October 11, 2005 memo to local system managers</p>	<p>Beginning October 21, 2005</p>	<p><u>Personnel:</u> State Part C staff</p>
<p>3. Continue to implement the process begun in 2005 for local system managers to notify their technical assistance consultant if unable to identify a service provider within 10 – 15 calendar days of the IFSP meeting</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p><u>Personnel:</u> State Part C staff  <u>Funding:</u> Already in the Part C budget</p>
<p>4. Implement Virginia’s definition of “timely” as it relates to beginning services following IFSP development statewide and include it in revised Part C policies and procedures</p>	<p>Written notification to local systems of implementation - <b>October 21, 2005 (Completed)</b>  Add definition to Virginia’s policies and procedures – <b>April 2007</b></p>	<p><u>Personnel:</u> State Part C staff</p>
<p>5. Refine the annual record review protocol used to collect data on the timely receipt of early intervention services to allow reporting of mitigating circumstances when services begin more than 21 calendar days after the IFSP meeting.</p>	<p>Protocol revised – <b>April 2006 (Completed)</b>  Annual implementation begins – <b>August 2006 (Completed)</b></p>	<p><u>Personnel:</u> State Part C staff  <u>Other:</u> Input from local system managers</p>
<p>6. In developing an enhanced State Part C data system (please see Indicator 14, Activity 1), explore ongoing electronic</p>	<p>Contract with professional who will facilitate completion of this activity – <b>October 2005 (Completed)</b></p>	<p><u>Personnel:</u> State Part C and IT Staff</p>

Activity	Timelines	Resources
collection of the data needed to monitor the timely start of services.	Project plan, including timelines, is developed – <b>November 2005</b> <i>(Completed)</i>  Analysis is completed – <b>March 2006</b> <i>(Completed)</i>  Add data elements to ITOTS - <b>2008</b>	<u>Funding</u> : Already in Part C budget  <u>Other</u> : Stakeholder input
7. Provide technical assistance and follow-up to local systems in implementing corrective action plans	Beginning <b>January, 2007</b>	<u>Personnel</u> – State Part C Staff
8. Develop a series of topic papers related to documentation and disseminate to local systems	2008	<u>Personnel</u> – State Part C Staff  <u>Other</u> – Stakeholder input
9. Collaborate with the Department of Medical Assistance Services and other stakeholders to explore alternative funding structure(s) for Part C supports and services that will facilitate the system's ability to recruit and retain providers.	Beginning <b>March 2006</b>  Changes targeted for <b>2008-2009</b>	<u>Personnel</u> – State Part C Staff, DMAS staff, EIIMT, National Consultants  <u>Funding</u> – Funding for consultants already in Part C budget; additional funding needs to be determined  <u>Other</u> – Stakeholder input, including Finance Stakeholder Group and VICC

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

Same as for the first Indicator

**Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments****Indicator 2 – Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community settings.****Measurement: Percent = # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community settings divided by the total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs times 100****Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

Trend data from multiple sources shows that, over the past 5 years, an increasing percentage of early intervention supports and services are being provided in natural environments (e.g., the home, a program for typically developing children and/or other community settings) in Virginia. For instance, chart reviews completed with the four MIMS (monitoring) sites involved in the 2003-05 cohort found that 100% of IFSPs indicated all services were to be provided in natural environments or provided appropriate justification if the services were to be provided in a setting other than the natural environment. Chart reviews conducted with MIMS sites in 2000 (17 sites) found that 83% of IFSPs met that criteria. Individual child data collected through Virginia's Infant and Toddler Online Tracking System (ITOTS) indicates the percentage of children who receive supports and services primarily in the home or community settings increased from 90% to 98% between 2002 and 2004. The increased use of natural environments reflects Virginia's extensive and continuing efforts to provide training and technical assistance related to provision of supports and services in natural environments. Those efforts have included the following:

- Based on locally-identified needs for information and support, training and technical assistance are designed and implemented to assist each local Part C system in moving toward adoption of the principles and practices associated with individualizing Part C supports and services in everyday routines, activities and places.
- Provision of early intervention supports and services in natural environments and planning for and provision of individualized supports and services in everyday routines, activities and settings have been the focus of keynote addresses and/or concurrent sessions of the Annual Virginia Early Intervention Conference.
- Kaleidoscope Service Coordination Training, Level I and Level II, which includes training and support to services coordinators in providing family-centered care and facilitating identification of individualized, family-centered IFSP outcomes, supports and services has been in place since 2001 and is offered multiple times each year.
- Written technical assistance documents and sample IFSPs have been developed and disseminated to local systems and providers to support individualized service planning and provision of services in natural environments.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

Settings Data from 618 Annual Data Reports	1999 Data from NCSEAM	2000 Data from NCSEAM	2001 Data from NCSEAM	2002 Data from NCSEAM	2003 Children reported under Section 618= 5228	2004 Children reported under Section 618= 5369
Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs served under Part C who primarily receive EI services in the home or community settings	64%	76%	84%	89%	95.3% (4006 out of 4204)	98.4% (4203 out of 4271)
Percent of infants and toddlers with IEPs served under Part B who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community settings	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	18.4% (189 out of 1024)	26.7% (293 out of 1098)
Total percent of infants and toddlers reported under Section 618 who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community settings	64%	76%	84%	89%	80.2% (4195 out of 5228)	83.7% (4496 out of 5369)

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Virginia's Section 618 data includes children under three who are served through the Department of Education under IDEA, Part B (with an IEP). Based on FFY 2004 Section 618 data, 98.05% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs (4235 out of 4319) primarily received their early intervention services in the home or in community settings.

The 2004 data reported as baseline data is the most accurate data available at this time. The individual child data collected through ITOTS and reported to OSEP in Virginia's Annual Performance Reports and annual 618 Reports of Program Settings Where Early Intervention Services are Provided to Children with Disabilities and Their Families in Accordance With Part C have, to date, reflected only the services planned on each child's initial IFSP. The State Lead Agency is unable to pinpoint the extent of inaccuracy in this data. The Section 618 settings data for children enrolled in Virginia's Part C system as of December 1, 2005 will reflect the primary service setting listed on the IFSP in effect on December 1, 2005 for every eligible child. Once this December 1, 2005 Section 618 settings data is available, the baseline data reported above will be updated, as appropriate, and an amended State Performance Plan will be submitted to OSEP.

Updated baseline data (May 2006): For December 1, 2005, the total percent of infants and toddlers reported under Section 618 (this includes children under age 3 served under Part B with an IEP) who receive services primarily in the home or community settings is 84.7% (4519 out of 5338). The Section 618 settings data for children enrolled in Virginia’s Part C program on December 1, 2005 indicates that 99.0% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs (4379 out of 4422) primarily receive early intervention services in the home or in community settings.

This data reflects the primary service setting on the IFSP in effect for each child on December 1, 2005. Each local system was required to submit a signed data verification form confirming that the primary service setting was from the IFSP in effect on December 1, 2005 and that the data submitted was accurate. The targets below were reviewed using the December 1, 2005 data as the accurate baseline, and determined to still be appropriate since the targets are already very high and reflect the need to individualize service settings for each child and family.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	98.425% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs primarily receive their early intervention services in the home or community settings
2006 (2006-2007)	98.425% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs primarily receive their early intervention services in the home or community settings
2007 (2007-2008)	98.425% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs primarily receive their early intervention services in the home or community settings
2008 (2008-2009)	98.45% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs primarily receive their early intervention services in the home or community settings
2009 (2009-2010)	98.45% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs primarily receive their early intervention services in the home or community settings
2010 (2010-2011)	98.45% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs primarily receive their early intervention services in the home or community settings

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

Activity	Timelines	Resources
1. In developing an enhanced State Part C data system (please see Indicator 14, Activity 1), incorporate collection and reporting of each child’s primary service setting data at the time of each initial IFSP, 6-month review and annual IFSP.	Contract with professional who will facilitate completion of this activity – <b>October 2005</b> (Completed)  Project plan, including timelines, is developed – <b>November 2005</b> (Completed)  Analysis is completed – <b>March 2006</b> (Completed)	<u>Personnel</u> : State Part C and IT Staff <u>Funding</u> : Already in Part C budget <u>Other</u> : Stakeholder input

Activity	Timelines	Resources
<p>2. Continue provision of targeted training and technical assistance related to natural environments based on needs identified by local Part C systems and through monitoring and supervision.</p>	<p>Review ITOTS primary service setting data with local system managers to understand justification when services are provided outside of natural environment and determine technical assistance needs – <b>March 2006 (Completed)</b></p> <p>Provision of targeted technical assistance – <b>Ongoing</b></p>	<p><u>Personnel</u>: State Part C staff <u>Funding</u>: Already in Part C budget</p>
<p>3. <a href="#">Continue to provide links to evidence-based materials and strategies related to natural environments through the Infant &amp; Toddler Connection of Virginia Update</a></p>	<p>Ongoing</p>	<p><u>Personnel</u> – State Part C Staff</p>
<p>4. Develop and implement a system of ongoing and individualized information and supports that will assist individual Part C providers (those currently in the system and those entering the system), teams of providers, families and local Part C systems in understanding and implementing the principles and practices of individualizing Part C supports and services in everyday activities, routines and places.</p>	<p>Conduct surveys with all Part C providers and administrators in order to understand the current landscape – <b>June 2006 (Completed)</b></p> <p>Develop a work plan that identifies a range of mechanisms for delivering information and support to local providers, administrators, and teams, along with timelines for phased in implementation – <b>December 2007</b></p>	<p><u>Personnel</u>: State Part C staff, Integrated Training Collaborative, <u>Funding</u>: To be determined</p>
<p>5. Continue implementation of <i>Kaleidoscope: New Perspectives in Service Coordination (Level I and II)</i> training for service coordinators</p>	<p>Revise curriculum to reflect IDEA 2004 regulations – <b>June 2006 (Completed)</b></p> <p>Implementation – <b>Ongoing</b></p>	<p><u>Personnel</u>: State Part C Staff, Integrated Training Collaborative <u>Funding</u>: Already in Part C budget; look into funding options to increase number of trainings offered per year.</p>
<p>6. Implement requirement for all Part C service providers to complete the Orientation to Part C training module, passing competency test with 80% accuracy</p>	<p>Revise training module based on pilot testing – <b>January 2006 (Completed)</b></p> <p>Include this requirement in revised Virginia policies and procedures – <b>April 2007</b></p> <p>Implement statewide – <b>July 2007</b></p>	<p><u>Personnel</u>: State Part C staff, Integrated Training Collaborative <u>Funding</u>: To be determined</p>
<p>7. <a href="#">Collaborate with the Department of Medical Assistance Services and other stakeholders to explore alternative funding structure(s) for Part C supports and services that better aligns with Virginia's approach to the provision of supports and</a></p>	<p>Beginning <b>March 2006</b></p> <p>Changes targeted for <b>2008-2009</b></p>	<p><u>Personnel</u> – State Part C Staff, DMAS staff, EIIMT, National Consultants <u>Funding</u> – Funding for consultants already in Part C budget; additional funding needs to be determined</p>

# SPP Template – Part C (3)

Virginia – amended February 2007

State

Activity	Timelines	Resources
services		<u>Other</u> – Stakeholder input, including Finance Stakeholder Group and VICC

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

In addition to the procedures described for the first indicator, stakeholder involvement for this indicator occurred through the work being done to develop child and family outcomes and measures (through a General Supervision Enhancement Grant) and included representatives from the following: families; the Virginia Community Service Board Data Management Committee; the Early Intervention/Mental Retardation Advisory Board; The Council Coordinators Association; the Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Substance Abuse Services Data Policy Task Force; Department of Social Services; Department of Medical Assistance Services; Providers; Special Education; Virginia Department of Health; the Partnership for People with Disabilities; and the Virginia Interagency Coordinating Council.

**Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments****Indicator 3 – Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:**

- a. **Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);**
- b. **Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and**
- c. **Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.**

**Measurement:**

- a. **Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):**
  - i. **Percent of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-ages peers = # of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100**
  - ii. **Percent of infants and toddlers who improve functioning = # of infants and toddlers who improved functioning divided by # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100**
  - iii. **Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = # of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning divided by # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100**
- **Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication):**
  - i. **Percent of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-ages peers = # of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100**
  - ii. **Percent of infants and toddlers who improve functioning = # of infants and toddlers who improved functioning divided by # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100**
  - iii. **Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = # of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning divided by # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100**
- **Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:**
  - i. **Percent of infants and toddlers who reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-ages peers = # of infants and toddlers who**

**reach or maintain functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers divided by # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100**

**ii. Percent of infants and toddlers who improve functioning = # of infants and toddlers who improved functioning divided by # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100**

**iii. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = # of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning divided by # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed times 100**

For each, if children meet criteria for I, report them in i. Do not include children reported in I in ii or iii. If i+ii+iii does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

#### **Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

The Virginia Part C Annual Performance Report submitted to OSEP in March 2004 acknowledged the lack of a mechanism to measure statewide the extent to which children demonstrate improved and sustained functional skills. In October, 2004 Virginia was awarded a General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) to develop Part C State outcome indicators and methods to collect and analyze Part C outcome indicator data. A management group, called the Core Team, was formed to oversee the project and make recommendations to the State Lead Agency. The Core Team, with stakeholder input from a Design Review Team, local system managers and focus groups, has established the following plans for the infrastructure associated with Virginia's child outcome measurement system:

#### *Policies and procedures to guide outcome assessment and measurement practices:*

The State Lead Agency has adopted the following Outcomes, Indicators and Measures:

- Part C Child Outcomes
  - Children have positive social relationships
  - Children have knowledge and skills
  - Children take appropriate action to meet their needs
- Part C Child Indicators
  - Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved social-emotional skills (including social relationships)
  - Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)
  - Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs
- Part C Measures
  - Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
  - Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
  - Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
  - Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
  - Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

Virginia's Part C Policies and Procedures have been revised (targeted for submission to OSEP in April 2007) to incorporate the outcome measurement system requirements. An assessment in all areas is required during each child's initial Part C evaluation and assessment process using an assessment instrument or multiple assessment instruments that assess in all five developmental domains. Assessments must incorporate parent input and team member observations and informed clinical opinion, in addition to information from the assessment instrument(s). A second assessment is conducted for each eligible child at the annual IFSP (and each subsequent annual IFSP) or at exit if the child has been in the Part C system for at least six months but will be leaving prior to the annual IFSP or exits more than 6 months after the most recent annual IFSP. At the initial and subsequent assessments, a performance measurement scale is used to determine the child's functional status, based on the assessment information, compared to same-aged peers.

*Provision of training and technical assistance supports to administrators and service providers in outcome data collection, reporting and use:*

Training and technical assistance was provided by national experts to administrators and service providers who participated in the pilot phase of Virginia's outcome measurement system to address quality assessment and outcome data collection, reporting and data use. In addition, the training addressed the skills necessary for IFSP teams to implement the Child Outcomes Summary Form in determining a child's developmental status based on assessment results and the judgment of IFSP team members, including the family.

Statewide training for full implementation of the outcome measurement system will occur regionally in January and February, 2007. The training will be conducted by GSEG staff, State Part C Staff and peer trainers (providers who participated in the pilot phase). Based on what was learned during the pilot phase, the training will incorporate a strong focus on practice and role play with the skills needed assure valid and reliable implementation of the outcome measurement system. There will also be emphasis on supporting the family's participation in the process of determining the child's functional status.

*Quality assurance and monitoring procedures to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the outcome data:*

All providers are required to participate in training on the outcome measurement system. Local system managers will have the responsibility to assure that any local service providers who are unable to attend the regional trainings in January and February are trained through another mechanism. Certificates will be issued to those who complete the training.

The Part C data system, ITOTS, has been revised to incorporate new elements associated with the outcome measurement system. The data system will include built-in edits to prevent knowable errors (e.g., data, scores, missing data).

*Data system elements for outcome data input and maintenance, and outcome data analysis functions:*

The new data system elements will require reporting of the developmental scale score for use in determination and reporting of progress. The supporting data, including assessment tools, results, summary of assessment form, and other supporting data will be available in each child's record. The scale scores at entry and exit will be converted to a progress statement electronically.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2005 (2005-2006):**

In FFY 2005, Virginia began the pilot phase of the outcome measurement system, in which 7 local systems participated (either for all or a portion of children entering the local system). The pilot sites included one rural area, a rural area near an urban area, two suburbs, two urban areas and a portion of an urban area. In these areas, all children entering the program from July 1, 2006 to August 15, 2006 were assessed. Children in the pilot were assessed using one of three instruments: HELP, ELAP or Carolina. Developmental status was determined by IFSP teams using the Child Outcomes Summary Form developed by the Early Childhood Outcomes (ECO) center and based on assessment results along with parent input and team member observations. Virginia used the Child Outcomes Summary Form to set the criteria for "same-aged peers." Children scoring on the scale at 6 or 7 were considered "comparable to same-aged peers" and those scoring 5 or below were considered "level below same-aged peers".

As a result of the pilot, data is available on the status at entry for 107 children. The table below provides the percentage of children who were, at entry, in each of the 2 required reporting categories for FFY 2005 for each of the 3 functional indicators:

- a. Children functioning at a level comparable to same aged peers
- b. Children functioning at a level below same aged peers

**PILOT DATA:  
CHILD'S STATUS AT ENTRY**

A. Positive Social-Emotional Skills		B. Acquisition & Use of Knowledge & Skills		C. Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet Their Needs	
Comparable	Below	Comparable	Below	Comparable	Below
51% (55/107)	49% (52/107)	36% (39/107)	64% (68/107)	43% (46/107)	57% (61/107)

While no baseline data are available at this time, the following measurement strategies will be used to respond to the five reporting categories in February 2008:

*Who will be included in the measurement?*

Once the outcome measurement system is fully implemented, all children with IFSPs who are younger than 30 months of age when the initial assessment for IFSP development occurs and who receive services for at least six months before making a planned exit will be included in the measurement. The first assessment (Time 1) will occur as part of the IFSP development and the second assessment (Time 2) will occur prior to exit if the child has been in services for at least six months and is exiting prior to the annual evaluation of the IFSP or at the annual evaluation of the IFSP (Time 2) for those who have been in services for one year. Assessments will continue to occur annually during the period the child is in services, or at exiting if an assessment has not occurred within the last six months prior to exiting.

Since statewide implementation begins with children entering the Virginia Part C system in March 2007, baseline data in February 2008 will include progress data for children who entered and received a Time 1 assessment during the pilot phase and then exited after receiving supports and services for at least 6 months.

*What assessment/measurement tools will be used?*

Following input from the pilot sites, the State Lead Agency has determined that, while use of an assessment tool(s) is required, there will be no requirement about what specific tool(s) must be used. The final determination of a child's developmental status would be by consensus of the IFSP team, using the results of the assessment instruments and the judgment of the IFSP team members, including the family. The ECO Center's Child Outcomes Summary Form will be used by the IFSP team to summarize the assessment information for each child.

*Who will conduct the assessments?*

Those qualified to administer assessment instruments will be those providing assessments.

*When will measurement occur?*

The initial assessment, Time 1, will occur as part of the development of the IFSP. The second assessment, Time 2, will occur at the annual evaluation of the IFSP if the child exits within 6 months after the annual IFSP. If the child exits prior to the annual IFSP, the child would be assessed at exiting as long as the child had been in services for at least six months. If exit occurs more than 6 months after the annual IFSP then a separate Time 2 assessment will occur or be coordinated with the local school division if the child is transitioning to preschool services under Part B.

*Who will report data to whom, in what form, and how often?*

Local assessors will administer an assessment tool to establish a baseline and to guide the decision-making process for outcome determination and IFSP development. This data will be available in the child's record for validation of the levels of development and verification of the process. These formal assessments will occur according to the time lines described above, or more often if needed. The Child Outcome Summary Form will be required for use in the summary process for determining the level of development, and a score on a developmental scale will be determined by the team. This form containing the score will be kept in the child's record. Data will be entered into the Part C data system at the time of the initial IFSP and at each annual evaluation of the IFSP and/or at exit (as described above).

*How will data be analyzed?*

It is important for this data to not only provide information on early intervention impact but also guide service delivery, local improvement, and state systems improvement. Therefore, data analysis must occur at all levels. After electronic conversion of raw score data to progress data, the data will be aggregated and

available for use. The IFSP team will be able to chart the child's progress on an individual basis. The local providers will be able to determine program impact and the State will be able to meet the federal reporting requirements and use the data for General Supervision and program improvement. Aggregated impact information will be available to the state legislature and the administration.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Baseline data are not available at this time.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	Targets will be set once baseline data are available
2006 (2006-2007)	
2007 (2007-2008)	
2008 (2008-2009)	
2009 (2009-2010)	
2010 (2010-2011)	

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

Activity	Timelines	Resources
1. Provide technical assistance, as needed, to pilot sites as they begin collecting exit data for children who entered during the initial pilot period	December 2006	<u>Personnel:</u> State Part C and IT staff, GSEG staff
2. Conduct statewide training on full implementation of the child outcome measurement system	January – February 2007	<u>Personnel:</u> State Part C staff, GSEG staff, peer trainers  <u>Funding:</u> Through General Supervision Enhancement Grant
3. Finalize data system elements for collection and reporting of child outcome data	March 2007	<u>Personnel:</u> State Part C and IT staff, GSEG staff

# SPP Template – Part C (3)

Virginia – amended February 2007

State

Activity	Timelines	Resources
4. Provide ongoing technical assistance as statewide implementation of the outcome measurement system begins	Beginning March 2007	<u>Personnel</u> : State Part C Staff

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

In addition to the procedures described for the first indicator, stakeholder involvement for this indicator occurred through the work being done to develop child and family outcomes and measures (through the GSEG grant) and included representatives from the following: families; the Virginia Community Service Board Data Management Committee; the Early Intervention/Mental Retardation Advisory Board; The Council Coordinators Association; the Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation, and Substance Abuse Services Data Policy Task Force; Department of Social Services; Department of Medical Assistance Services; Providers; Special Education; Virginia Department of Health; the Partnership for People with Disabilities; and the Virginia Interagency Coordinating Council.

**Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services in Natural Environments****Indicator 4 – Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:**

- a. Know their rights;
- b. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- c. Help their children develop and learn.

**Measurement:**

- a. Percent = # of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights divided by the # of respondent families participating in Part C times 100
- b. Percent = # of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs divided by the # of respondent families participating in Part C times 100
- c. Percent = # of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn divided by the # of respondent families participating in Part C times 100

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

Virginia has used family surveys to measure family satisfaction and gather family input about their early intervention experience since 1996. The current 2-part Family Survey was introduced in 2000. Family Survey I is disseminated to all families following IFSP development, and Family Survey II goes to all families following transition out of the Part C system. While family survey data are available and survey respondents indicate a high level of satisfaction and improved self-confidence in meeting their children's needs, there are no outcome indicators.

