

**Talking Points
Teleconference Call
Virginia's Annual Performance Report
December 15th, 2006
1-2:30 p.m.**

A. Greetings:

- Welcome to our 4th teleconference call in a series of calls on the revised monitoring system for Virginia. Today's topic is an overview of the Annual Performance Report data, which includes indicators #1-9 of Virginia's Monitoring Indicators.
- In the email for today's call, you were sent a copy of a document entitled "Virginia's Monitoring Indicators" & an evaluation form. We would appreciate your feedback by completing the evaluation form and emailing it back to us as soon as possible. Please ensure that all participants listening with you receive a copy of the evaluation form.
- Mary Anne White and Bonnie Grifa, State Part C Monitoring Staff will present the information for today's topic. Also participating in today's call in the State Part C Office is: Mary Ann Discenza, Kyla Patterson, Beth Tolley and Karen Durst. To our knowledge, there are 22 local systems on today's call.

B. Format of Call:

- As in the previous calls, 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 dial in again.
- All questions will be answered in the order in which the conference operator receives them.

C. What is the Annual Performance Report?

- The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEA 2004) required that each State's Part C Lead Agency develop and submit a State Performance Plan (SPP) to the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) by December 2nd, 2005. A copy of Virginia's State Performance Plan is located on the Infant & Toddler Connection of Virginia Website.
- The intention of the SPP is to evaluate each State's effectiveness in implementing the requirements and purposes of Part C of IDEA and to describe how each State will improve such implementation over a six-year period beginning with the Annual Performance Report due in February 2007.
- The Virginia Interagency Coordinating Council (VICC) served as the primary stakeholder group providing advice and assistance to the State Lead Agency in the development of the SPP and the Annual Performance Report. During a full day meeting on November 28th, VICC members:
 - Received information regarding focused monitoring
 - Reviewed FY 2005 data on the status of local systems & the State as a whole related to the targets set in the SPP;

Formatted

Formatted

Formatted

- Discussed improvement activities to address indicators that are below target;
- Began the process of identifying State focus topics.

Formatted

Formatted

- The targets for the performance indicators in the SPP are based on baseline data. Please pull out the handout for today's call entitled "Virginia's Monitoring Indicators". This handout is a Statewide summary of the data collected for the APR by Indicator. In the 1st column is a statement describing the Indicator. In the 2nd column is the State Baseline percentage and year that the baseline data was collected or in some cases, will be collected. In the 3rd column is the State target for the current APR covering data collected in FY 2005. In the 4th column is our performance as a state for each indicator, which can be compared to the previous column indicating the state target. In the last column is the state target for the current fiscal year ending June 30th, 2007 so you can see where we came from (the state baseline), how we did for the APR due in February and where we need to be by the end of June, 2007.
- The data in the Annual Performance Report is how OSEP is going to look at Virginia's performance on all indicators within the State Performance Plan; determine our overall performance as a State as well as report and rank our performance as a State to the public.
- The State Lead Agency is also required (per IDEA 2004) to report annually to the public on the performance of each local Part C System located in the State on the targets identified in the State Performance Plan and reported in the Annual Performance Report. Public Reporting of each local system's monitoring data is the topic for January's Teleconference call with the field and is scheduled for January 25th, 2007 from 1-2:30 p.m.

Formatted

Formatted

C. Is There a Mechanism For Local Systems To Provide Input Into the Annual Performance Report?

- Yes, the State Part C Office has elected to disseminate the Draft APR for public review and comment beginning December 15th and ending January 4th. Following submission to OSEP, the APR and revised SPP will be posted to the Infant & Toddler Connection of Virginia website and disseminated to and through participating State agencies no later than February 28th, 2007.

D. How Did Virginia Do On the SPP Indicators?

- Let's take a look at each indicator individually on your hand-out.
- If you recall, Virginia's Monitoring Indicators are made up of the SPP indicators that involve monitoring data from each local system to assess Virginia's performance &/or compliance and also includes an indicator where Virginia was previously identified for non-compliance by OSEP and correction had not yet been achieved.

