

**Talking Points
Teleconference Call
Virginia's Monitoring Indicators
August 11, 2006
1-2:30 p.m.**

A. Greetings:

- Welcome to our 2nd teleconference call in a series of calls on the revised monitoring system for Virginia.
- Mary Anne White and Bonnie Grifa, Part C Monitoring Consultants will present the information for today's topic. Also participating in today's call in the State Part C Office is Mary Ann Discenza, Part C Coordinator, Karen Durst, Beth Tolley and David Mills, Part C Technical Assistance Consultants. To our knowledge, there are 29 local system managers on today's call and two VICC members.
- We hope you will find the information from today's call helpful to you in understanding Virginia's monitoring indicators.
- We sent you an evaluation form with the materials for today's call and request that you fill it out following the call so we can get your feedback. Please ensure that all participants listening with you receive a copy of the evaluation form.
- Thank you to everyone who provided feedback to the last call. Based on that feedback, we are planning to provide more time for questions in today's call and in future calls.
- The "Talking Points" for last month's call, hand-outs for the call as well as a compilation of all of the questions and answers can now be found on the Part C website. Our plan is to have the same information for today's call and future calls posted to the website within two weeks of the conclusion of each call.

B. Format of Call:

- We will start and end the call on time.
- All phones are currently in "listening" mode".
- When we are finished with our portion of the presentation, we will contact the conference operator who will come on the line and instruct everyone who has questions on how to "dial" in to ask their question.
- Please limit your questions to no more than one per "dial in". If you have additional questions, you may re-query in. This will help us ensure that everyone who has questions will be heard during our allotted time.
- If, we do not get to all questions, we will ask that you e-mail your questions to us to be included in the Q&A that will be posted on the web site following this call
- All questions will be answered in the order in which the conference operator receives them.

C. Virginia's Monitoring Indicators (Please refer to Hand-Out): There are currently 11 monitoring indicators and we will be reviewing up to date information on each indicator with you during today's call.

- 10/11 monitoring indicators are based on the SPP indicators. Other indicators may be added or deleted as time goes on based on the needs of Virginia. For example, we are currently monitoring evaluation and assessment in all developmental areas because we have not yet met compliance as a state in this

area. However, once we achieve compliance as a state for this indicator, then the VICC may recommend removing that indicator from Virginia's list of monitoring indicators since compliance has been achieved. On the other hand, there may be an area in the future that is identified and recommended by the VICC as needing more specific attention statewide, and a new indicator could be added to the list of Virginia's monitoring indicators.

- The 10 monitoring indicators that are directly related to the State Performance Plan will remain monitoring indicators for FY 2005-2010 to meet the reporting requirements for the APR.
- Virginia must submit to OSEP an updated status on the State Performance Plan indicators in the Annual Performance Plan, which is due each February. The first report is due February 2007.
 - To provide this data, Virginia will use information that local systems enter into ITOTS, local annual record reviews, information from the GSEG pilots and 618 data.
 - The APR is how OSEP is going to look at Virginia's performance on all compliance and performance indicators within the State Performance Plan and determine our overall performance as a state as well as report and rank our performance as a state to the public via OSEP's website. The data you submit to us is what we will submit to OSEP. So, the more accurate data at the local level translates into more accurate statewide data and helps meet the targets that have been set for each year between now and 2010.

Indicator #1: Timely Initiation of Services:

- This is a State Performance Plan Indicator whose target is set by the law at 100% for FY 2005-2010.
Baseline data reported in the SPP for FFY 2004: 72%
- The State Performance Plan requires states to report on the percentage of children who receive the early intervention services on their IFSP's in a timely manner. States were also required to include in the SPP the State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services.
- **What is the definition Virginia will use for "timely" initiation of services?**
As defined in a memo from Mary Ann Discenza dated April 4th, 2006, Virginia's definition of "timely" is as follows: "Entitled services listed on the IFSP begin within 21 calendar days of the date the parent signs the IFSP. Early intervention services may begin more than 21 calendar days following the parent signing the IFSP 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".
- **How will we collect the data for this indicator?** Through the annual local record review process.
- **What is the timeframe that will be used to collect data for this indicator?** 11/1/05-6/30/06. (Mary Ann Discenza sent a memo to the field in October 2005 first identifying the definition of timely as 21 days, therefore, we are collecting data on this indicator after that time).
- **When will the data be generated?** By August 31st, 2006 (deadline for annual local record reviews)