**[TO BE UPDATED IN JANUARY ONCE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FAMILY SURVEY IS COMPLETE]**

In October, 2004 Virginia was awarded a General Supervision Enhancement Grant (GSEG) to develop Part C State outcome indicators and methods to collect and analyze Part C family outcome indicator data. The GSEG includes resources for a professionally administered parent survey that would be conducted at the State level and would result in a sample representative of Virginia's population. This initial implementation will be considered a pilot phase of the project. Following this pilot, a decision will be made about whether to continue with a sampling process administered at the State level by a professional service, survey parents at the local level, or implement some other option.

*Policies and procedures to guide outcome assessment and measurement practices:*

Virginia’s Part C Policies and Procedures will be revised based on decisions made following the pilot phase of the project. Policies and procedures will address administration procedures, use of a required instrument, reporting of data, and sampling.

*Provision of training and technical assistance supports to administrators and service providers in outcome data collection, reporting and use:*

Training and technical assistance will be planned based on decisions made following the pilot phase of the project.

*Quality assurance and monitoring procedures to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the outcome data:*

Virginia’s monitoring and supervision system is currently being reviewed and revised in response to findings from OSEP’s April 2005 verification visit and reporting requirements associated with the State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Reports. These revisions are being coordinated with the outcomes system development needs, and the revamped monitoring and supervision system will incorporate requirements associated with accurate collection, reporting and use of outcomes data. The State data system is also being reviewed and revised and will incorporate new elements associated with the outcomes measurement system. The data system will include built-in edits to prevent knowable errors (e.g., data, scores, missing data)

*Data system elements for outcome data input and maintenance, and outcome data analysis functions:*

The required data system elements will be identified based on decisions made following the pilot phase of the project.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

**Baseline data will be available in January 2007 and will be added at that time.**

While no baseline data are available at this time, the parameters/strategies for measurements are described below.

*Who will be included in the measurement?*

The survey contractor will develop a sampling methodology that meets best practice requirements for ensuring a representative/stratified sample.

*What assessment/measurement tools will be used?*

The GSEG Core Group will review all available resources, including the NCSEAM parent surveys, the Early Childhood Outcome (ECO) Center parent survey and Virginia’s existing family surveys (Family Survey I and II). Based on that review, the State Lead Agency will select an instrument for use in the pilot phase of the project. Final decisions regarding the instrument to be used will be made following the pilot.

*Who will conduct the surveys?*

In the pilot phase, the survey will be conducted by a professional service at the State level. A final decision regarding who will conduct the survey will be made following the pilot phase of the project.

*When will measurement occur?*

This will be determined following the pilot phase of the project.

*Who will report data to whom, in what form, and how often?*

This will be determined following the pilot phase of the project.

*How will data be analyzed?*

This will be determined following the pilot phase of the project.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Baseline data are not available at this time.

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Measurable and Rigorous Target</b>
------------	---------------------------------------

# SPP Template – Part C (3)

Virginia – amended February 2007

State

<b>2005</b> (2005-2006)	Targets will be set once baseline data are available.
<b>2006</b> (2006-2007)	
<b>2007</b> (2007-2008)	
<b>2008</b> (2008-2009)	
<b>2009</b> (2009-2010)	
<b>2010</b> (2010-2011)	

### Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

To be determined when data are available.

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

Same as for the first Indicator

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find**

**Indicator 5 – Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:**


- a. Other states with similar eligibility criteria; and
- b. National data.

**Measurement:**

- a. Percent = # of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs divided by the population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions
- b. Percent = # of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs divided by the population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 times 100 compared to National data.

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

The number of children referred to Virginia’s Part C system when they are under 1 year of age and the percentage of Virginia’s birth – 1 population served in Part C (using both the December 1 child count and annualized child count data) have remained mostly steady since 2000. An increased number of referrals of children 1 – 3 years of age has accounted for almost all of the increase in the number of children served in Virginia’s Part C system since at least 2001, as indicated in the following table:



Virginia is implementing a variety of child find initiatives, and these are described in the next indicator. Activities related to child find initiatives occur at both the State and local levels, and a statewide public awareness campaign for Part C is in place. Efforts that are particularly important in increasing the percentage of eligible infants, birth – 1, who are identified and served include the following:

- The State Lead Agency has worked with the Department of Health in the implementation of the Universal Newborn Hearing Screening Program. Training for the Universal Newborn Hearing Screening Program includes information about referral to Part C. An interagency work group has been established at the State level to increase the referral rate of children who are diagnosed with hearing loss as a result of the newborn hearing screening.

- The website created to provide physicians and nurses with general information about Virginia’s Part C system, as well as referral procedure information, continues to be available and updated as needed.
- In 2004, approximately 110,000 copies of Virginia’s Part C developmental checklist brochure (100,000 in English and 10,000 in Spanish) were included in New Parent Kits, which were distributed through local departments of social services and other local public agencies as part of a Governor’s Initiative project.
- The State Lead Agency is in the process of validating, at the local system level, the projected numbers of eligible children reported in the Virginia Cost Study (completed in 2004). Data regarding the birth to one population served in each local system as compared to local demographics are being analyzed.
- In 2005 Virginia began implementation of expanded newborn screening for chronic conditions. The number of blood tests done on newborns has been increased from 11 to 29 and will facilitate earlier diagnosis of many chronic conditions. The legislation that established the expanded newborn screening program identified Care Connection as responsible for ongoing coordination of services once a child is identified and a diagnosis has been confirmed. The State Lead Agency is working in partnership with Care Connection to ensure referrals are made to the Part C system, as appropriate.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

Percent of infants birth – 1 with IFSPs compared to:	2001	2002	2003	2004
Virginia birth – 1 population	.59%	.97%	.59%	.58%
Same percent for other States with broad eligibility	1.0% Virginia ranked 22 <sup>nd</sup> out of 28 states in this category	1.1% Virginia ranked 3 <sup>rd</sup> out of the 28 states in this category	1.0% Virginia ranks 25 <sup>th</sup> out of 28 states in this category	.97% Virginia ranks 21st out of 24 states in this category
National data	.90%	.95%	.91%	.92%

The data in this table is taken from Part C – State Rank tables from OSEP and reflects Section 618 data from December 1 of the stated year.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Virginia’s baseline data for FFY 2004 is as follows:

- On December 1, 2004, .58% of the birth-1 population in Virginia was receiving Part C early intervention services.
- As a group, states with broad eligibility definitions similar to Virginia’s were serving .97% of the birth – 1 population.
- National baseline data for December 1, 2004 indicated .92% of the birth – 1 population was receiving Part C services nationally.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	.62% of Virginia's birth – one population is receiving Part C services
2006 (2006-2007)	.65% of Virginia's birth – one population is receiving Part C services
2007 (2007-2008)	.70% of Virginia's birth – one population is receiving Part C services

<b>2008</b> (2008-2009)	.77% of Virginia's birth – one population is receiving Part C services
<b>2009</b> (2009-2010)	.87% of Virginia's birth – one population is receiving Part C services
<b>2010</b> (2010-2011)	1.0% of Virginia's birth – one population is receiving Part C services

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

Activity	Timelines	Resources
1. During the process of validating projected numbers of eligible children at the local system level (see activity 1 for the next indicator), analyze data regarding the birth to one population served in each local system as compared to local demographics.	March 2006 – <i>(Completed)</i>	<u>Personnel:</u> State Part C staff
2. Participate in the activities of the Legislative Subcommittee studying follow-up with children who are born prematurely	Ongoing	<u>Personnel:</u> State Part C Staff
3. Continue existing and begin new dialogues, as appropriate, in order to understand the referral process from regional children's hospitals	Began October 2006	<u>Personnel:</u> State Part C staff
4. Explore the possibility of developing interagency agreements between the DMHMRSAS and regional children's hospitals to ensure timely referral of children to Part C early intervention	December 2007	<u>Personnel:</u> State Part C Staff
5. Continue to collaborate with Care Connection and the Virginia Department of Health in ensuring referrals to Part C for potentially eligible infants identified through Virginia's expanded newborn screening (blood test) program for chronic conditions	Ongoing	<u>Personnel:</u> State Part C staff  <u>Other:</u> Care Connection staff
6. Continue to collaborate with Department of Health and	Development underway	<u>Personnel:</u> State Part C staff, Department of Health staff,

Activity	Timelines	Resources
<p>Department of Education on development and statewide implementation of the VISITS data base that automatically refers to Part C all children who are reported with hearing loss.</p>	<p>Implementation date uncertain</p>	<p>Department of Education staff</p> <p><u>Funding:</u> Through Department of Health</p>
<p>7. Collaborate with Early Head Start and Migrant Head Start to identify procedures and strategies to ensure that children served through Head Start programs who are potentially eligible for Part C are referred to the local Part C system and include in the State Interagency Agreement (see below).</p>	<p>April 2007</p>	<p><u>Personnel:</u> State Part C Staff, Head Start staff</p>
<p>8. Revise the State Interagency Agreement for Part C to clarify responsibilities associated with child find and referral to the Part C system.</p>	<p>April 2007</p>	<p><u>Personnel:</u> State Part C staff; Other Participating State Agencies' staff</p>
<p>9. Explore the possibility of establishing local system-specific targets for the percent of birth – 1 population served in the local Part C system</p>	<p>2008</p>	<p><u>Personnel:</u> State Part C staff</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Input from local stakeholders</p>

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

Same as for the first Indicator

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find****Indicator 6 – Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:**

- a. Other states with similar eligibility definitions; and
- b. National data.

**Measurement:**

- a. Percent = # of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs divided by the population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions
- b. Percent = # of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs divided by the population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 times 100 compared to National data.

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

In 2002, Virginia launched a statewide public awareness campaign that continues to be implemented. The campaign includes radio spots, media kits, posters and collateral materials, media lists, and packets of materials with tactics for reaching traditionally underserved populations. Some of the public awareness campaign activities are implemented at the State level, but most are done at the local level using State-provided materials (which are available in English, Spanish and Farsi). New State efforts related to public awareness in 2004 included use of billboards along major state highways; multiple press releases; articles in newsletters such as the *Child Abuse and Prevention Newsletter* and *Virginia Pediatrics* (the newsletter of the Virginia chapter of the American Academy of Pediatrics); and displays at conferences and health fairs.

