

**State Performance Plan / Annual Performance Report:  
Part C**

**for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
Individuals with Disabilities Education Act**

**For reporting on  
FFY18**

**Virginia**



**PART C DUE February 3, 2020**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## Introduction

### Instructions

Provide sufficient detail to ensure that the Secretary and the public are informed of and understand the State's systems designed to drive improved results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families and to ensure that the Lead Agency (LA) meets the requirements of Part C of the IDEA. This introduction must include descriptions of the State's General Supervision System, Technical Assistance System, Professional Development System, Stakeholder Involvement, and Reporting to the Public.

### Intro - Indicator Data

#### Executive Summary

#### General Supervision System

**The systems that are in place to ensure that IDEA Part C requirements are met, e.g., monitoring systems, dispute resolution systems.**

In order to ensure general supervision of Virginia's Part C early intervention system, the State Lead Agency employs a full-time Early Intervention Administrator (Coordinator); a full-time Early Intervention Team Leader, who is responsible for oversight of the monitoring and supervision team, requirements and timelines; 3 full-time Monitoring Consultants, one of whom is also responsible for dispute resolution; 3 full-time Technical Assistance Consultants; and a full-time Data Manager.

Implementation of federal and state Part C early intervention requirements and evidence-based practices is supported by state regulations that were signed by the Governor in December 2014, a Practice Manual, and an annual contract between the State Lead Agency and each local lead agency. Technical assistance and professional development are in place to ensure local administrators, local system managers and providers are aware of and understand the requirements and expectations.

All local systems are monitored on each State Performance Plan indicator annually. Beginning in FFY 2018, the State Lead Agency also is implementing a new topic-focused monitoring process that addresses both quality and compliance and includes both desk review and on-site monitoring with all local lead agencies. The length of each topical monitoring cycle has not yet been determined since this is a new process. Additional monitoring or more extensive monitoring (drill-down) may be triggered through the dispute resolution process, local system performance on an indicator, or the local system's determination status. Ongoing monitoring for compliance on related Part C requirements occurs through all interactions with local systems (technical assistance, self-reporting by local systems, requests for additional funds, etc.).

The State Lead Agency monitors local systems using a variety of data sources, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Infant & Toddler Online Tracking System (ITOTS) data;
- Family survey data;
- On-site monitoring;
- Desk audits;
- Dispute resolution findings; and
- Tracking of timely submission of local data.

Each of the three Monitoring Consultants is assigned to work with local systems in 2 regions of the state, and each Monitoring Consultant is paired with a Technical Assistance Consultant who works in those same regions. This process allows the Monitoring Consultants to become familiar with local system and regional issues impacting compliance with Part C requirements and/or results for children and families and, therefore, promptly identify and work with their Technical Assistance partner to correct noncompliance and/or improve results. Correction of non-compliance and improved results for children and families are facilitated by individualized improvement planning with the local system, and may include requiring a written improvement plan with prescribed status checks to ensure expected progress.