- **Clarification from OSEP on Indicators 1 ,7,8 (Part C APR FAQ's final 8/2/06):**
 - After the 1st call was held with the field and questions answered in writing, the State Part C Office received a written document from OSEP with questions from states and OSEP's responses. This document was the Q&A document from one of the OSEP teleconference calls with states regarding the SPP. This document further clarifies answers given during our first call and in the written question and answer document related to timely initiation of services as follows:
 - ***How should states report data when there is justification for why services began beyond 21 calendar days?***
OSEP's response is that states should not include in their calculation those children for whom delays are attributable to documented exceptional family or other circumstances outside of the lead agency's control. States must however include in their narrative for this indicator the number of children for whom such factors were identified and how the state insured documentation was available of such circumstances. In addition, OSEP further states a natural disaster as a reason.
 - ***Do states have to report on the timeliness of all services on the IFSP?***
OSEP's response is that states must measure timeliness under this indicator by ensuring that any EI services identified on the initial IFSP and any additional EI services identified on subsequent IFSP's are **initiated** within the required time period. This indicator is not intended to measure frequency of EI services.
 - ***If a child had 4 services on his/her IFSP and 2 were timely and 1 was due to family illness, and 1 was due to provider illness, then we are out of compliance for that child?***
OSEP's response Yes

Indicator #2: Percent of Infants & Toddlers with IFSP's who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community settings

This is a State Performance Plan Indicator whose target has been set by the VICC at 98.425%.

- Baseline data reported in the SPP for FFY 2004: 98.05%.
- **How will we collect the data for this indicator?** ITOTS
- **What is the timeframe that will be used to collect data on this indicator?**
Based on December 1, 2005 point in time data
- **When will the report be generated?** After January 30th, 2006 (to allow local systems ample time to ensure data is entered into ITOTS).
- **FYI:** For reporting purposes to OSEP, residential facilities and hospitals are not considered natural environments or as stated in the indicator, as "home or community settings".
- Review of Monitoring Indicator Chart for Indicator #2:

Indicator #3: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSP's who demonstrate improved:

- a. Positive social-emotional

- b. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)
- c. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs
- o **Data Source:** *How will we collect the data for this indicator?* ITOTS
- o **Targets** have not yet been established but will be set once baseline data from the Pilots is available.

For this year, through the GSEG, the baseline data used for the APR in February will be based on the Pilot data and plans for full implementation with the rest of the local systems is currently in the planning phase.

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
- c. Help their children develop and learn
- o **Data Source:** *How will we collect the data for this indicator?* Statewide Family Survey
- o **Targets** have not yet been established but will be set once baseline data from the first statewide survey is available.

Again, for this year, through the GSEG, the baseline data used for the APR in February will be based on a statewide survey administered through the mail to all participating families with follow-up phone calls to those who do not respond to the written survey.

Indicator #5: Percent of Infants and Toddlers birth to 1 with IFSP's compared to:

- a. **Other states with similar eligibility criteria; and**
- b. **National data.**
 - o This is a State Performance Plan Indicator whose performance is set at .62% by the VICC for 2005's target.
Baseline data reported in the SPP for FFY 2004: On December 1, 2004, .58% of the birth to 1 population in Virginia was receiving Part C Early Intervention services as compared to .97% in states with broad eligibility definitions similar to VA's and to national baseline data of .92%.
 - o For the APR, OSEP requires aggregated State data compared to the national data and to other States with similar eligibility.
 - o **How will we collect the data for this indicator?** ITOTS compared to OSEP Data Tables.
 - o **What is the timeframe that will be used to collect data on this indicator?** On December 1, 2005
 - o **When will the report be generated?** After January 30th, 2006 (to allow local systems ample time to ensure data is entered into ITOTS).

PLEASE NOTE: In order for local systems to monitor how they are doing compared to their local population of 0-1, we are currently working with OSEP to determine how to get the most recent local data for this comparison. We are currently waiting for a response and will provide further information on this indicator at that time via email.

Indicator #6: Percent of Infants and Toddlers birth to 3 with IFSP's compared to

a. Other states with similar eligibility definitions; and

b. National data.

