

Monitoring and Supervision Teleconference Call #2

Virginia's Monitoring Indicators

August 11, 2006

Questions and Answers

General

1. Question: Will future dates for annual local record reviews be the same as this year?

Answer: Not sure at this time. We are piloting a number of monitoring processes this year, so we will need to evaluate the annual local record review process that was used this year to ensure that we are able to get all of the required data in, verified, analyzed, in written report format & reviewed by the VICC and still meet the deadline for the Annual Performance Report each February. We may have to move the record review a little earlier to accomplish all of that. We hope that by December 2006, we can have the chart on Virginia's Monitoring Indicators finalized with this information. We do know that some data timeframes will change from what we did this year; timely, for example, will change to collecting data for the full fiscal year now that the criteria has been established. This year we eliminated the portion of the fiscal year that occurred prior to establishing the criteria/definition of "timely".

Indicator #4: Family Outcomes

1. Question: Are the family surveys going to be mailed out and parents be called if they don't return them?

Answer: Final details have not been determined at this time. The proposed plan is to have all families included in the survey. When the details are worked out with the Social Science Research Center, we will let you know. We are researching now whether families have to give consent to have their names and contact information released to the Social Science Research Center who will be doing the survey. 17.5 weeks is the estimated time span for the family survey to be completed. The proposed plan is to have two waves of mailing of the survey followed by phone calls to families who didn't respond. Also considering a Spanish version of the survey.

2. Question: How can the family survey be anonymous if there is follow up with families who did not respond? Also, phone numbers are not in ITOTS or accurate. Could be an issue.

Answer: The information provided to the state will be aggregated & therefore, non-identifiable.

Indicator #5: Birth to One

1. Question: Why do the indicators 5 and 6 overlap?

Answer: These were set by OSEP as part of the State Performance Plan. Birth to one was singled out because of the focus on this age group at the national level.

Indicator #6: Birth to Three

1. Question: On indicator 6, under A, I don't understand it because it says you are going to measure infants birth to one but this is a Birth to three indicator.

Answer: That is a typo. Should read birth to three, not birth to one.

Indicator #8: Transition

1. Question: On the 90 day transition meeting and justification. On the record review form, there were lots of options for why it wasn't held, but just three on this form (*Virginia's Monitoring Indicators Chart*). What do you record if parent declines?

Answer: *Virginia's Monitoring Indicators* chart only lists the family reasons. The annual local record review form lists all of the reasons (family as well as system).

CLARIFICATION: On the call, we stated that you would check "other" if the parent declines the 90 day transition conference. If you select "other", please be sure to write the reason (parent declined). An additional option to answering this question: If the parent declined the conference, you would have marked "no" for question 1 "Did the parents give consent for the 90-day transition planning conference with Part B to occur." Then you would not need to respond to questions 2-4.

2. Question: For indicator 8, if the 90 day conference was not held, if you check LEA preference, will that be held against us?

Answer: Mary Ann Discenza is deferring answering this until she talks with the Part B 619 Coordinator so we can be sure we are consistent with Part B and with the law. We will get back to you once we have this information.

3. Question: Regarding parental permission obtained for 90-day conference. Where the chart review asks if family allowed for transfer of information to Part B, some families have said no, then later, said yes. We were advised in the past to document this in a contact note & through use of consent to release records.

Answer: Yes, it's ok if you do it the way you have described. In the future, it would be advisable to have the family initial and date page 7 of the IFSP in order to keep the chronology of events all on one page.

4. Question: I just want to remind you that there are some systems where a child is found eligible and starts school before the 90 day time-line is up, because some schools may complete the process of determining eligibility very quickly and have the child start school sooner than expected.

Answer: Yes, that's o.k. In Francis' area, some of her localities will accept the IFSP as part of the eligibility process. A child could be referred on Monday and have the entire process completed within a week or two and the child start school shortly thereafter. Thank you Francis for bringing this to our attention.

5. Question: Will multiple transition issues be addressed with the 619 coordinator? Transition used to go very smoothly and there are multiple problems now.

Answer: Yes, multiple issues will be addressed.