The percentage of the birth- 3 population being served in Virginia's Part C system (and two year olds served through Part B) has increased from .8% in 1995 to 1.75% in 2003. Despite Virginia's efforts to identify all eligible children and overall increases in the percentage of eligible children being served, the percentage of eligible children identified and referred in Virginia has not yet reached a level comparable to national demographic data as of 2004. The following data analysis efforts are underway in order to effectively increase the percentage of children served:

- o The projected numbers of eligible children reported in the Virginia Cost Study (2004) are being validated at the local system level.
- o ITOTS data indicates that there are a large number of infants and toddlers referred each year that never enter early intervention services (approximately 25% in each of the last 3 years). Reasons for the child not entering services are being analyzed so that child find and public awareness strategies and intake procedures can be adjusted in order to lower the number of children who are referred but do not enter services.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

Percent of infants birth – 3 with IFSPs compared to:	2001	2002	2003	2004
Virginia birth – 3 population	2.07%	1.73%	1.75%	1.79%
Same percent for other States with broad eligibility	2.21% Virginia ranked 18 <sup>th</sup> out of 28 states in this category	2.23% Virginia ranked 19 <sup>th</sup> out of the 28 states in this category	2.32% Virginia ranks 23 <sup>rd</sup> out of 28 states in this category	2.11% Virginia ranks 19 <sup>th</sup> out of 24 states in this category
National data	2.10%	2.16%	2.18%	2.24%

The data in this table is taken from Part C – State Rank tables from OSEP and reflects Section 618 data from December 1 of the stated year.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Virginia's baseline data for FFY 2004 is as follows:

- On December 1, 2004, 1.79% of the birth-3 population in Virginia was receiving Part C early intervention services.
- As a group, states with broad eligibility definitions similar to Virginia's were serving 2.11% of the birth – 3 population.
- National baseline data for December 1, 2004 indicated 2.24% of the birth – 3 population was receiving Part C services nationally.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2005 (2005-2006)	1.9% of Virginia's birth – three population are served in the Part C system
2006 (2006-2007)	2.05% of Virginia's birth – three population are served in the Part C system
2007 (2007-2008)	2.2% of Virginia's birth – three population are served in the Part C system
2008 (2008-2009)	2.45% of Virginia's birth – three population are served in the Part C system
2009 (2009-2010)	2.7% of Virginia's birth – three population are served in the Part C system
2010 (2010-2011)	3.0% of Virginia's birth – three population are served in the Part C system

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activity	Timelines	Resources
<p>1. Develop and implement training related to referral of children affected by child abuse or neglect or substance abuse.</p>	<p>Gather input from local systems on local forms and procedures being used –<b>October 2005</b> (Completed)</p> <p>Determine what, if any, requirements exist in DSS policies related to local DSS workers participating in training on CAPTA – <b>January 2006</b> (Completed)</p> <p>Attend meetings of DSS regional supervisors and present information on early intervention, determine need for additional information and training– <b>March 2006</b> (Completed)</p> <p>Develop statewide referral form with release of information – <b>March 2007</b></p>	<p><u>Personnel:</u> State Part C Staff, Integrated Training Collaborative, State DSS staff, EIIMT</p>
<p>2. Review the existing Virginia Part C Developmental Checklist Brochure and how it is being used to determine whether the brochure needs to be revised</p>	<p>June 2006 (Completed)</p>	<p><u>Personnel:</u> State Part C staff</p> <p><u>Funding:</u> To be determined, if there is a need to revise the brochure</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Input from local stakeholders</p>
<p>3. Provide technical assistance and follow-up to local systems in implementing corrective action plans</p>	<p>Beginning January 2007</p>	<p><u>Personnel:</u> State Part C Staff</p>
<p>4. Collaborate with Early Head Start and Migrant Head Start to identify procedures and strategies to ensure that children served through Head Start programs who are potentially eligible for Part C are referred to the local Part C system and include in the State interagency agreement (see below)</p>	<p>April 2007</p>	<p><u>Personnel:</u> State Part C staff; Head Start staff</p>
<p>5. Revise the State Interagency Agreement for Part C to clarify responsibilities associated with child find and referral to the Part C system.</p>	<p>April 2007</p>	<p><u>Personnel:</u> State Part C staff; Other Participating State Agencies' staff</p>
<p>6. Revise Virginia's ability to pay procedures to establish Family Cost Participation practices that better ensure that a family's inability to pay is not a barrier to</p>	<p>Practices document complete – <b>April 2007</b></p> <p>Statewide training on practices – <b>June 2007</b></p>	<p><u>Personnel:</u> State Part C Staff; national consultants</p> <p><u>Funding:</u> Already in Part C budget</p>

Activity	Timelines	Resources
seeking or accepting supports and services		<u>Other</u> : Stakeholder workgroup
7. Provide training to managed care organizations regarding the supports and services available through the Part C system, the process for making referrals and the key role the managed care case managers play in facilitating access to these supports and services for eligible children and families	May 2007	<u>Personnel</u> – State Part C Staff, DMAS staff
8. Conduct on-site focused monitoring with lowest performing local systems on this indicator	July 2007	<u>Personnel</u> – State Part C Staff
9. Develop new or link to existing evidence-based materials for use with primary referral sources in improving the appropriateness of referrals	July 2007	<u>Personnel</u> – State Part C Staff
10. Add a report function in ITOTS that will list, by referral source, how many referrals were found eligible or not	July 2007	<u>Personnel</u> – State Part C and IT Staff
11. Analyze the findings from on-site focused monitoring and development of CAPs to identify statewide trends and improvement activities necessary to address systemic issues	August 2007	<u>Personnel</u> : State Part C Staff; national consultants
12. Provide guidance to local system managers and providers on considerations in evaluation and assessment, especially related to difficult measure aspects of development, infant mental health issues, premature infants and atypical development	Written guidance developed – <b>June 2007</b> Follow-up technical assistance in regional meetings – <b>July 2007</b>	<u>Personnel</u> : State Part C staff <u>Other</u> : Stakeholder workgroup
13. Provide technical assistance (through written policy clarification, information in the <u>Update</u> and follow-up at regional meetings) on the appropriate use of developmental screening before and after referral to the local Part C system	October 2007	<u>Personnel</u> : State Part C staff <u>Other</u> : Input from local stakeholders

Activity	Timelines	Resources
<p>14. Review and revise, as needed, statewide public awareness materials and practices to ensure appropriateness with traditionally under-served populations (e.g., minorities; low income, rural, homeless, wards of the State)</p>	<p>December 2007</p>	<p><u>Personnel</u> – State Part C Staff, possibly consultant  <u>Funding</u> – To be determined  <u>Other</u> – Stakeholder input</p>
<p>15. Develop a quarterly newsletter to physicians with information about what’s happening in Part C</p>	<p>December 2007</p>	<p><u>Personnel</u> – State Part C Staff  <u>Funding</u> – Pending</p>
<p>16. Revise the existing Virginia Part C Developmental Checklist Brochure</p>	<p>December 2007</p>	<p><u>Personnel</u> – State Part C Staff  <u>Funding</u> – Pending  <u>Other</u> – Stakeholder input</p>
<p>17. Explore the possibility of establishing local system-specific targets for the percent of birth – 1 population served in the local Part C system</p>	<p>December 2007</p>	<p><u>Personnel</u>: State Part C Staff  <u>Other</u>: Input from local stakeholders</p>

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

Same as for the first Indicator

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision / Child Find****Indicator 7 – Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.**

**Measurement: Percent = # of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline divided by # of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed times 100**

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

In response to Virginia's FFY 2002 Annual Performance Report (submitted in March 2004), OSEP found that the Commonwealth was out of compliance for the second year with the requirement to complete an evaluation and assessment and conduct the initial IFSP meeting within 45 days of referral. Data reported in the March 2005 Annual Performance Report indicated that Virginia had still not reached 100% compliance with this requirement but did demonstrate continued improvement.

In order to address non-compliance with the 45-day timeline, the State Lead Agency began conducting quarterly reviews of each local systems' ITOTS (Infant & Toddler Online Tracking System) data related to the timeline. Each quarter the relevant ITOTS reports are generated by the State Lead Agency; and, for each child for whom the timeline was exceeded, the technical assistance consultants review the circumstances with the local system manager. Local systems are required to submit written documentation to confirm the mitigating circumstances.

Based on the results of each quarter's data review, improvement planning and technical assistance have occurred, as follows:

- Based on the first quarterly review of data (for children referred to Part C between August 1, 2004 and October 31, 2004 who were found eligible), local systems that had 1 or more children for whom the 45-day timeline was exceeded for system reasons were cited as out of compliance. These local systems were required to work with their technical assistance consultant to complete a State-developed improvement planning worksheet and submit a plan of improvement to ensure correction of noncompliance by March 31, 2006.
- After the second quarterly review of data (January 1 – March 31, 2005), any local system that was out of compliance for the first time was required to complete the improvement planning worksheet and submit a plan of improvement to the State Lead Agency to ensure correction of noncompliance by March 31, 2006. For those local systems that were out of compliance for the second time, technical assistance consultants reviewed the existing plans of improvement with local system managers and worked to identify needed modifications or additions to the strategies in order to achieve compliance by March 31, 2006.
- Following the third quarterly review of data (April 1 – June 30, 2005), data was also analyzed for each local system for the six-month period from January 1 – June 30, 2005 to identify those local systems in need of more extensive support in addressing barriers to compliance. For these local systems, the technical assistance consultant, monitoring consultant and the State Part C Coordinator met with the local system manager and his/her supervisor to identify continuing local barriers to compliance and determine how the State can best assist the local system to overcome the barriers and achieve compliance no later than March 31, 2006. Please see "Discussion of Baseline Data" for more specific information about the findings from these on-site visits. Those local systems that are out of compliance but did not fall into the targeted group are receiving continued technical assistance in implementing, modifying, and/or adding strategies to their local plans of improvement to ensure correction of noncompliance by March 31, 2006.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

45-day Timeline Data

From State Data System (ITOTS)

1/1/05 – 6/30/05

	1/1/05 – 3/31/05	4/1/05 – 6/30/05	Total for 1/1/05 – 6/30/05
# eligible infants and toddlers referred	1,115	1,033	2,148
# for whom evaluation and assessment and initial IFSP meeting were held within 45-day timeline	1,052	947	1,999
% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom evaluation and assessment and initial IFSP meeting were held within 45-day timeline	94%	92%	93%
# of local systems out of compliance	16/40	13/40	20/40

This baseline information reflects data from ITOTS for all 40 local systems in Virginia.

Note: The baseline data reflects less than the full 2004 federal fiscal year because procedures to validate mitigating circumstances data reported through ITOTS and, thereby, confirm the accuracy of the ITOTS data regarding compliance with this indicator were fully implemented for children referred on or after January 1, 2005.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Virginia's baseline data indicates that 93% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs (who were referred to the Part C system between January 1 and June 30, 2005) received an evaluation, assessment and initial IFSP meeting within Part C's 45-day timeline.

Of the 149 eligible children for whom the 45-day timeline was exceeded (due to system reasons) between January 1 and June 30, 2005, 40% are from two local systems. Six local systems, together, account for 75% of the children who exceeded the timeline for system reasons. Specifically, untimely evaluations/IFSP meetings are accounted for by 20 of the 40 local systems, as follows:

Local system 1:	36 children for whom the 45-day timeline was met/ 37 children = 97%
Local system 2:	85 / 87 = 98%
Local system 3:	147 / 183 = 80%
Local system 4:	88 / 91 = 97%
Local system 5:	100 / 102 = 98%
Local system 6:	67 / 68 = 99%
Local system 7:	14 / 16 = 88%
Local system 8:	50 / 52 = 96%
Local system 9:	23 / 36 = 64%
Local system 10:	6 / 7 = 86%
Local system 11:	22 / 37 = 59%
Local system 12:	10 / 13 = 77%

Local system 13:	19 / 20 = 95%
Local system 14:	82 / 93 = 88%
Local system 15:	117 / 121 = 97%
Local system 16:	7 / 30 = 23%
Local system 17:	117 / 141 = 83%
Local system 18:	104 / 105 = 99%
Local system 19:	60 / 63 = 95%
Local system 20:	60 / 61 = 98%
	<u>1,214 / 1,363 = 89% compliant</u>

Five (5) of the six local systems that accounted for 75% of the children who exceeded the timeline for system reasons were targeted for intensive technical assistance, as described in the “Overview” section above. The sixth system was not placed in the targeted group because they had improved from exceeding the timeline for 12 children in January – March to exceeding the timeline for only one child in April – June. The following barriers to compliance and steps to address those barriers were identified during on-site visits with the 5 targeted systems:

- **Provider shortages** – In all 5 local systems, provider shortages were a primary barrier to meeting the 45-day timeline. Four of the five local systems had experienced large increases in the number of referrals, and measures taken to address these increases could not be sustained when the increased number of referrals was not temporary. All five systems have added or are in the process of adding staff positions to address the issue. Contracts have been expanded with existing providers, new staff positions have been established and/or existing staffing patterns have been re-structured in order to increase local capacity for service coordination and evaluation/assessment. For one system, there have been difficulties in hiring due to local government procedures, and the State Lead Agency is working with the local lead agency to provide additional documentation of Part C compliance requirements to support local efforts to add staff positions. In addition, the State Lead Agency is exploring with the local lead agency possible revisions to the local Part C budget in order to address provider shortages.
- **Delays in initial contact with families, obtaining paperwork/physician orders** – In 3 of the 5 local systems, delays in the intake process were contributing to difficulties in meeting the 45-day timeline. All 3 local systems have made or are in the process of making changes to local procedures and/or providing training to local providers to ensure timely contact with the family following referral and timely receipt of necessary paperwork.
- **Inadequate documentation** – For one local system, documentation in the child’s record was not adequate to verify the reasons that the 45-day timeline was exceeded. Staff training and additional oversight by the local system manager have been implemented to address this issue.