- This is a State Performance Plan Indicator whose performance is set at 1.9% by the VICC for FY 2005's target.
Baseline data reported in the SPP for FFY 2004: On December 1, 2004, 1.79% of the birth to 3 population in Virginia was receiving Part C Early Intervention services as compared to 2.11% in states with broad eligibility definitions similar to VA's and to national baseline data of 2.24%.
- For the APR, OSEP requires aggregated State data compared to the national data and to other States with similar eligibility.
- **How will we collect the data for this indicator?** ITOTS compared to OSEP Data Tables.
- **What is the timeframe that will be used to collect data on this indicator?** Point in time data on December 1, 2005
- **When will the report be generated?** After January 30th, 2006 (to allow local systems ample time to ensure data is entered into ITOTS).
- In addition to the information in ITOTS, the number of two year olds being served in the local school system will also need to be included in this calculation. We are currently working with the State DOE to get this information broken down by local school systems for you.

PLEASE NOTE: In order for local systems to monitor how they are doing compared to their local population of 0-1, we are currently working with OSEP to determine how to get the most recent local data for this comparison. We are currently waiting for a response and will provide further information on this indicator at that time via email.

Indicator #7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSP's for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45 day timeline This is a State Performance Plan Indicator whose compliance is set by the law at 100% for FY 2005-2010.

Baseline data reported in the SPP for FFY 2004: 93%

- **How will we collect the data for this indicator?** ITOTS
- **What is the timeframe that will be used to collect data on this indicator?** 4/1/06-6/30/06 (last quarter's 45 day data for FY 2005).
- **When will the report be generated?** September 1st, 2006 covering the data timeframe (4/1/06-6/30/06).

Clarification from OSEP on Indicators 1, 7,8 (Part C APR FAQ's final 8/2/06):

- After the 1st call was held with the field and questions answered in writing, the State Part C Office received a written document from OSEP with questions from states and OSEP's responses. This document further clarifies answers given during our first call and in the written question and answer document related to the 45 day timeline:
- **When does the 45-day timeline begin?**
OSEP's response The 45 day timeline begins upon referral of the child to the Part C system.
- **When does the 45-day timeline end?**

OSEP's response The 45 day timeline ends at the initial IFSP meeting.

- ***How does the state report data when there are exceptional circumstances outside of the lead agency's control in meeting the 45 day timeline?***

OSEP's response States should not include in their calculation (that is the denominator) those children for whom delays are attributable to documented exceptional family or other circumstances outside the lead agency's control. States must however, include in their narrative the number of children for whom such factors were identified and how the State ensured documentation was available of such circumstances.

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:

IFSP's with transition steps and services

- a. **Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and**
- b. **Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B**

- This is a State Performance Plan Indicator whose compliance is set by the law at 100% for each part of the indicator.
Baseline data reported in the SPP for FFY 2004:
 - Transition steps & services (84%)
 - Notification to LEA (81%)
 - 90-day transition planning conference (51%)
- **How will we collect the data for this indicator?** Annual Local Record Review
- **What is the timeframe that will be used to collect data on this indicator?** 1/1/06-9/30/06
- **When will the report be generated?** By August 31st (deadline for annual local record reviews)
- Judgment of whether a child is potentially eligible takes into consideration the child's developmental status and eligibility criteria for the local school division. (Eligibility criteria are not the same for all local school divisions across Virginia.)
- Child's eligibility means under Part B either (a) the start of the school year in which the child turns two by September 30th or (b) the child's 3rd birthday depending on when the parent chooses to transition the child to Part B.

Clarification from OSEP on Indicators 1, 7,8 (Part C APR FAQ's final 8/2/06):

- After the 1st call was held with the field and questions answered in writing, the State Part C Office received a written document from OSEP with questions from states and OSEP's responses. This document further clarifies answers given during our first call and in the written question and answer document related to transition:
- ***At what point in time should states be capturing data for 8a?***
OSEP's response States should be capturing data on children transition and/or exiting at age 3.

- ***Do states have to report on all children exiting from Part C under indicator 8 or only those children transitioning at age 3?***
OSEP's response States must report under 8a,b,c, only on the children who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday.
- ***On 8c, the transition conference requirement, how do states report data for exceptional circumstances and lack of family approval?***
OSEP's response States should not include in their calculation (that is the denominator) those children for whom delays are attributable to documented exceptional family or other circumstances outside of the lead agency's control. In addition, states should not include in their calculation but report separately the number of children for whom family approval for the transition conference was not obtained. States must however, include in their narrative for this indicator, the number of children for whom such factors were identified and the State insured documentation was available of such circumstances.