Indicator #1: Percent of Infants & Toddlers with IFSP's who receive the early intervention services on their IFSP's in a timely manner. (Timely is defined by Virginia as "within 21 days of the date the IFSP is signed by the parent")

- This is a compliance indicator whose State target is set by OSEP @ 100%.
- The Data Source for this indicator was the annual local record review completed in August 2006 for data collected between 11/1/05-6/30/06.
- The Measurement for this indicator (as required by OSEP) is as follows:

%= The # of infants & toddlers with IFSP's who received the early intervention services on their IFSP's in a timely manner divided by the total # of infants & toddlers with IFSP's times 100.

- Things To Consider with this Indicator:
 - Per OSEP, this indicator is required to be measured by child not by service. In order to be in compliance with this indicator, a child must have ALL services listed on the IFSP initiated in a timely manner to be considered.
 - Family reasons are acceptable reasons for delay in the initiation of services and are included in the % of compliance.
 - We are required to report in the APR the # of children for whom family reasons were identified.
 - Family reasons can include the following:
 - Child/family ill;
 - Family Scheduling Preference;
 - Temporarily Lost Contact; and
 - The IFSP Team Planned a Later Start Date to meet the family's needs.
 - System reasons can include the following:
 - Provider unavailability;
 - No reason documented and
 - Foster/surrogate parent issues.
 - Although we are required by OSEP to measure compliance on this indicator by child, OSEP did recommend that we include in our narrative in the APR the data results by service as well.
 - This allows us the opportunity to drill down into the barriers preventing timely initiation of services.
 - **Our State baseline data collected in FY 2004 was 72%. The overall State percentage of compliance for children receiving services in a timely manner remained at 72%;**
 - There are 6 local systems who achieved the State Target of 100% compliance;
 - There is 1 local system close to the State Target @ 96% compliance;
 - There are 33 local systems that fell below the State Target and will be required to have a Corrective Action Plan in this area. Those percentages ranged from 40%-92% compliance.
 - If we look at a state summary of services delayed due to family reasons, there were:
 - A total of 244 family reasons; of those:
 - 135 were due to family scheduling preference;
 - 48 were due to the team planning a later start date to meet family needs;
 - 35 were due to temporarily losing contact with the family and
 - 26 were due to child and family illness.
 - If we look at a state summary of services delayed due to system reasons, there were:
 - A total of 281 reasons, of those:
 - 205 were due to no reason documented;
 - 72 were due to provider unavailability and
 - 4 were due to foster/surrogate parent issues.

- o If we look at a state summary of services delayed due to provider unavailability, there were:
 - o 34 due to Speech Therapy unavailability
 - o 15 due to PT unavailability
 - o 7 due to OT unavailability
 - o 4 due to other entitled EI services and
 - o 1 each due to SC, audiology and nutrition.
- o **Although we are required by OSEP to measure compliance on this indicator by child, if we look at this indicator by service, the overall State percentage of services in a timely manner increases from 72% by child to 86% by service.**
- o There are 6 local systems at the State Target of 100% compliance;
- o There are 8 local system close to the State Target ranging in % from 93%-98% compliance;
- o There are 26 local systems that fall below the State Target. Those percentages ranged from 65%-92% compliance.
- o Keep in mind, the new target for the current fiscal year ending June 30th, 2007 remains at 100%.

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

- This is a performance indicator whose State target was set by the VICC @ 98.425%.
- The Data Source for this indicator was an ITOTS report for data collected on December 1st, 2005.
- The Measurement for this indicator (as required by OSEP) is as follows: *Divide the # children served in the home or community setting by the total # of children with IFSP's times 100.*
- Things To Consider with this Indicator:
 - o Data for this indicator is "Point in time data" on December 1st, 2005.
 - o Virginia's APR must include data for children 0-3 served in the public schools (Part B) in addition to data for children 0-3 served in early intervention (Part C).
- **Our State baseline data collected in FY 2004 was 98.4%. The overall State percentage of compliance to be reported in the APR for children served in the home or community setting for Part C is 99%; which exceeds the State target of 98.425%.**
 - o There are 35/40 local systems at or above the State Target;
 - o There are 3 local systems close to the State Target @ 93%-96% compliance;
 - o There are 2 local systems that fell below the State Target and will be required to have a Corrective Action Plan in this area. Those percentages were 87% and 81% compliance.
 - o If we look at a state summary of the less than 1% of services provided in a non-natural environment, there were:
 - o A total of 41 non-natural environments; of those:
 - o 38 were delivered in the provider location;
 - o 1 was provided in a residential facility;
 - o 1 was provided in a hospital and

