

**VIRGINIA INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COUNCIL
DRAFT MEETING MINUTES
Henrico Mental Health, Mental Retardation & Substance Abuse East Center
Richmond, Virginia
September 14, 2005**

Brenda Laws, Virginia Interagency Coordinating Council (VICC) Chair, called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Jim Henson, Virginia's technical assistant from Mid-South Regional Resource Center of the University of Kentucky, was introduced. Brenda Laws shared that Mr. Henson is facilitating today's presentation on the State Performance Plan (SPP). The newest Part C staff member, Bonnie Grifa, was also introduced. She is serving as a Monitoring and Improvement Measurement System (MIMS) consultant. The roll was then called. Eighteen VICC members were present. (Please see the attendance sheet following the minutes.)

Ms. Corinne Garland, the Executive Director from Child Development Resources (CDR), was then recognized by the Part C Office of Child and Family Services and the VICC for her many contributions to Part C and the early childhood community. Ms. Garland is retiring in January 2006 after more than 28 years of service. She was presented with an engraved plaque as an expression of appreciation and recognition.

As part of the business of the VICC, Brenda Laws then recognized and welcomed the three newest members who have been recently appointed by the Governor to serve on the VICC. They are Ms. Jacqueline Fagan Myal, the parent representative from the Southwest Region; Ms. Sheila Nelson, the parent representative from the Central Virginia Region; and Ms. Sharon Osborne, the Head Start representative. This was the first meeting for each of the newest members.

Mary Lou Hutton, the System Manager representative on the VICC, then updated the members on the work of the Nominating Committee for VICC officers. She stated that the Nominating Committee has finalized a proposed slate of officers to serve for the upcoming year. They are:

- Brenda Laws-Chair
- Phyllis Mondak-Vice Chair
- Sandra Binns Whitaker- Secretary

The VICC By-Laws require that the proposed slate of officers be made available in writing to the VICC members one month prior to the September VICC meeting. Since that was not possible prior to the September 14, 2005 VICC meeting, an electronic notice was sent from the Part C office notifying the members of the proposed slate of officers. The members will vote via email following the 30-day notice time period that will conclude on October 10, 2005.

Debra Holloway, Program Manager for the Family Involvement Project, then presented the Family Report. The following italicized information is verbatim from the written report provided:

The Family Involvement Project staff is assisting Part C staff in finding nominees for the vacant Northern Virginia Parent Representative VICC position. We would like to welcome the newly appointed members. We continue to assist with MIMS by conducting family interviews. Project staff continues to be active participants on the VICC steering Committee and Advocacy Committee, GSEG, Management Team, Integrative Training Collaborative, Virginia Integrated Network of Family Organizations (VA-INFO) which is a new group forming to collaborate and to advocate on behalf of children with special needs and their families in obtaining timely access to information, support, and service, the MR-EI Advisory Committee, Child and Family Services Advisory Group and local and regional council meetings.

Nine Parent-to-Parent match requests were made this quarter. Four Parent Partner trainings are scheduled for September, October and November.

Project staff was invited to present the Family Involvement Project to a CoCoA Steering Committee this past quarter. Project staff was also given the opportunity to meet with the Family Resource Coordinator of Pulaski School and the President of The Arc of the Roanoke Valley to discuss our parent-to-parent program and The Family Involvement Program. The meeting focused on how we could work together to get more parents involved and to hold PTP trainings for each group.

Project staff continues to host the ARCFIP list serve with 228 members. Our new website with updated information and easier navigation is available still at www.arcfip.org. There is also a direct link to our site from the Infant and Toddler Connection of Virginia site. We are very excited about our new fresh look!

The Arc of Virginia will be hosting The MArch for Virginians with Disabilities. This will take place on Oct. 1st at 10:00 a.m. starting at Mayo Island then the crowd will march to the bell tower on the capitol grounds. This event is to encourage elected officials and communities to invest in resources necessary to create and maintain community based services for Virginians with disabilities. The theme this year is "A Life Like Yours" we are selling reminder bands to support this mind set, \$3.00 a band. For more information you can ask me after the meeting or visit www.arcofva.org.

The Arc of Virginia Family Involvement Project is in the process of searching for a regional parent representative in the Northern Virginia area and hopes to begin a search for a regional representative in the Tidewater area this winter. The goal of these part-time employees is to improve parent involvement and communication of resources in these areas.

Jim Henson then presented a power point presentation about the State Performance Plan. The following introductory information was provided:

- The SPP is a statutory requirement by Congress through the reauthorization of IDEA and applies to all states.