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Measurable and Rigorous Target</b>
<b>2005 (2005-2006)</b>	100% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs receive an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting within Part C’s 45-day timeline
<b>2006 (2006-2007)</b>	100% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs receive an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting within Part C’s 45-day timeline
<b>2007 (2007-2008)</b>	100% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs receive an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting within Part C’s 45-day timeline
<b>2008</b>	100% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs receive an evaluation and assessment and an

(2008-2009)	initial IFSP meeting within Part C's 45-day timeline
<b>2009</b> (2009-2010)	100% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs receive an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting within Part C's 45-day timeline
<b>2010</b> (2010-2011)	100% of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs receive an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting within Part C's 45-day timeline

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

Activity	Timelines	Resources
1. Continue to generate and review ITOTS reports quarterly for each local system. At the end of each quarter, the data for the quarter and for the period July 1, 2005 through the end of the most recent quarter will be reviewed.	Reports generated on: December 1, 2005 March 1, 2006 June 1, 2006 September 1, 2006  (Completed)	<u>Personnel</u> : State Part C staff
2. At the end of each quarterly review, notify local systems of noncompliance based on data from July 1, 2005 through the end of the most recent quarter.	January 15, 2006 April 1, 2006 July 1, 2006 October 1, 2006  (Completed)	<u>Personnel</u> : State Part C staff
3. Continue to provide technical assistance to local systems based on local corrective action plans developed to address noncompliance with the 45-day timeline, including evaluation and assessment requirements.	Ongoing	<u>Personnel</u> : State Part C staff  <u>Funding</u> : Already in Part C budget
4. Continue service coordination training through Kaleidoscope	Ongoing	<u>Personnel</u> – Part C staff; Integrated Training Collaborative <u>Funding</u> – Already in Part C Budget
5. For those local systems with existing plans of improvement that continue to exceed the timeline for the highest numbers of children, provide more intensive technical assistance involving administrators at higher levels of the State and local lead agencies.	October 2005 – (Completed)	<u>Personnel</u> : State Part C staff  <u>Funding</u> : Already in Part C budget
6. Review and revise, as needed, the Policy Clarification and	October 2007	<u>Personnel</u> : State Part C Staff

**SPP Template – Part C (3)**

Virginia – amended February 2007

State

Activity	Timelines	Resources
<p><i>Technical Assistance on the Implementation of Requirements for Vision and Hearing Components of the Part C Evaluation and Assessment to clarify circumstances under which the use of the Virginia screening tools is not required</i></p>		

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

Same as for the first Indicator

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition**

**Indicator 8 – Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child’s transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:**

- a. IFSPs with transition steps and services;
- b. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and
- c. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

**Measurement:**

- a. Percent = # of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services divided by # of children exiting Part C times 100
- b. Percent = # of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to LEA occurred divided by # of children exiting Part C times 100
- c. Percent = # of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred divided by # of children exiting Part C times 100

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

A transition planning component is included on the statewide Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) form, which must be used by all Part C providers. The statewide IFSP form identifies 8 activities that must take place when planning for transition, and transition planning is expected to begin for every family with the initial IFSP. The Part C service coordinator or designee is responsible for notifying the local school division of children residing in the community who are potentially eligible for Part B services. Parents are informed in writing through the IFSP transition page that the locality intends to notify the public school division in which the child resides of the child's name, address, telephone number and birth date prior to the child reaching the age of eligibility for Part B. Unless the parent indicates in writing on the IFSP transition page that they do not want the information transmitted, it is forwarded to the school division. With the family's permission, an individual transition planning conference between the family, Part C representatives and LEA representatives is held at least 90 days before the child's third birthday or the date on which the child is eligible under Part B.

Chart reviews completed by state review teams in 2004 indicate significant improvement in transition planning over previous years. However, that same chart review data and MIMS (Monitoring and Improvement Measurement System) self-assessment information clearly indicate that transition in general remains an area needing improvement in Virginia. Data also indicate that there may be systemic non-compliance with the 90-day transition conference requirement.

Chart Review Data	2000 MIMS (17 sites)	MIMS '01- '03 (13 sites)	MIMS '03-'05 (4 sites)
% of charts in which IFSP includes transition planning	73%	85%	95%
% of charts in which child's record indicates that the 90-day transition planning conference has taken place	38%	20%	52%

In order to address these transition planning issues, Virginia made the following efforts in 2004:

- Any MIMS site not providing a 90-day conference for families transitioning to Part B, on a consistent basis, was required to address this issue in their local plan of improvement.
- Technical assistance and training were provided at the local and regional level based on local/regional needs as identified through monitoring and supervision activities or by local Part C systems.

- Sample IFSPs were developed and disseminated to local Part C systems and providers in July 2004. Each sample IFSP includes a transition plan with individualized activities, and one includes planning for the 90-day transition conference.
- Part B staff provided training to all local school divisions about Part B requirements associated with children transitioning from Part C to Part B. In February and March 2005, State Part B staff provided information related to transition between Part C and Part B to all local Special Education Directors through regional forums throughout the Commonwealth. The information provided included requirements for Part B participation in the 90-day transition conference.
- Localities were encouraged to implement a local record review process using a checklist provided by the State Lead Agency. This checklist prompts the locality to monitor their own compliance by checking each IFSP to ensure that transition planning activities are included and each chart to be sure the 90-day conference has taken place when appropriate.

#### Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):

Because so few local systems had completed the MIMS process in FFY 2004 and because there appeared to be systemic noncompliance with the 90-day transition conference, the State Lead Agency required all 40 local systems to complete a record review in July 2005 as part of the State Monitoring System to determine statewide compliance with this indicator. Each local Part C system followed the same method for selecting records for the review, as follows:

- The number of records to be reviewed was based on the number of children who had exited or would exit the local Part C system between September 1, 2004 and September 30, 2005:
  - <50 children, select 50% of records (not less than 10 records)
  - 50 – 99 children, select 25% of records
  - 100 – 199 children, select 15% of records
  - 200 – 499 children, select 10% of records
  - 500 or more children, select not more than 60 records
- Once the number of records was determined, the exact records to be reviewed were selected based on a random number chart.

Data from these record reviews from all 40 local systems provided the following baseline data related to transition:

- a. Percent of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services  
The records of 730 children who had or would be exiting the Part C system between September 1, 2004 and September 30, 2005 were reviewed. Of those, 612 children had IFSPs with transition steps and services.  
  
(612 with steps and services / 730 exiting) x 100 = 84%
- b. Percent of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred  
The records of 730 children who had or would be exiting the Part C system between September 1, 2004 and September 30, 2005 were reviewed (Virginia's policies and procedures require that notification be sent to the LEA for all families exiting Part C, not just those potentially eligible for Part B, unless the parent indicates in writing that they do not want the notification sent). Of those, 307 families indicated in writing on the IFSP that they did not want notification sent to the LEA. For the remaining 423 children (those whose families did allow notification to the LEA), 342 of the records included documentation confirming that the notification was sent to the LEA.  
  
(343 with documented notification / 423 exiting who allowed notification) x 100 = 81%
- c. Percent of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred  
The records of 374 children who were potentially eligible for Part B were reviewed. Of these 374 children, there were 164 whose parents consented to the transition conference. The records of these 164 children indicated that for 84 of the children the transition conference was held in a timely manner and with all required participants (i.e., family, Part C representative, Part B representative).  
  
(84 with timely conference / 164 with permission for conference) x 100 = 51%

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

- a. Percent of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services = 84%

The 16% of children whose IFSPs did not include transition steps and services are accounted for by 19 local systems, as follows:

Local system 1: 12 children whose IFSP included transition steps/ 19 children exiting = 63%

Local system 2: 13 / 22 = 59%

Local system 3: 20 / 21 = 95%

Local system 4: 3 / 4 = 75%

Local system 5: 13 / 17 = 76%

Local system 6: 14 / 15 = 93%

Local system 7: 12 / 22 = 55%

Local system 8: 0 / 4 = 0%

Local system 9: 21 / 45 = 47%

Local system 10: 22 / 23 = 96%

Local system 11: 16 / 23 = 70%

Local system 12: 16 / 20 = 80%

Local system 13: 18 / 24 = 75%

Local system 14: 15 / 18 = 83%

Local system 15: 16 / 17 = 94%

Local system 16: 2 / 18 = 11%

Local system 17: 4 / 17 = 24%

Local system 18: 8 / 13 = 62%

Local system 19: 14 / 15 = 93%

239 / 357 = 67% compliant

- b. Percent of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred = 81%

The 19% of children for whom notification was not sent is accounted for by 29 local systems. The record review form completed by local systems required that the record include documentation confirming that the notification was sent to the LEA (e.g., copy of the notification with fax date, etc.). Information on the record review forms indicated that notification may have actually been sent as required, but that documentation to confirm that notification was absent. When there was no documentation listed to confirm that notification was sent, the local system was not given "credit" for completing the notification.

- c. Percent of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred = 51%

The 49% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B, whose parents gave permission for the transition conference but who did not receive a transition conference in accordance with Part C requirements are accounted for as follows:

- Record review forms from 11 of 40 local systems included no children who were potentially eligible for Part B whose parents gave permission for the transition conference.
- Of the remaining 19 local systems, only 2 were 100% in compliance with this indicator. Local compliance for the other 17 systems ranged from 0% to 83%.
- Of the 80 children whose parents gave consent for the 90-day transition conference but the conference was not held in compliance with Part C requirements, 17 children (21%) received a transition planning conference that was held outside of the required timelines due to either Part C or Part B staff scheduling difficulties. Records for thirty-three of the 80 children (41%) indicated that a transition planning conference was held but did not include documentation that all required participants were present.

