

Red= Compliance Indicator
(Target set by OSEP)

VIRGINIA'S MONITORING INDICATORS
Infant & Toddler Connection of _____

Aqua=Performance Indicator
(Target set by VICC based on VA data)

	INDICATOR	Virginia Target 2006	VA's Actual Performance 2006	Local Actual Performance 2006
1	<p>Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSP's who receive the early intervention services on their IFSP's in a timely manner. <i>Timely is defined by Virginia as "within 21 days of the date the IFSP is signed by the parent".</i></p> <p>Data Source: Annual Local Record Review Time Frame for Record Reviews: 11-1-05 thru 6-30-06</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ To determine percentage of compliance OSEP says: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Percent</u> = [(# 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. ◦ In a Part C APR FAQs dated 8/2/06, OSEP states that "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. ◦ States must, however, include in their narrative the number of children for whom such factors were identified and how the State ensured the documentation was available for such circumstances. ◦ We are obtaining clarification from OSEP on how to determine compliance to ensure all necessary information is addressed in the calculations. ◦ The excel record review spreadsheet will calculate the number of YES responses inserted into Column D "Services start within 21-calendar days from date IFSP signed?" ◦ For NO responses, review information why services were not provided within the 21day time period. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Justifications that do not count against the 21-day timeline are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Child/Family ill ▪ Family Scheduling Preference* ▪ Temporarily Lost Contact* ▪ Late start date to meet child family need* <p>*Will need to review the record to ensure that the reason is truly a family reason and not a system reason.</p>	100%		
2	<p>Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSP's who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community settings.</p> <p>Data Source: ITOTS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Select Active Case Reports b. Select "Primary Service Setting Data" c. Insert December 1 2005 into "Report Date" Box d. Click "Excel Export" e. Highlight all information in the excel report except the header titles f. Click the Data button on the information bar on top of the reports g. Alphabetize the "Primary Service Setting" column from A-Z h. Determine total number of children with IFSP's that designate a primary service setting in this report (e.g. If the 	98.425%		

	INDICATOR	Virginia Target 2006	VA's Actual Performance 2006	Local Actual Performance 2006
	<p>names of children start on line 2 and end on line 80, there are 78 children in this report)</p> <p>i. Determine the number of children served in the home or community settings (from the ITOTS drop down menu this would include home, programs for typically developing children and "other" if the location meets the definition of a natural environment (e.g. playground, library, McDonald's, etc) (e.g. 70 children served in these environments)</p> <p>j. Divide the number of children served in the home or community settings (i) by the total number of children a setting into the total number of children with IFSP's that designate a primary service setting (h) in the report x 100 to get the percentage of children receiving services in the natural environments (e.g. $70/78 \times 100 = 89.7\%$)</p> <p>k. Enter this number in the Local Actual Performance 2006 Column</p>			
3	<p>Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSP's who demonstrate improved:</p> <p>a. Positive social-emotional</p> <p>b. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication);</p> <p>c. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs</p> <p>Data Source: ITOTS</p>	TBD (Part of GSEG)		
4	<p>Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:</p> <p>a. Know their rights;</p> <p>b. Effectively communicate their children's needs;</p> <p>c. Help their children develop and learn.</p> <p>Data Source: Family Survey</p>	TBD (Part of GSEG)		
5	<p>Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSP's compared to local population</p> <p>Data Source: ITOTS and population information</p> <p>We are awaiting information from OSEP before being able to instruct you how to calculate this on the local level.</p> <p>OSEP will measure Virginia's compliance by:</p> <p>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. (Virginia is considered by OSEP to have a broad eligibility definition).</p> <p>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.</p>	.62%		
6	<p>Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSP's compared to local population</p> <p>Data Source: ITOTS, Information from Department of Education and population information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o We are awaiting information from OSEP before being able to instruct you how to calculate this on the local level. o We are working with DOE to get the number of 2 year olds served within the local school divisions by each community so that this number can be included in overall calculations. <p>OSEP will measure Virginia's compliance by:</p> <p>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. (Virginia is considered by OSEP to have a broad eligibility definition).</p>	1.9%		