- The SPP is a 6-year plan, 2006-2011, by which each state addresses specified indicators and determines measurable and rigorous targets that must be met for each indicator.
- Measurable and rigorous targets are established for each indicator and progress must be reported annually.
- The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) will assess each state's annual progress for each indicator.
- The SPP evolved from the Continuous Improvement Monitoring Plan (CIMP).
- The component of Continuous Improvement Focused Monitoring related to the Annual Performance Report (APR) was added with further evolution to the SPP.
- Many of the indicators are the same as in the last APR.
- The SPP includes baseline data, targets, improvement strategies, timelines, resources, progress and slippage for each indicator.
- Stakeholder involvement is required in the development of the SPP.
- A public process must be followed in the development and annual reporting on the state's plan. (Please see the statutory requirements below.)
- The SPP is due to OSEP on December 02, 2005.

The following statutory requirements relate to the SPP:

- The State shall use the targets in the SPP to analyze the performance of each early intervention system in the State.
- The State shall report annually to the public on the performance of each early intervention system in the State on the targets in the SPP.
- The State shall make the State's performance plan available through public means, including by posting on the website of the State Educational Agency, distribution to the media and distribution through public agencies.
- The state must report on every indicator (except General Supervision), for every agency, every year.
- The State must sample every agency at least once every 6 years.

Copies of the compliance indicators were provided to each VICC member. (Please see the attached indicator chart). Fourteen indicators must be addressed by the Part C system. Seven of the fourteen indicators, 1, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 14, are compliance indicators with targets requiring 100% compliance. If noncompliance is identified, it must be corrected within one year of identification and must stay in compliance over time.

Three indicators are new indicators, 3, 4, and 12, and do not require baseline data. However, the State must report on the plans to address the provision of a baseline and target that will be due February 01, 2007. Indicator 12 will not be applicable to Virginia as it relates only to those states that are adopting the due process procedures of Part B.

Indicators 2, 5, 6 and 13 are Performance Indicators and require the State to establish baseline data and targets. The baseline data is to be derived from 2003-04 data.

Jim Henson shared with the group Congress' definition of "measurable and rigorous targets". The definition follows: "Within the context of the State Performance Plan, measurable and rigorous targets are established with broad stakeholder input and specify the challenging levels of improved performance to be reached with a particular timeframe."

It was further explained that measurable and rigorous means specific; measurable; achievable, but challenging; relevant; and timed. The targets must be specifically related to the indicators and must be quantifiable. They should be realistic, but ambitious and a stretch and should not be a wish list. The targets should be relevant to the stakeholders and relevant to the current baseline. They should also be established within the context of the state's improvement goals.

Discussion was then held and questions presented by the VICC members based on the information provided by Mr. Henson. The following statements and clarifications were made:

- The State must report not only on the performance of the State as a whole but also on the performance of each local system.
- The performance information for each local system must be made public.
- The Federal Government is requiring accountability.
- Even though the State does not presently have a data system in place to report all of the required information, the State must show its present plan for reporting and include information on future data system improvements.
- Not having a data system in place does not relieve the state of the reporting responsibility now.
- Information can be used on the SPP from this year's Annual Performance Report.
- The State should start working on the plan as it is submitted and modify it as feedback is provided from OSEP.
- The performance measures are a way for local systems to self-assess and determine if they are meeting the standards and indicators and if improvements are needed.
- Sampling is allowed for certain identified indicators.

At 11:00, the discussion was stopped to allow for public comment. Audience members introduced themselves. (Please see the list of audience members following the minutes). Those presenting public comment were then identified. Alison Standring, on behalf of CoCoA, presented the following comments, which were provided in writing and are italicized verbatim.

I am speaking on behalf of the Steering Committee of CoCoA, the Virginia Council Coordinator's Association.

We would like to express our gratitude to the Part C office and the members of the VICC who are working so hard to develop the State Performance Plan. We greatly appreciate recent opportunities provided for us to give feedback in developing the plan, such as providing input into the proposed definition of "timely" before it was finalized.

One of the critical issues that will impact Virginia's compliance with the timely beginning of IFSP services and the provision of ongoing IFSP services is the current severe shortage of providers who are able to deliver services in natural environments. This is a growing issue being faced by many areas around the state, and we are concerned about the long-term impact of providers being unable to deliver services in natural environments. CoCoA would like to work with the Part C office and the VICC on identifying strategies to meet this challenge.

We would like to recognize the efforts and hard work of the Integrated Training Collaborative. The Collaborative has worked hard to develop and implement trainings so that providers in Virginia are well prepared and can offer consistent, high quality services to children and their families. However, we are concerned with the decrease in the number of proposed Kaleidoscope Level I and Level II trainings for the coming year. With the number of new staff needing training and the limited spaces available, there will be longer waiting periods for new staff to receive consistent service coordination training, and increased costs to local systems who have to send staff outside of their regions to receive this training. These trainings are critical for implementing strategies consistently across the state. We hope that in the future some additional resources can be secured for training.

Finally, we wish to welcome Bonnie Grifa to the position of MIMS consultant, and we look forward to working with Bonnie on monitoring and improving Part C services in Virginia.

Again, thank you for your continuing support and for the opportunity to express these views.