To better measure progress since the FFY 2003 APR was submitted in March 2005, the record review data described above was narrowed down to analyze statewide status based on children whose most recent IFSPs were developed on or after January 1, 2005 (i.e., those children who had transitioned more recently). There were 200 transition records reviewed that fit into this timeline. Of those 200 records, 114 were for children transitioning to Part B. Thirty-eight (38) parents gave consent for the transition conference, and records indicated that 27 of those children and families received a 90-day transition planning conference that met Part C requirements. Therefore, the review of records for children who transitioned more recently shows that 71% of those who consented to a transition conference received one. Although the sample size is smaller, these record review results suggest continued progress toward compliance with the transition planning conference requirements.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<p><b>2005</b> (2005-2006)</p>	<p>100% of children exiting Part C have IFSPs with transition steps and services.</p> <p>Notification to the LEA occurs for 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B unless the parent indicates in writing on the IFSP that they do not want the information sent</p> <p>The transition conference occurs for 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B whose parents consent to the conference.</p>
<p><b>2006</b> (2006-2007)</p>	<p>100% of children exiting Part C have IFSPs with transition steps and services.</p> <p>Notification to the LEA occurs for 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B unless the parent indicates in writing on the IFSP that they do not want the information sent</p> <p>The transition conference occurs for 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B whose parents consent to the conference.</p>
<p><b>2007</b> (2007-2008)</p>	<p>100% of children exiting Part C have IFSPs with transition steps and services.</p> <p>Notification to the LEA occurs for 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B unless the parent indicates in writing on the IFSP that they do not want the information sent</p> <p>The transition conference occurs for 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B whose parents consent to the conference.</p>
<p><b>2008</b> (2008-2009)</p>	<p>100% of children exiting Part C have IFSPs with transition steps and services.</p> <p>Notification to the LEA occurs for 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B unless the parent indicates in writing on the IFSP that they do not want the information sent</p> <p>The transition conference occurs for 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B whose parents consent to the conference.</p>
<p><b>2009</b> (2009-2010)</p>	<p>100% of children exiting Part C have IFSPs with transition steps and services.</p> <p>Notification to the LEA occurs for 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B unless the parent indicates in writing on the IFSP that they do not want the information sent</p> <p>The transition conference occurs for 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B whose parents consent to the conference.</p>
<p><b>2010</b> (2010-2011)</p>	<p>100% of children exiting Part C have IFSPs with transition steps and services.</p> <p>Notification to the LEA occurs for 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B unless the parent indicates in writing on the IFSP that they do not want the information sent</p> <p>The transition conference occurs for 100% of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B whose parents consent to the conference.</p>

Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:

Activity	Timelines	Resources
<p>1. During the re-design of the State's Part C data system (see Indicator 14, activity 1) explore inclusion of data elements and functions that will (a) remind local systems about required timelines and participants for the 90-day transition conference, notification to LEAs, and transition activities; and (2) allow for ongoing, timely monitoring for compliance with these requirements at the local and State levels.</p>	<p>Starting <b>October 2005</b> <i>(Completed)</i></p> <p>Projected completion date <b>to be determined</b> – see Indicator 14, Activity 1</p>	<p><u>Personnel</u>: State Part C staff, Part C Data Analyst</p> <p><u>Funding</u>: Already in Part C budget</p> <p><u>Other</u>: Input from local stakeholders</p>
<p>2. Gather information from local system managers during regional meetings about how transition is done in each local system and any barriers to meeting Part C requirements related to transition.</p>	<p>January 2006 <i>(Completed)</i></p>	<p><u>Personnel</u>: State Part C staff</p>
<p>3. Conduct meetings with service coordinators to get their perspective on how transition is done in the local system and any barriers to meeting Part C requirements related to transition.</p>	<p>February 2006 <i>(Completed)</i></p>	<p><u>Personnel</u>: State Part C staff</p>
<p>4. Use the information gathered in activities 2 and 3 to determine additional activities that can be implemented to address barriers from the Part C side of transition and share with State Part B staff any issues identified that need to be addressed collaboratively or directly from the Department of Education to LEAs.</p>	<p>March 2006 <i>(Completed)</i></p>	<p><u>Personnel</u>: State Part C staff</p> <p><u>Funding</u>: To be determined based on issues identified</p>
<p>5. Refine the annual record review protocol used to collect data on transition in order to clarify definitions of terms and ensure that items on the protocol match the data required for reporting in the APR</p>	<p>Protocol revised – <b>April 2006</b> <i>(Completed)</i></p> <p>Annual implementation begins – <b>August 2006</b> <i>(Completed)</i></p>	<p><u>Personnel</u>: State Part C staff</p> <p><u>Other</u>: Input from local system managers</p>
<p>6. Review the transition component of Kaleidoscope (K-I) service coordinator training and revise or expand as needed to address</p>	<p>September 2006 <i>(Completed)</i></p>	<p><u>Personnel</u>: State Part C staff, Integrated Training Collaborative</p>

Activity	Timelines	Resources
issues related to compliance with Part C transition requirements		<u>Funding</u> : To be determined based on needed revisions
7. Identify a state-level Part C contact person for problem-solving when transition issues arise between Part C and Part B and request that Part B do the same	March 2007	<u>Personnel</u> – State Part C and Part B Staff
8. Identify parent advocates that are available in communities to support families when the transition process becomes stalled or difficult	March 2007	<u>Personnel</u> – State Part C Staff, Family Involvement Project Staff
9. Conduct a careful review of Virginia’s Policies and Procedures for transition and revise as needed to address new language in IDEA 2004 and to facilitate compliance with Part C transition requirements	April 2007	<u>Personnel</u> – State Part C Staff
10. Revise the State Interagency Agreement for Part C to establish specific procedures to be used at the local level to meet Part C transition requirements	April 2007	<u>Personnel</u> : State Part C staff; Other Participating State Agencies' staff
11. Collaborate with T-TACs to provide local technical assistance and training around transition issues	May 2007	<u>Personnel</u> – State Part C Staff, T-TAC Staff
12. Revise the statewide IFSP form transition page and other sections of the IFSP form, as needed, to prompt consistent inclusion of desired information and to support the service coordinator in meeting timelines. Revise IFSP instructions and sample IFSPs accordingly	June 2007	<u>Personnel</u> – State Part C Staff  <u>Other</u> – Local stakeholder input
13. Conduct on-site focused monitoring with lowest performing local systems on this indicator	June 2007	<u>Personnel</u> – State Part C Staff
14. Begin a transition column in the Part C Update to highlight/share effective local transition practices	June 2007	<u>Personnel</u> – State Part C Staff

**SPP Template – Part C (3)**

Activity	Timelines	Resources
15. <a href="#">Develop and disseminate to local Part C systems and LEAs a series of monthly topic papers related to transition in collaboration with DOE</a>	September 2007	<u>Personnel</u> –State Part C and Part B Staff <u>Other</u> - Stakeholder input
16. Explore development of web-based training on transition that would be accessible to all Part C service providers	2008	<u>Personnel</u> : State Part C staff, Integrated Training Collaborative  <u>Funding</u> : To be determined

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

Same as for the first Indicator

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

**Indicator 9 – 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.**

**Measurement:**

**a. Percent of noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:**

- i. # of findings of noncompliance made related to priority areas
- ii. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification

**Percent = ii divided by i times 100**

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

**b. Percent of noncompliance related to areas not included in the above monitoring priority areas and indicators corrected within one year of identification:**

- i. # of findings of noncompliance made related to such areas
- ii. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification

**Percent = ii divided by i times 100**

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

**c. Percent of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms (complaints, local performance plans or annual performance reports, data reviews, desk audits, etc.) corrected within one year of identification:**

- i. # of EIS programs in which noncompliance was identified through other mechanisms;
- ii. # of findings of noncompliance made
- iii. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification

**Percent = iii divided by ii times 100**

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

Virginia's general supervision system for Part C includes several components:

- the Local Contract for Continuing Participation in Part C, which specifies the scope of work, deliverables and compliance requirements for local lead agencies;
- the Monitoring and Improvement Measurement System (MIMS), a cyclical self-assessment and state review process;
- the Infant and Toddler Online Tracking System (ITOTS), the State's Part C data system;
- a Family Survey;
- a system of technical assistance; and

- a system for dispute resolution.

During an April 2005 verification visit to the Commonwealth, OSEP representatives determined that Virginia has a monitoring system that is reasonably designed to identify, and has identified, noncompliance across the range of Part C requirements and Part C service providers. However, OSEP also determined that Virginia’s supervision system does not ensure correction of State-identified noncompliance within a reasonable period of time, not to exceed one year from the time an improvement plan is approved. In particular, OSEP noted that State monitoring reports do not specify areas of noncompliance that the local lead agency must correct, there is no formal process for approving local improvement plans, there are no systematic procedures for determining whether a local lead agency has corrected noncompliance, and the State has never imposed any sanctions if a local lead agency did not correct noncompliance. In August 2005, the State Lead Agency submitted to OSEP a plan of improvement to address these issues.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

- a. Noncompliance related to monitoring priority areas and indicators:  
 The only indicator for which findings were made in FFY 2004\* was #7 (45-day timeline). All 40 local systems were monitored for compliance with this requirement through ITOTS data review.
  - There were 20 findings of noncompliance related to the 45-day timeline.
  - The percent of the noncompliance corrected for this indicator cannot be determined since the deadline for correction has not been reached yet.
- b. Noncompliance related to areas not included in monitoring priorities and indicators:  
 In FFY 2004\* Virginia monitored all 40 local systems through record reviews for compliance with the Part C requirement that each child’s IFSP documents the frequency and intensity for each needed early intervention service listed on the IFSP.
  - There were 32 findings of noncompliance with the requirement to document frequency and intensity for each needed early intervention service on the IFSP
  - The percent of the noncompliance corrected for this indicator cannot be determined since the deadline for correction has not been reached yet
- c. Noncompliance identified through other mechanisms  
 In FFY 2004 Virginia received two administrative complaints and one request for mediation. One of the administrative complaints and the mediation involved the same local system and the same issue.
  - Noncompliance was identified in 2 local systems based on other mechanisms (complaints, mediation)
  - There were 2 findings of noncompliance made: 1 finding in 1 local system related to provision of early intervention services in accordance with the frequency specified on the IFSP and 1 finding in 1 system related to use of procedural safeguards forms
  - 2 corrections were made as soon as possible and within one year from identification of the noncompliance
  - 2/2 = 100% of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms was corrected within one year of identification

\* Since only those monitoring reports developed after OSEP’s April verification visit to Virginia have specifically identified areas of noncompliance and timelines for correction, the baseline data for (a) and (b) only reflect findings as of May 1, 2005.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Virginia’s baseline data for FFY 2004 is as follows:

- a. Percent of noncompliance related to monitoring priorities and indicators that has been corrected cannot be calculated since the deadline for correction has not been reached
- b. Percent of noncompliance not related to monitoring priorities and indicators that has been corrected cannot be calculated since the deadline for correction has not been reached
- c. 100% of noncompliance identified through other mechanisms (e.g., complaints, mediation) has been corrected within one year.