	INDICATOR	Virginia Target 2006	VA's Actual Performance 2006	Local Actual Performance 2006		
	<p>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.</p>					
7	<p>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</p> <p>Data Source: ITOTS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ To determine percentage of compliance OSEP says: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Percent</u> = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed)] times 100. ◦ In a Part C APR FAQs dated 8/2/06, OSEP states that "States should not include in their calculation (that is the denominator) those children fro 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 the number of children for whom such factors where identified and how the State ensured the documentation was available for such circumstances. ◦ We are obtaining clarification from OSEP on how to determine compliance to ensure all necessary information is addressed in the calculations ◦ Will need 2 different reports (listed below #1 and #2) to determine if your local system complies with the 45-day timeline and one report (listed below (# 3) to ensure that there are not children whose status needs to be updated in ITOTS. ◦ Custom General Reports provides the number of days from referral to the development of the IFSP for each child who had an IFSP developed within the time frame entered into "by Date of Referral" ◦ For those children whose IFSP was developed after 45 days, Custom Case Reports will need to be pulled in order to look at the mitigating circumstances. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Mitigating circumstances that do not count against the 45-day timeline include; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Child/Family ill ▪ Family Scheduling Preference* ▪ Temporarily Lost Contact* ▪ No Show <p>*Will need to review the record to ensure that the reason is truly a family reason and not a system reason.</p>	100%				
	<p>1. Custom General Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Select "Days from Referral to IFSP by Council" ◦ Select time period you want to look at "by Date of Referral" ◦ Generate your report 	<p>2. Custom Case Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Select "Children Exceeding 45 Day Timeline with Mitigating Circumstances" ◦ Enter same time period from #1 into "By date of Referral". ◦ Generate your report 	<p>3. Custom Case Reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Select "Referrals Not Yet Evaluated" ◦ Use same time period as in #1 and 2 and enter into "By Date of Referral" ◦ Generate your report <p>This report shows those children not yet evaluated for whom there is no final disposition. Local systems should look at this report to determine whether there is a need to update the</p>			

	INDICATOR	Virginia Target 2006	VA's Actual Performance 2006	Local Actual Performance 2006
	status of these children in ITOTS.			
8	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. IFSP's with transition steps and services b. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and b. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B <p>Data Source: Annual Local Record Review Time frame for record reviews: Jan1 06- Sept 30 06 Example: Total # of children exiting Part C = 30 Total # of children potentially eligible for Part B = 10 Total # of children potentially eligible for Part B where notification to LEA occurred = 5 Total # of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services = 20 Total # of children exiting Part C that had a transition planning conference = 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. To determine percentage of records with "IFSP's with transition steps and services": <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100. $20/30 \times 100 = 66.6\%$ o Enter this number in the "Local Actual Performance 2006" Column" for "a." b. To determine percentage of records with Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for part B <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100. $5/10 \times 100 = 50\%$ o Enter this number in the "Local Actual Performance 2006" Column" for "b" c. To determine percentage of records that indicated the 90-day transition planning conference was held <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and 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. $6/10 \times 100 = 60\%$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o In a Part C APR FAQs dated 8/2/06, OSEP states that "States should not include in their calculation (that is the denominator) those children fro whom delays are attributable to documented exceptional family or other circumstances outside of the lead agency's control. o States must, however, include in their narrative the number of children for whom such factors where identified and how the State ensured the documentation was available for such circumstances. o We are obtaining clarification from OSEP on how to determine compliance to ensure all necessary information is addressed in the calculations <p>IMPORTANT: In order for a transition planning conference to be considered to have occurred and be in compliance with federal regulations, ALL of the following must have a YES response on the record reviews:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Parental Permission obtained o Parent present at meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 100% b. 100% c. 100% 		