Upon the conclusion of public comment, the VICC members returned to the discussion of the SPP. The following points were made:

- The compliance indicators are set at 100% by the Federal Government and cannot be changed.
- The State, with public input, sets the targets for the Performance Indicators.
- Upon being asked how the local system managers view themselves related to existing wording in the SPP, the response was that local system managers see themselves as a combination of providers, programs and agencies.
- Local systems will have the responsibility of evaluating how their system is doing.
- The expectation from OSEP is that all local systems will be in compliance.
- The state will have to address noncompliance.
- Collaboratively efforts will be taken to help each local system with compliance issues.
- Local systems must determine how they will reach the required targets.

Individual indicators were viewed and discussion occurred related to setting targets. It was identified that 98% of the children in Part C in Virginia are receiving services in the

natural environment and that OSEP would not expect 100% compliance as this would not allow for individualization and those children where a justification is warranted. The following questions arose:

- Could there be a justification for lowering the target?
- Could there be variables that affect the data?
- How does the data from those two-year olds that go to Part B effect reporting?
 - It was suggested that a clear explanation and distinction be provided to OSEP related to the data and the percentage of children in Part C and those 2-year olds that have transitioned to Part B.
- Should Virginia examine the decision-making process and explain that Virginia's policy of transitioning at age 2 to Part B fully addresses the option of the family?

David Mills then presented charts representing the number of children in Part C in Virginia that are the ages of birth to one and birth to three related to the State's total population for those age groups. The indicators addressing these areas look at the comparison of the state to the national. Discussion surrounding setting targets for these indicators was held. As part of his presentation, David Mills suggested looking at growth as a factor and doing a comparison to other states similar to Virginia. Data could be looked at related to the states that have reached the national average and used to help set targets for Virginia.

The discussion was then opened to the audience. Discussion surrounded existing variables and those things that Virginia may want to examine. It was suggested that the SPP might include future plans to explore these variables and their impact on the data and the state. They included:

- Population growth;
- Funding issues and the impact of increasing numbers;
- Financing issues that include NICUs referring children only when insurance is ready to run out and how these late referrals affect the data on age of referrals;
- Families that decide they don't want Part C services;
- Analysis of disproportionality-
 - Demographics, cultural differences, ethnicity;
 - Look at states with similar demographics and eligibility;
- Shortage of providers;
- CAPTA;
- System of payment-Family Fees as compared to other states that don't charge fees or bill differently- (Medicaid, Insurance, etc.);
- Prevalence data to include poverty and developmental growth;
- Success in reducing poverty and the impact; and
- States that screen or monitor children.

Jim Henson then shared that Indicators 3 and 4 were being addressed through the Outcomes Group of the GSEG as stakeholders. He explained how they related to outcomes for children and families which is the work of that committee.

The timeline for the SPP development process was reviewed and discussion held as to whether another meeting would be needed related to the work of the SPP. The short time frame until the submission date was recognized. Glen Slonneger suggested that the Part C staff complete a draft of the SPP including the suggested targets and other information. The draft would then be sent to the VICC members via email and feedback would be provided. Phyllis Mondak reminded the members that revisions could be made to the plan if this was determined in the future as being needed. Curtis Smith suggested that the date of February 2007 be added to the timeline as a data submission requirement. The members agreed.

It was decided by the VICC members that the Part C Office would complete the draft SPP and send it to the VICC members electronically. Individual comments would be sent from the members to a designated Part C staff member. A conference call would then be scheduled in order for discussion to occur.

Brenda Laws thanked Jim Henson for the SPP presentation. A draft agenda was then developed for the December VICC meeting. Items to be included are:

- SPP Update
- Project Hope Presentation
- Part C Update to include information on ITOTS

The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Attendance

VICC Members

Ashley Barton on behalf of Tamara Whitlock
Sherry Confer
Pat Dewey
Delly Greenberg
Ginny Heuple
Mary Lou Hutton
Dr. Colleen Kraft
Martha Kurgans
Brenda Laws
Phyllis Mondak
Jackie Fagan Myal
Sheila Nelson
Sheri Osborne
Shirley Ricks
Glen Slonneger
Curtis Smith on behalf of Lyndell Lewis
Yolanda Tennyson
Dr. Eva Thorp
Sandra Binns Whitaker

Part C Staff

Beverly Crouse
Mary Ann Discenza
Karen Durst
Bonnie Grifa
Cori Hill
David Mills
Mary Anne White

System Managers

Elizabeth Faulk
Debbie Ferguson
Liz Fletcher
Carol Granger
Jane Prince
Frances Rudd
Susan Shaw
Alison Standing
Susan Werner

Others

Peggy Agee
Shannon Byrd
Bill Desmond
Corinne Garland
Sandi Harrington
Alan Phillips
Leslie Snead
Lisa Thomas
Kate Whitehead
Kim-Student
Shannon-Student