Indicator #9: Evaluation and Assessment for each child includes:

An evaluation of the child's level of functioning in each of five specified developmental areas (Cognitive, Motor, Communication, Social/Emotional & Adaptive including vision and hearing):

- (a) **The IFSP reflects the functioning levels for each of the areas.**
 - Compliance has been set at 100% by the law.
 - **How will we collect the data for this indicator?** Annual Local Record Review
 - **What is the timeframe that will be used to collect data on this indicator?** 11/1/05-6/30/06
 - **When will the report be generated?** By August 31st, 2006 (deadline for annual local record reviews)
 - **Why is this indicator being addressed?**
 - In the Annual Performance Report submitted to OSEP in 2002, we stated that we were in 71% compliance with reflecting the child's present levels of functioning
 - In an Oct 2004 letter to VA, OSEP indicated that we had to be in compliance with this indicator by November 2005. We are not there.
 - In correspondence received from OSEP on March 13, 2006, OSEP said that data submitted in the APR in February 2007 must show VA is in compliance with this indicator. They also stated "Failure to demonstrate compliance at that time will affect OSEP's determination of the state's status under section 616 (d) of IDEA.
 - Section 616 is the Monitoring Section of IDEA which spells out what sanctions or status, OSEP could place on VA for continued non-compliance.
 - This wording is the strictest wording that OSEP has given states related to the state's performance toward meeting compliance with this indicator.

- Data is collected on the most recent initial or annual IFSP within the timeframe (11/1/05-6/30/05)
- For the initial IFSP, developmental age levels must be present
- For an annual IFSP, developmental age levels or a statement of present levels of developmental functioning must be present somewhere on the IFSP, typically page 3 or 4.
- For vision and hearing status: a developmental age level is not required however, a statement about the child's current vision and hearing abilities must be included. This could be from Section 5-*Findings from the Policy Clarification and Technical Assistance on the Implementation of Requirements for Vision and Hearing Components of the Part C Evaluation and Assessment* (October 2003 revised) document and/or a statement of behaviors.
- The IFSP must document use of Part C's Screening Tool for Vision and Hearing.

Indicator #10: Locally reported data (including data submitted for 618 reporting, State Performance Plan and the Annual Performance Report) and local contract deliverables are timely and accurate.

- This is a State Performance Plan Indicator whose target is set by the law at 100%.
- **How will we collect the data for this indicator?** Tracking forms based on deadlines established by the State Part C Office.
- **What is the timeframe that will be used to collect data on this indicator?** 7/1/05-6/30/06
- The State has to submit reports to OSEP, the General Assembly and the Department on a periodic basis and requires the timely and accurate submission of local data to do this. If the local data is not accurate and timely, then the State cannot be timely in getting this information to the various constituents that it needs to report to.
- We at the State are monitoring all of the contract deliverables and other requests for data and when they are submitted to the State as compared to due dates.
- We would encourage local systems to also monitor the timeliness of submitted reports/data to the State.
- At the back of the local contract there is a list of the contract deliverables.
- **When will the report be generated?** September 1st, 2006 covering the data timeframe (7/1/05-6/30/06).

Indicator #11: Local Systems correct non-compliance as soon as possible but no later than one year from the date of identification of the non-compliance. This is a

State Performance Plan Indicator whose compliance is set by the law at 100%.

- **How will we collect the data for this indicator?** Tracking forms; based on compliance dates in Corrective Action Plans and/or Findings letters.
- **What is the timeframe that will be used to collect data on this indicator?** July 1, 2005-June 30, 2006. Any Corrective Action Plans (CAPs), previously known as Plans Of Improvement, whose compliance date falls within this timeframe, will be measured for compliance with this indicator.
- It is the expectation that local systems will be working diligently toward compliance by the established deadline (no later than one year from the date

of identification of the non-compliance). The State Part C Office is available to provide assistance to achieve this.

- **When will the data be generated?** September 1st, 2006 covering the data timeframe (7/1/05-6/30/06).

Summary:

- The reason we are collecting all of this data is two-fold:
 1. It has to be reported to OSEP in February each year with the first report due in February 2007;
 2. It's going to be used to help us identify our focused monitoring priorities and those local systems who will require onsite focused monitoring visits. This process will be explained in other venues in the near future in more detail.
- All 40 local systems will be monitored on all of Virginia's Monitoring Indicators.
- Corrective Action Plans will be required for local systems who are not in compliance with an indicator.
- Non-compliance is corrected as soon as possible but no later than one year from the date of identification.

REMINDER: Our next call is scheduled for September 15th from 1-2:30 p.m.

Topic: Data Verification Process