	INDICATOR	Virginia Target 2006	VA's Actual Performance 2006	Local Actual Performance 2006
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Part C representative present at meeting o Part B representative present at meeting <p>Review justifications as to why 90-day conference was not held within the appropriate time frame.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Justifications that do not count against why a 90-day conference was not held within the appropriate timeframe include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Child/Family ill ▪ Family Scheduling Preference* ▪ Late Referral to Part C <p>*Will need to review the record to ensure that the reason is truly a family reason and not a system reason</p>			
9	<p>Comprehensive Evaluation & related IFSP content: Evaluation an Assessment for each child includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. an evaluation of the child's level of functioning in each of nine specified developmental areas; b. the IFSP reflects the functioning levels for each of the areas. <p>Data Source: Annual Local Record Review Time Frame for Record Reviews: 11-1-06 thru 6-30-06</p> <p>a. Children who received an evaluation containing a level of functioning in each of the 9 specified developmental areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o For local monitoring purposes, you will be able to look at the calculations on the excel database in two ways: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Each individual child record</u>: You will be able to see how many developmental levels were evaluated out of the 9 areas. (e.g. The excel database calculates the number of YES responses for each individual child. At the end of the row, you may see 6, which means that 6/9 developmental levels were assessed/evaluated. 2. <u>All Children included in the record review</u>: The excel database will total the number of YES responses for each of the developmental domains (e.g. Cognitive, Gross Motor, Fine Motor, Adaptive, etc) on all records reviewed. o To calculate the percentage of children who had all developmental domains evaluated/assessed: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Count the number of records reviewed and multiple by 9 (15 records reviewed x 9 = 135. This number is the total number of opportunities a developmental domain could have been evaluated for the 15 records reviewed b. At the bottom of each of the developmental domain columns, total the sums of YES responses (e.g. Cog: 13, Adaptive, 10, GM: 15, FM: 15, Rec Lang: 15, Exp Lang: 11; Social/Emotional 10; Hearing: 8, Vision: 8 = 105 o Divide b. by a. x 100 to obtain the percentage of compliance for this portion of the indicator. (105/135 x 100 = 77.8%) o Enter this number in the "Local Actual Performance 2006" Column" for "a". <p>If a local system so chooses for local monitoring purposes, to determine the percentage of each of the developmental areas evaluated/assessed (e.g. cognitive vs. Hearing), divide the number of yes responses from the specific developmental area column into the number of records reviewed x 100 (e.g. Cognitive 13/15 x 100 = 86.7%; Hearing: 8/15 x 100 = 53.3%)</p> <p>b. Children who have IFSPs that reflects the function levels for each of the developmental areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o For local monitoring purposes, you will be able to look at the calculations on the excel database in two ways: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Each individual child record</u>: You will be able to see if developmental levels were present somewhere on the IFSP for each of the 9 developmental domains. (e.g. The excel database calculates the number of YES responses for each individual child. At the end of the row, you may see 6, which means that 6/9 developmental domains had a 	<p>a. 100%</p> <p>b. 100%</p>		

	INDICATOR	Virginia Target 2006	VA's Actual Performance 2006	Local Actual Performance 2006
	<p>developmental level listed somewhere on the IFSP.</p> <p>2. <u>All Children included in the record review:</u> The excel database will total the number of YES responses for each of the developmental domains (e.g. Cognitive, Gross Motor, Fine Motor, Adaptive, etc) on all records reviewed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ To calculate the percentage of children who had a developmental level recorded somewhere on their IFSP in each of the 9 specific developmental areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Count the number of records reviewed and multiple by 9 (15 records reviewed x 9 = 135. This number is the total number of opportunities a developmental level could have been reported somewhere on the IFSP for the 15 records reviewed b. At the bottom of each of the developmental domain columns, total the sums of YES responses (e.g. Cog: 13, Adaptive, 10, GM: 15, FM: 15, Rec Lang: 15, Exp Lang: 11; Social/Emotional 10; Hearing: 8, Vision: 8 = 105) ◦ Divide b by a x 100 to obtain the percentage of compliance for whether developmental levels were present somewhere on the IFSP for each of the developmental domains. (105/135 x 100 = 77.8%) ◦ Enter this number in the "Local Actual Performance 2006" Column" <p>If a local system so chooses for local monitoring purposes, to determine the percentage each developmental domain was listed somewhere on the IFSP (e.g. cognitive vs. Hearing) divide the number of YES responses into the number of records reviewed x 100 (e.g. Cognitive 13/15 x 100 = 86.7%; Hearing: 8/15 x 100 = 53.3%)</p>			
10	<p>Locally reported data (including data submitted for 618 reporting, State Performance Plan and the Annual Performance Plan) and local contract deliverables are timely and accurate</p> <p>Data Source: <i>Tracking Forms, CAPS, etc</i> Time Frame: <i>July 1 through June 30</i> OSEP will measure Virginia's compliance by: State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met). <p>It is highly recommended that local systems develop a local monitoring mechanism to monitor this indicator to include all the factors the state will be monitored on.</p>	100%		
11	<p>General Supervision system at the local level identifies & corrects non-compliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.</p> <p>Data Source: <i>Tracking Form, CAPS etc</i> Time Frame <i>one year from date non-compliance identified</i> OSEP will measure Virginia's compliance by: Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. # of findings of noncompliance b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification. 	100%		

	INDICATOR	Virginia Target 2006	VA's Actual Performance 2006	Local Actual Performance 2006
	<p>Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.</p> <p>For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.</p> <p>It is highly recommended that local systems develop a local monitoring mechanism to monitor this indicator to include all the factors the state will be monitored on.</p>			