Deleted: <#>Cite the SPP indicator Listed a-bove¶
 <#>Information from OSEP letter (page 7) following April visit to Virginia¶
 ¶
 E- What Procedures is Virginia Using for Data Verification?¶
 <#>Shared responsibility between Part C Office and local systems. Not a procedure¶
 <#>Local systems use new quarterly ITOTS reports to verify active child, children discharged, and children evaluated eligible¶
 <#>Local system managers confirm by their signature the accuracy of data submitted to Part C Office. ¶
 <#>For ITOTS, keep quarterly signature on file locally; submit annually¶
 <#>For record review, submit with data.¶
 <#>State completes annual on-site data verification visits. This is what we'll discuss today.¶
 ¶

- 1 was provided at the DSS.
- There are 8 local systems close to the State Target ranging in % from 93%-98% compliance;
- There are 26 local systems that fall below the State Target. Those percentages ranged from 65%-92% compliance.
- The new target for the current fiscal year remains at 98.425%.

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

- ***Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);***
 - ***Acquisition & use of knowledge & skills (including early language/communication; and***
 - ***Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.***
- Things To Consider with this Indicator:
 - This is a performance indicator whose State target will be determined with the advice and assistance of the VICC once the baseline progress data is reported in 2008.
 - In FY 2005, Virginia piloted its Child Outcome Measurement System as part of a "General Supervision and Enhancement Grant" awarded to Virginia in 2004. The pilot sites included one far western rural area, a rural area near an urban area, two suburbs, two urban areas and a portion of an urban area. 107 children entering the program between July 1, 2006 and August 15, 2006 were assessed.
 - Data on their status at entry on each of the three areas described in the indicator is as follows:
 1. Positive Social-Emotional Skills:
 - 51% of the children functioned comparable to their same age peers and 49% functioned below same-aged peers;
 2. Acquisition & Use of Knowledge & Skills:
 - 36% of the children functioned comparable to their same age peers and 64% functioned below same aged peers;
 3. Use of Appropriate Behaviors to Meet their Needs:
 - 43% of the children functioned comparable to their same age peers and 57% functioned below same aged peers.

Indicator #4: Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- ***Know their rights;***
 - ***Effectively communicate their children's needs; and***
 - ***Help their children develop and learn.***
- Things To Consider with this Indicator:
 - This is a performance indicator whose State target will be determined with the advice and assistance of the VICC once the baseline data for the family survey is available. This is due to the State Part C Office in early January and will be reported to OSEP in the APR in February.
 - In addition to collecting and analyzing child outcome data, the GSEG also included collecting and analyzing Part C family indicator data. As part of a pilot project, the GSEG funded a professionally administered parent survey at the state level resulting in a sample representative of Virginia's population.

- The baseline data for this indicator will be added to the SPP once it is available in January.

Indicator #5: Percent of infants & toddlers birth to one with IFSP's compared to other States with similar eligibility definitions and national data.