<b>FFY</b>	<b>Measurable and Rigorous Target</b>
------------	---------------------------------------

<b>2005</b> (2005-2006)	100% of identified noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible and in no case later than 1 year from identification
<b>2006</b> (2006-2007)	100% of identified noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible and in no case later than 1 year from identification
<b>2007</b> (2007-2008)	100% of identified noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible and in no case later than 1 year from identification
<b>2008</b> (2008-2009)	100% of identified noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible and in no case later than 1 year from identification
<b>2009</b> (2009-2010)	100% of identified noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible and in no case later than 1 year from identification
<b>2010</b> (2010-2011)	100% of identified noncompliance is corrected as soon as possible and in no case later than 1 year from identification

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Resources</b>
1. Develop and implement procedures to ensure that all monitoring reports resulting from any State monitoring activity (including, but not limited to, MIMS, complaint investigations, review of ITOTS data and record reviews) specify any areas of noncompliance that the local lead agency must correct, as well as the required timelines for correction.	October 2005 <i>(Completed)</i>	<u>Personnel</u> : State Part C staff
2. Develop and implement procedures to ensure that all local plans of improvement that must be developed as a result of State monitoring activities are approved by the Part C Office prior to local implementation of the plan.	October 2005 <i>(Completed)</i>	<u>Personnel</u> : State Part C staff
3. Establish effective sanctions and use when necessary to correct local noncompliance that persists for more than one year.	Establish range of sanctions – <b>April 2006</b> <i>(Completed)</i>  Explore development and implementation of incentives for achieving and/or continuing compliance – <b>April 2006</b> <i>(Completed)</i>	<u>Personnel</u> : State Part C staff, State Monitoring Task Force  <u>Other</u> : Information from other States, technical assistance from experts

Activity	Timelines	Resources
	Include sanctions (and any incentives) in SFY-07 Local Contract for Continuing Participation in Part C – <b>June 2006</b> <i>(Completed)</i>  Establish procedures to evaluate effectiveness of sanctions – <b>September 2006</b> <i>(Completed)</i>	
4. Develop and implement procedures for the Part C Office to use in determining, for every local lead agency with a plan of improvement, whether the local lead agency has corrected non-compliance no later than one year after that local plan of improvement was approved by the Part C Office.	August 2006 <i>(Completed)</i>	<u>Personnel:</u> State Part C Staff  <u>Funding:</u> Already in Part C budget
5. Conduct training and follow-up technical assistance on the collection and use of data for ongoing local oversight and monitoring as well as improvement planning	Training: <b>January – February 2007</b> TA: <b>Ongoing</b>	<u>Personnel:</u> State Part C and IT Staff  <u>Funding:</u> Already in Part C Budget
6. Provide technical assistance and follow-up to local systems on the implementation of corrective action plans	Beginning January 2007	<u>Personnel:</u> State Part C Staff
7. Finalize the format and process for annual public reporting on each local system	February 2007	<u>Personnel:</u> State Part C Staff
8. Implement the process for making an annual determination about the status of each local system	Within 60 days of state determinations being issued by OSEP  <b>Estimated Spring 2007</b>	<u>Personnel</u> – State Part C Staff
9. Conduct on-site focused monitoring visits with the lowest performing local systems in each of the annual focus areas identified	June 2007	<u>Personnel:</u> State Part C Staff
10. Conduct statewide training for local system managers on oversight and management of the local Part C system to both prevent and correct noncompliance	June 2007	<u>Personnel</u> – State Part C Staff; Integrated Training Collaborative  <u>Funding</u> – Already in Part C Budget

Activity	Timelines	Resources
11. Hire additional Part C monitoring staff at the State Lead Agency in order to implement the increased level of supervision and monitoring established in Virginia's revised Part C Policies and Procedures	July 2007	<u>Funding:</u> Already in Part C Budget

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

Same as for the first Indicator

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

**Indicator 10 – Percent of signed written complaints resolved within 60-day timeline, including a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.**

**Measurement: See rows in Attachment 1. Percent = (1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by (1.1) times 100**

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

When disputes arise, local systems are encouraged to resolve those disputes locally using informal mechanisms. Virginia's Part C Family Involvement Program (FIP) is also available and used by families to assist in resolving disputes informally. When disputes cannot be successfully resolved at the local level, a signed written complaint may be submitted to the State Lead Agency. State staff members work closely with local systems and families within the first 10 days after receipt of a complaint to determine whether an informal resolution can be reached. In most cases, the local system and family are able to reach a mutually acceptable resolution in the first 10 days, and the complaint is withdrawn by the family.

If the complaint cannot be resolved within the first 10 days, an investigation is completed by the State Lead Agency. Following the investigation of each complaint, issues identified in the complaint are addressed through a "Findings Report." The "Findings Report" outlines each alleged violation and states the findings of facts related to the violation; whether the finding is "founded" or "unfounded." The report also includes the conclusion that is reached and the reason for this conclusion, citing applicable regulations and law as appropriate. The final part of the report outlines the procedure for implementation of the final decision. For other issues identified through the investigation but not identified in the complaint, a separate report is sent to the locality with a Plan of Improvement designed to correct the deficiencies.

Since 1994, Virginia has received 13 signed written complaints (eight were withdrawn). All complaints were resolved within the 60-day timeline or beyond the 60-day timeline with exceptional circumstances and parent agreement. As noted in OSEP's letter following an April 2005 verification visit to Virginia, State Lead Agency staff have provided extensive follow-up with local systems involved in administrative complaints in order to ensure implementation of corrective actions that the State has required in those complaint decisions.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

As indicated on Attachment 1, 100% of signed written complaints received between July 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005 were resolved with reports issued within the 60-day timeline, including a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances.

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

$$((1 \text{ within timeline} + 1 \text{ within extended timeline}) / 2 \text{ complaints}) \times 100$$

$2/2 \times 100 = 100\%$

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Virginia's baseline data for FFY 2004 is 100%.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2005</b> (2005-2006)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued are resolved within 60 days or within a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint
<b>2006</b> (2006-2007)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued are resolved within 60 days or within a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint
<b>2007</b> (2007-2008)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued are resolved within 60 days or within a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint
<b>2008</b> (2008-2009)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued are resolved within 60 days or within a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint
<b>2009</b> (2009-2010)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued are resolved within 60 days or within a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint
<b>2010</b> (2010-2011)	100% of signed written complaints with reports issued are resolved within 60 days or within a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

Activity	Timelines	Resources
In collaboration with the Family Involvement Project, develop a dispute resolution handbook with information about the three formal ways of resolving disputes in Virginia (administrative complaint, mediation, due process hearing), for use by service providers and families	2008	<u>Personnel:</u> State Part C staff, Family Involvement Project
Develop and implement a mechanism to collect data on the number of potential complaints that are resolved informally through the efforts of the Part C Office or the Family Involvement Project.	2008	<u>Personnel:</u> State Part C staff, Family Involvement Project

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

Same as for the first Indicator

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

**Indicator 11 – Percent of due process hearing requests fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.**

**Measurement: Percent = (3.2.(a) + 3.2.(b)) divided by (3.2) times 100**

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

When disputes arise, local systems are encouraged to resolve those disputes locally using informal mechanisms. Virginia’s Part C Family Involvement Program (FIP) is also available and used by families to assist in resolving disputes informally. If a dispute relating to the identification, evaluation or placement of the child, or provision of appropriate early intervention services cannot be successfully resolved at the local level, the family may request a due process hearing. A due process hearing is completed and a written decision is mailed to all parties within 30 days of receipt by the State Lead Agency of the request for the due process hearing. Upon receipt of a request for a due process hearing, the State Lead Agency notifies the local lead agency about the request and ensures appointment of a hearing officer within 5 days. Following the hearing and written decision, the State Lead Agency is also responsible for contacting the local system to check on the implementation of the hearing officer’s decision.

To date, Virginia has received only 1 request for a due process hearing, and that request was withdrawn because the disagreement was subsequently resolved informally.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

There were no requests for a due process hearing in FFY 2004.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

There were no requests for a due process hearing in FFY 2004.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2005 (2005-2006)</b>	100% of due process hearing requests are fully adjudicated within the applicable timelines
<b>2006 (2006-2007)</b>	100% of due process hearing requests are fully adjudicated within the applicable timelines
<b>2007 (2007-2008)</b>	100% of due process hearing requests are fully adjudicated within the applicable timelines
<b>2008 (2008-2009)</b>	100% of due process hearing requests are fully adjudicated within the applicable timelines
<b>2009 (2009-2010)</b>	100% of due process hearing requests are fully adjudicated within the applicable timelines

<p><b>2010</b> (2010-2011)</p>	<p>100% of due process hearing requests are fully adjudicated within the applicable timelines</p>
------------------------------------	---

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

Activity	Timelines	Resources
<p>In collaboration with the Family Involvement Project, develop a dispute resolution handbook with information about the three formal ways of resolving disputes in Virginia (administrative complaint, mediation, due process hearing), for use by service providers and families</p>	<p>2008</p>	<p><u>Personnel</u>: State Part C staff, Family Involvement Project</p>
<p>Develop and implement a mechanism to collect data on the number of potential complaints that are resolved informally through the efforts of the Part C Office or the Family Involvement Project.</p>	<p>2008</p>	<p><u>Personnel</u>: State Part C staff, Family Involvement Project</p>

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

Same as for the first Indicator

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

**Indicator 12 – Percent of hearing requests resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).**

**Measurement: Percent = 3.1(a) divided by (3.1) times 100**

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

Virginia has not adopted Part B due process procedures

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

N/A

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

N/A

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2005</b> (2005-2006)	N/A
<b>2006</b> (2006-2007)	N/A
<b>2007</b> (2007-2008)	N/A
<b>2008</b> (2008-2009)	N/A
<b>2009</b> (2009-2010)	N/A
<b>2010</b> (2010-2011)	N/A

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:** N/A

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

Same as for the first Indicator

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

**Indicator 13 – Percent of mediations resulting in mediation agreements.**

**Measurement: Percent = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by (2.1) times 100**

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

Local systems are encouraged to resolve disputes locally using informal mechanisms. Virginia’s Part C Family Involvement Program (FIP) is also available and used by families to assist in resolving disputes informally. If a dispute relating to the identification, evaluation or placement of the child, or provision of appropriate early intervention services cannot be successfully resolved at the local level, the family may request mediation (either alone or simultaneously with a due process hearing). The purpose of mediation is to facilitate the resolution of a family-provider disagreement in an informal, non-adversarial atmosphere. It offers an opportunity to resolve differences either before entering or during a hearing process.

Both parties to the dispute must agree to participate in mediation. Once the State Lead Agency is notified that both parties agree to mediation, the State Lead Agency appoints a mediator within 5 days. Mediation is conducted by a qualified and impartial mediator who is trained in effective mediation techniques and on Part C requirements. The mediation, including a written mediation agreement reflecting agreements reached by the parties to the dispute, must be completed within 15 calendar days of the receipt by the State Lead Agency of the notice that both parties agreed to mediation. If resolution is not reached within 15 days, parents must be informed in writing of the right to a due process hearing.

To date, Virginia has received 2 requests for mediation. Both were resolved within the 15-day timeline, except when the timeline was extended at parent request, and both resulted in mediation agreements that were implemented in a timely manner.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

As indicated on Attachment 1, 100% of mediations between July 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005 resulted in mediation agreements.

$$\text{Percent} = (2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) \text{ divided by } (2.1) \text{ times } 100$$

$$((0 \text{ mediation agreements related to due process} + 1 \text{ not related to due process}) / 1 \text{ agreement}) \times 100$$

$$1/1 \times 100 = 100\%$$

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

Virginia’s baseline data for FFY 2004 is 100%. Because Virginia has had so few mediation requests, it is difficult to predict the percentage that will result in agreements in future years. One would not expect all mediations to result in agreements, and failure to reach a mediation agreement does not necessarily imply a negative outcome.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2005</b> (2005-2006)	N/A until the number of mediations requested totals 10 or more
<b>2006</b> (2006-2007)	N/A until the number of mediations requested totals 10 or more

<p><b>2007</b> (2007-2008)</p>	<p>N/A until the number of mediations requested totals 10 or more</p>
<p><b>2008</b> (2008-2009)</p>	<p>N/A until the number of mediations requested totals 10 or more</p>
<p><b>2009</b> (2009-2010)</p>	<p>N/A until the number of mediations requested totals 10 or more</p>
<p><b>2010</b> (2010-2011)</p>	<p>N/A until the number of mediations requested totals 10 or more</p>

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

No improvement activities are required until the number of mediations requested totals 10 or more in a reporting period.

**Overview of the State Performance Plan Development:**

Same as for the first Indicator

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

**Indicator 14 – State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.**

**Measurement: Appropriate State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:**

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, settings and November 1 for exiting, personnel, dispute resolution); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring accuracy).

**Overview of Issue/Description of System or Process:**

Data for reporting to OSEP on child count, services, settings and exiting are collected through the Infant and Toddler Online Tracking System (ITOTS), a web-based individual record data system first implemented in 2001. Each local lead agency is responsible for entering individual child data into ITOTS for each child referred to the local Part C system. OSEP's letter to Virginia after their April verification visit to the Commonwealth notes the following concerns about the accuracy of data reported:

- The State Lead Agency has no systematic procedures for monitoring the accuracy of data reporting (such as comparing, as part of an on-site visit, the data in a child's IFSP against the data reported in ITOTS for that child);
- While there are procedures that a local lead agency can choose to use to review the accuracy of its data, the State does not require local lead agencies to implement such procedures or to certify the accuracy of its data;
- The State Lead Agency has no way to determine the extent of inaccurate copying of data into ITOTS or other data entry errors (beyond the edit checks for illogical data that are built into the ITOTS software); and
- The only services and settings data entered into ITOTS are the data from the child's initial IFSP and are not in accordance with Section 618 requirements and OSEP reporting instructions that the data be from the child's most recent IFSP.

In order to address these findings, Virginia was required to submit to OSEP procedures for reviewing and requiring data accuracy by local lead agencies to ensure that the data the State collects, analyzes and submits to OSEP are accurate. Those procedures were submitted to OSEP in August 2005 and are described in the Baseline Data and in the Improvement Activities.

**Baseline Data for FFY 2004 (2004-2005):**

- a. For data due between July 1, 2004 and June 30, 2005 Virginia submitted all OSEP-required data on or before their due dates, except for child count data:
  - Child count data was submitted late on February 23, 2005 (due February 1, 2005)
  - Services, settings, and exiting data were submitted on February 13, 2004 (due November 1, 2004)
  - Personnel data were submitted on October 28, 2004 (due November 1, 2004)
  - The Annual Performance Report, including dispute resolution data, was submitted on March 31, 2005 (due March 31, 2005)
- b. The following mechanisms were used to verify the accuracy of the data being submitted in this State Performance Plan:
  - Indicator 1 (Services begin in a timely manner): The State Lead Agency compiled a spreadsheet for each local system reflecting the data on "timely" submitted through record reviews completed in January – February 2005. The local system manager was required to compare the data in the spreadsheet with the data in the child's record to confirm the accuracy and then submit corrections. The data reported for indicator 1 reflects the confirmed and corrected data.

- Indicator 2 (Services primarily in the home and community settings): The 2004 data reported as baseline data is the most accurate data available at this time. The individual child data collected through ITOTS and reported to OSEP in Virginia's Annual Performance Reports and annual 618 *Reports of Program Settings Where Early Intervention Services are Provided to Children with Disabilities and Their Families in Accordance With Part C* have, to date, reflected only the services planned on each child's initial IFSP. The State Lead Agency is unable to pinpoint the extent of inaccuracy in this data. The Section 618 settings data for children enrolled in Virginia's Part C system as of December 1, 2005 will reflect the primary service setting listed on the IFSP in effect on December 1, 2005 for every eligible child. Once this December 1, 2005 Section 618 settings data is available, the baseline data reported will be updated as appropriate, and an amended State Performance Plan will be submitted to OSEP.
- Indicators 3 & 4: New indicators; no data reported.
- Indicators 5 & 6 (Number of children served): The SFY-05 Local Contract for Continuing Participation in Part C required the local lead agency to review ITOTS data, update as needed and confirm by January 10, 2005. Data on children under three served through the public schools was verified by the Department of Education. DOE edited, as needed, to ensure an unduplicated count and then required a signed verification from all local school divisions.
- Indicator 7 (45-day timeline): Local system managers were required to review their 45-day timeline data quarterly with their Technical Assistance Consultant and to submit copies of local documentation that confirms the reasons for instances in which the 45-day timeline was exceeded.
- Indicator 8 (Transition): This data was collected through local record reviews. Each local system manager was required to submit a signed statement confirming the accuracy of the data submitted via these record reviews.
- Indicators 9 – 14 (General supervision system): This data was confirmed through documentation kept at the State Lead Agency.

**Discussion of Baseline Data:**

- a. Virginia's baseline data reflects that 83% of required data (5 out of 6 reports) were submitted to OSEP in a timely manner in FFY 2004.
- b. Methods are in place to confirm the accuracy of baseline data for 13 of the 14 State Performance Plan indicators (93%). Baseline data for the remaining indicator (settings) will be corrected and an amended State Performance Plan will be submitted to OSEP as soon as possible. For Section 618 data, procedures were in place in FFY 2004 to confirm the accuracy for only the child count data (1 out of 6 reports, 17%).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<b>2005</b> (2005-2006)	<b>100%</b> of State reported data (Section 618 and Annual Performance Reports) are timely and accurate
<b>2006</b> (2006-2007)	<b>100%</b> of State reported data (Section 618 and Annual Performance Reports) are timely and accurate
<b>2007</b> (2007-2008)	<b>100%</b> of State reported data (Section 618 and Annual Performance Reports) are timely and accurate
<b>2008</b> (2008-2009)	<b>100%</b> of State reported data (Section 618 and Annual Performance Reports) are timely and accurate
<b>2009</b> (2009-2010)	<b>100%</b> of State reported data (Section 618 and Annual Performance Reports) are timely and accurate
<b>2010</b>	<b>100%</b> of State reported data (Section 618 and Annual Performance Reports) are timely and

(2010-2011)	accurate
-------------	----------

**Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources:**

Activity	Timelines	Resources
<p>1. Conduct a detailed data requirements analysis and develop a “master plan” for the technology solutions needed by the State Lead Agency to meet federal and State reporting requirements related to Part C in an accurate and timely manner.</p>	<p>Contract with professional who will facilitate completion of this activity – <b>October 2005</b> <i>(Completed)</i></p> <p>Project plan, including timelines, is developed – <b>November 2005</b> <i>(Completed)</i></p> <p>Analysis is completed – <b>March 2006</b> <i>(Completed)</i></p>	<p><u>Personnel:</u> Part C Data Analyst, Data Project Team</p> <p><u>Funding:</u> Already in Part C budget</p> <p><u>Other:</u> Stakeholder input</p>
<p>2. Implement the following procedures: On at least a quarterly basis, each local system generates the following new ITOTS reports for their local system: Children Active, Children Discharged, Children Evaluated Eligible – Will Receive Ongoing Part C Services. The local lead agency reviews and confirms in writing (and with signature of the local system manager) that the data is accurate. This quarterly confirmation of accuracy is kept on file at the local lead agency and is available for review upon request of the State Lead Agency. On an annual basis, the local lead agency submits to the State Lead Agency confirmation on data accuracy signed by the local system manager.</p>	<p>Reports are available for use through ITOTS – <b>January 2006</b> <i>(Completed)</i></p> <p>Local systems begin using new reports – <b>April 2006</b> <i>(Completed)</i></p>	<p><u>Personnel:</u> State Part C staff, Welligent (ITOTS contractor)</p> <p><u>Funding:</u> For addition of new ITOTS reports – already in Part C budget</p>
<p>3. Develop and implement procedures to ensure that the Section 618 services and settings data reported to OSEP reflect the most current IFSP for each eligible child.</p>	<p>Develop and implement manual collection of the settings data for each child – <b>January 2006</b> <i>(Completed)</i></p> <p>Enhance the ITOTS system to require services and settings data be updated for each child at the time of each IFSP review and annual IFSP – <b>January 2008</b></p>	<p><u>Personnel:</u> The Part C staff, DMHMRSAS MIS staff, contractor to conduct detailed requirements analysis and develop “master plan” for needed technology solutions</p> <p><u>Funding:</u> For contractor – already in Part C budget</p>
<p>4. Implement procedures to require that submission of data from all record reviews required by the</p>	<p>Standard form for signature developed – <b>September 2005</b> <i>(Completed)</i></p>	<p><u>Personnel:</u> State Part C staff</p>

Activity	Timelines	Resources
<p>State Lead Agency and conducted by the local system is accompanied by a signed certification by the local system manager confirming the accuracy of the data.</p>	<p>Local contract for SFY-2007 includes language reflecting this process of data confirmation – <b>May 2006</b> <i>(Completed)</i></p> <p>Implementation - <b>Ongoing</b></p>	
<p>5. Conduct an annual on-site record review to confirm randomly selected data (e.g., Section 618 and other data collected through ITOTS and data from annual record reviews conducted by the local system), in June 2006, December 2006, and every December thereafter,.</p>	<p>Specific procedures for sampling are determined – <b>December 2005</b> <i>(Completed)</i></p> <p>Role of existing personnel and/or need for additional personnel to complete this task are determined – <b>January 2006</b> <i>(Completed)</i></p> <p>Specific process for conducting the record reviews is determined – <b>March 2006</b> <i>(Completed)</i></p> <p>Pilot implementation – <b>May/June 2006</b> <i>(Completed)</i></p> <p>Statewide implementation – <b>December 2006 and annually thereafter</b> <i>(Completed)</i></p>	<p><u>Personnel</u>: Existing and/or additional State Part C staff</p> <p><u>Funding</u>: To hire additional personnel if needed – already in Part C budget</p> <p><u>Other</u>: Consultation with experts on sampling</p>
<p>6. Confirm data on 2-year-olds served through the public schools by annual receipt of a confirmation statement from the Department of Education</p>	<p>Begin receiving annual confirmation statement - <b>January 2006</b> <i>(Completed)</i></p>	<p><u>Personnel</u>: Staff Part C staff, State Part B staff</p>
<p>7. Develop and implement procedures to determine local compliance with submission of data in accordance with local contract timelines and assist local systems in implementing steps to ensure immediate correction of noncompliance.</p>	<p>Procedures developed – <b>February 2007</b></p> <p>Implementation begins - <b>March 2007</b></p>	<p><u>Personnel</u>: State Part C staff</p>
<p>8. Implement training for State Part C staff and all local users on ITOTS, including improvements made to screens and reports</p>	<p>For State staff – <b>December 2006</b></p> <p>Regional trainings for local users – <b>January – February 2007</b></p>	<p><u>Personnel</u> – State Part C and IT Staff</p> <p><u>Funding</u> – Already in Part C budget</p>
<p>9. Develop and disseminate an ITOTS User's Manual, including a data dictionary</p>	<p>February 2007</p>	<p><u>Personnel</u> – State Part C and IT Staff</p>

Activity	Timelines	Resources
10. Move ITOTS into the State Lead Agency to facilitate better control of data integrity and a streamlined process for making future enhancements to the system	March 1, 2007	<u>Personnel</u> – State Part C and IT Staff
11. Determine the process for selecting sites and data elements for annual on-site data verification	June 2007	<u>Personnel</u> – State Part C Staff
12. Determine additional enhancements to be made to ITOTS and timelines for those improvements	June 2007	<u>Personnel</u> – State Part C and IT staff <u>Funding</u> – To be determined
13. Develop and implement reports that flag large changes or unusual findings in local data that are then discussed with local systems to determine if errors occurred	2009	<u>Personnel</u> – State Part C and IT Staff