- This is a performance indicator whose State target was set by the VICC @ .62%.
- The Data Source for this indicator were two ITOTS reports (Table 1-1: "Percentage of Children Per Council by Age Group, Age as of 12/1/2005" and Table 3: "Race of Infant by Age: Infant Active on 12/1/2005") for data collected on December 1st, 2005 compared to population information from the "Easy Access to Juvenile Populations" online website.
- The State Measurement for this indicator (as required by OSEP) for the APR is as follows:
Percent = the number of infants & toddlers birth to one with IFSP's divided by the population of infants and toddlers birth to one times 100 compared to the same % calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions (Virginia is considered by OSEP to have a broad definition) and compared to National data.
- The Local Measurement for this indicator is as follows:
Percent = the number of infants and toddlers birth to one with IFSP's divided by the population of infants and toddlers birth to one times 100 compared to the same % calculated for the local population.
- Things To Consider with this Indicator:
 - Data for this indicator is "Point in time data" on December 1st, 2005.
 - At this time, the data to compare Virginia's results to other States with similar eligibility definitions is not yet available.
 - The following data is based on 2004 population data and will most likely change when OSEP issues the figures using 2005 population data.
- **Our State baseline data collected in FY 2004 was .58%. The overall State percentage of compliance for serving children birth to one (using 2004 population data) is .62%, which meets the State target.**
 - There are 18/40 local systems at or above the State Target;
 - There are 6 local systems close to the State Target;
 - There are 16 local systems that fell below the State Target. Those percentages ranged from 0-.57% compliance.
 - We will report the final results once OSEP provides us with the 2005 population data.
 - Since the State Target is set at .62% of the population, an algebraic equation was used to convert the above results to 100% so a comparison can be made between results of all of the indicators. (For example, systems achieving .62% have achieved 100% of the State Target).
 - Keep in mind, the new target for the current fiscal year increases from .62% to .65%.

Indicator #6: Percent of infants and toddlers birth to three with IFSP's compared to other States with similar eligibility and National data.

- This is a performance indicator whose State target was set by the VICC @ 1.9%.

- The Data Source for this indicator were two ITOTS reports (Table 1-1: “*Percentage of Children Per Council by Age Group, Age as of 12/1/2005*” and Table 3: “*Race of Infant by Age: Infant Active on 12/1/2005*”) for data collected on December 1st, 2005 compared to population information from the “Easy Access to Juvenile Populations” online website.
- The State Measurement for this indicator (as required by OSEP) for the APR is as follows:
Percent = the number of infants & toddlers birth to three with IFSP’s divided by the population of infants and toddlers birth to three times 100 compared to the same % calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions (Virginia is considered by OSEP to have a broad definition); and compared to national data.
- The Local Measurement for this indicator is as follows:
Percent = the number of infants and toddlers birth to three with IFSP’s divided by the population of infants and toddlers birth to three times 100 compared to the same % calculated for the local population.
- Things To Consider with this Indicator:
 - Data for this indicator is “Point in time data” on December 1st, 2005.
 - The 2005 population data for this indicator was just released by OSEP.
- **Our State baseline data collected in FY 2004 was 1.79%. The overall State percentage of compliance for serving children birth to three is 1.72% or 91% of the State target, which falls below the State target of 1.9%.**
 - There are 18/40 local systems at or above the State Target;
 - There are 3 local systems close to the State Target;
 - There are 19 local systems that fell below the State Target and will be required to have a Corrective Action Plan in this area. Those percentages ranged between .92%-1.7% compliance.
 - Since the State Target is set at 1.9 % of the population, an algebraic equation was used to convert the results to 100% so a comparison can be made between results of all of the indicators. (For example, systems achieving 1.9% have achieved 100% of the State Target).
 - Keep in mind, the new target for the current fiscal year increases from 1.9% to 2.05%.

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 compliance indicator whose State target is set by OSEP @ 100%.
- The Data Source for this indicator was an ITOTS report for data collected between 4/1/06-6/30/06.
- The Measurement for this indicator (as required by OSEP) is as follows:
%= The # of eligible infants & toddlers for whom an evaluation & assessment & an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C’s 45-day timeline divided by the # of eligible infants & toddlers evaluated & assessed times 100.
- Things To Consider with this Indicator:
 - This was a major focus of Virginia over the past year due to long-standing non-compliance.

- OSEP allows us to include family reasons in our percentage of compliance, but we are required to report in the APR the # of children for whom family reasons were identified.
- Family reasons included the following:
 - Child/family ill;
 - Family Scheduling Preference;
 - Temporarily Lost Contact; and
 - No show for the scheduled evaluation/IFSP.
- System reasons included the following:
 - Provider unavailability;
 - No reason documented and
 - Foster/surrogate parent issues.
- **Our State baseline data collected in FY 2004 was 93%. The overall State percentage of compliance for children for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP were conducted within the 45-day timeline is 98%.** Although this is slightly below the State target of 100%, Virginia has made a significant improvement in this area.
- There are 31 local systems at the State Target of 100% compliance;
- There are 5 local systems close to the State Target;
- There are 4 local systems that fell below the State Target and will be required to have a Corrective Action Plan in this area. Those percentages ranged from 44%-92% compliance.
- Keep in mind, the new target for the current fiscal year remains at 100%.

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

- ***IFSP's with transition steps & services;***
 - ***Notification to the Local Education Agency, if the child is potentially eligible for Part B; and***
 - ***Transition Conference if child is potentially eligible for Part B.***
- This is a compliance indicator whose State target is set by OSEP @ 100%.
 - The Data Source for this indicator was the Annual Local Record Review in August 2006 for children transitioning between 1/1/06-9/30/06

TRANSITION STEPS AND SERVICES:

- The Data Measurement for IFSP's with transition steps and services (as required by OSEP) is as follows:
 - *%= The # of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps & services divided by the # of children exiting Part C times 100.*
- Things To Consider with this portion of the Transition Indicator:
 - A child may be potentially eligible for Part B, but their family may choose not to pursue transition to Part B;
 - Judgment of whether a child is "potentially eligible for Part B" takes into consideration the child's developmental status & eligibility criteria for the local school division.
- **Our State baseline data collected in FY 2004 was 84%. The overall State percentage of compliance for children transitioning whose IFSP's include**

transition steps and services is 86%, which falls below the State Target of 100% compliance.

- o There are 18/40 local systems at the State Target of 100% compliance;
- o There are 4 local systems close to the State Target;
- o There are 18 local systems that fell below the State Target and will be required to have a Corrective Action Plan in this area. Those percentages ranged from 0%-91% compliance.
- o Keep in mind, the new target for the current fiscal year remains at 100%.

NOTIFICATION TO THE LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY:

- The Data Measurement for this portion of the transition indicator (as required by OSEP) is as follows:
%= The # of children exiting Part C & potentially eligible for Part V where notification to the LEA occurred divided by the # of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B times 100.
- Things To Consider with this portion of the Transition Indicator:
- The information that is required to be sent to the LEA includes the child's name, address, phone number and birth date.
- **Our State baseline data collected in FY 2004 was 81%. The overall State percentage of compliance for notification to the LEA is 89%, which falls below the State Target of 100%.**
 - o There are 28/40 local systems at the State Target of 100% compliance;
 - o There are 2 local systems close to the State Target;
 - o There are 10 local systems that fell below the State Target and will be required to have a Corrective Action Plan in this area. Those percentages ranged from 0%-92% compliance.
 - o Keep in mind, the new target for the current fiscal year remains at 100%.

• **TRANSITION CONFERENCE:**

- The Data Measurement for the Transition Conference (as required by OSEP) is as follows:
%= The # of children exiting Part C & potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred divided by the # of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B times 100.
- Things To Consider with this portion of the Transition Indicator:
 - o The Transition Conference is required by law to be held between the family, Part C representative & the LEA representative at least 90 days before the child's third birthday or, the date on which the child is eligible for Early Childhood Special Education under Part B of IDEA.
 - o The discussion of appropriate services is intended to be a general discussion of potential services that might be appropriate if the child is found eligible for Part B.
 - o "Eligibility for Part B" means either the start of the school year in which the child turns two by September 30th or the child's third birthday, depending on when the parent chooses to transition their child.
 - o OSEP allows us to include family reasons in our percentage of compliance.
 - o We are required to report in the APR the # of children for whom family reasons were identified.
 - o Family reasons included the following:

- Child/family ill;
 - Family Scheduling Preference; (those families who choose to postpone or delay the transition process to Part B)
- System reasons included the following:
 - LEA scheduling difficulties and
 - Part C scheduling difficulties.
- **Our State baseline data collected in FY 2004 was 51%. The overall State percentage of compliance for the transition conference is 87%, which is a significant increase over the baseline data a year ago, but falls below the State target of 100% compliance.**
 - There are 17/40 local systems at the State Target of 100% compliance;
 - There is 1 local system close to the State Target;
 - There are 20 local systems that fell below the State Target and will be required to have a Corrective Action Plan in this area. Those percentages ranged from 0%-91% compliance.
- Keep in mind, the new target for the current fiscal year remains at 100%.

Indicator #9: Comprehensive Evaluation & related IFSP content includes:

- **Evaluation and assessment for each child including an evaluation of the child's functioning in each of the specified developmental areas;**
 - **An IFSP for each child that reflects the functioning levels for each of the developmental areas.**
 - The developmental areas include: gross motor, fine motor, cognitive, communication, social-emotional, adaptive, vision and hearing.
- This is a compliance indicator whose State target is set by OSEP @ 100%.
 - The Data Source for this indicator was the annual local record review completed in August 2006 for data collected between 11/1/05-6/30/06.
 - The Measurement for "evaluation and assessment for each child including an evaluation of the child's functioning in each of the specified developmental areas" is as follows:
 $\% = \frac{\text{The \# of children who had all developmental domains evaluated}}{\text{the total \# of children evaluated}} \times 100.$
 - The Measurement for "An IFSP for each child that reflects the functioning levels for each of the developmental areas" is as follows:
 $\% = \frac{\text{The \# of children who had an IFSP with functioning levels indicated for all of the developmental domains}}{\text{the total \# of children evaluated}} \times 100.$
 - Things To Consider with this Indicator:
 - This indicator is not a State Performance Plan indicator but is required by OSEP to be included in Virginia's APR due to longstanding non-compliance in this area.
 - This target is set by the law at 100% compliance.
 - In order to be in compliance with this indicator, a child must have been evaluated in ALL 8 developmental areas.
 - If a child was evaluated in 7/8 developmental areas, for purposes of reporting to OSEP, the system would be considered to be out of compliance with this indicator.

- **The overall State percentage of compliance for evaluation in all 8 developmental areas is 95%.**
 - There are 26/40 local systems at the State Target of 100% compliance;
 - There are 8 local systems close to the State Target;
 - There are 6 local systems that fell below the State Target and will be required to have a Corrective Action Plan in this area. Those percentages ranged from 62%-92% compliance.
- **The overall State percentage of compliance for the IFSP reflecting functioning levels for each of the areas assessed is 95%.**
 - There are 26/40 local systems at the State Target of 100% compliance;
 - There are 4 local systems close to the State Target;
 - There are 10 local systems that fell below the State Target and will be required to have a Corrective Action Plan in this area. Those percentages ranged from 60%-92% compliance.
- Lack of documentation of vision and hearing screening and level of functioning on the child's IFSP was identified in last year's APR for Virginia as a major reason for non-compliance. Results of this year's monitoring of vision and hearing screening indicate the following:
 - Vision screened was @ 97% compliance statewide and
 - Hearing screened was @ 96% compliance statewide.
 - Documentation of vision functioning was @ 96% compliance statewide and
 - Documentation of hearing functioning was @ 97% compliance statewide.

Summary:

- The Annual Performance Report is in draft form and was made available today for public comment ending January 4th.
- The Annual Performance Report is due to OSEP by February 1st, 2007.
- We are currently in the fiscal year for the next APR and have new targets for each of the monitoring indicators. Please keep these targets in mind for monitoring your local system's performance in relation to the State target for each of the monitoring indicators.
- Both the statewide aggregate monitoring indicator results and Individual local system monitoring indicator results are required by law to be publicly reported. Our next call scheduled for January 25th from 1-2:30 p.m. will explain "Public Reporting" in more detail.
- We hope you found the information from today's call helpful to you in understanding Virginia's Annual Performance Report for Fiscal Year 2005.

FYI:

- We are currently working on the findings letters for each individual local system related to the monitoring indicators. Our goal is to make these available to you in early 2007. Your Technical Assistance and Monitoring Consultants will be contacting you shortly thereafter to discuss collaboratively the strategies and activities for any indicators that require improvement.
- We would like to publicly thank each and every one of you for your timely assistance in collecting the data necessary to report to OSEP in Virginia's Annual Performance Report.
- Have a great week-end!