A system of enforcements is also in place. Enforcements are imposed when noncompliance extends beyond one year. Targeted technical assistance is required for all local systems that do not correct areas of noncompliance in a timely manner. The focus of the targeted technical assistance is on capacity building and overcoming barriers to compliance. Since noncompliance beyond one year affects the local system's annual determination status, additional enforcements may be imposed based on their determination. Enforcement options available to the State Lead Agency include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Conduct on-site activities (training, technical assistance, record reviews, meetings with staff and/or providers, etc.) with the Local System Manager as needed and appropriate;
- Conduct on-site activities that include the Local System Manager's supervisor;
- Conduct on-site activities that include the local lead agency's administration;
- Complete focused monitoring site visit(s) on area(s) of noncompliance;
- Increase frequency of improvement plan status check-ins;
- Require targeted technical assistance and/or training;
- Require development/revision of the local system's annual staff development plan to include professional development related to the area(s) of noncompliance;
- Require the Local System Manager to collect and analyze data and review it with their Technical Assistance and/or Monitoring Consultant at a frequency determined with the State Lead Agency;
- Require the local system to complete additional record reviews at a frequency determined with the State Lead Agency and with verification by the State Lead Agency;
- Link to another local system that demonstrates promising practices in the identified area(s) of noncompliance;
- Require a meeting with the local lead agency administration and the State Part C Administrator, Technical Assistance and Monitoring Consultants to discuss barriers to compliance, improvement plan strategies, and how the State Lead Agency can further assist the local system;
- Report noncompliance to the administration of the local lead agency explaining that it may be necessary to redirect or withhold funds if timely improvement is not shown;
- Conditionally approve the local contract;
- Require the local lead agency to direct use of Part C funds to areas that will assure correction of noncompliance;
- Withhold a percentage of the local system's funds;
- Recover funds; Withhold any further payments to the local lead agency;
- Terminate the contract with the local lead agency.

In addition to oversight of programmatic requirements, Virginia's General Supervision system includes fiscal monitoring and accountability. Adherence to the Part C fiscal requirements is required through the State Lead Agency contract with the local lead agencies. Compliance with Part C fiscal requirements is monitored through the following mechanisms:

- Local budgets are required annually and are reviewed by the State Lead Agency;
- Expenditure reports are required from local lead agencies twice a year and must include revenues and expenditures from the local lead agency and all private providers; and
- The local contract requires local lead agencies to notify the State Lead Agency of anticipated budget shortfalls, including supporting documentation of need, specific reasons for need and efforts to secure other available funding, upon the identification of the potential financial need. Not only does this assist in oversight of federal and state Part C dollars, but it also ensures the State Lead Agency becomes aware of any reduction in other state funding (State Developmental Services dollars, for example) or local funding that occurs at the local system level.

Infrastructure within the State Lead Agency ensures assignment of responsibilities and a process for providing oversight of fiscal requirements. One person reviews contracts as they are submitted; Technical Assistance Consultants and Monitoring Consultants review budgets and budget revisions; and there is both a programmatic (early intervention staff) and fiscal office review of expenditure reports. The Early Intervention Office and Fiscal Office within the State Lead Agency work closely together through review of the expenditure reports to identify any potential fiscal issues and follow-up quickly to address questionable data. Two additional processes address fiscal accountability:

- Medicaid Quality Management Reviews conducted by the State Medicaid Agency; and
- Community Services Board local lead agencies undergo independent single audits annually. Audit reports go to the State Lead Agency's Office of Budget and Finance, which then completes monitoring desk audits. The Part C early intervention office receives a copy of the report if any identified issues are related to Part C.

#### **Technical Assistance System:**

**The mechanisms that the State has in place to ensure the timely delivery of high quality, evidenced based technical assistance and support to early intervention service (EIS) programs.**

The primary mechanism for technical assistance and support to local early intervention systems is the technical assistance team. The State Lead Agency employs 3 full-time Technical Assistance Consultants who work directly with local systems across Virginia. Each Technical Assistance Consultant is assigned to two regions of the state. This allows the Technical Assistance Consultant to get to know the local systems and the region and provides the local system manager with a specific person to contact for support and questions. When working with a local system, the Technical Assistance Consultant may work with the local system manager, local lead agency administrators, service providers, private contractors, local public agencies and/or the local interagency coordinating council. In addition to working individually with local systems to address local issues, each Technical Assistance Consultant holds monthly regional meetings with local system managers to facilitate 2-way information sharing, group learning and collaborative problem-solving. In order to facilitate consistent information going to local systems, consistent planning for regional meetings, and team problem-solving, the state technical assistance team meets regularly to share information about current technical assistance needs and issues and to identify areas for statewide focus (e.g., child and family outcomes, implementation of evidence-based practices, etc.).

In addition to the direct support provided by the Technical Assistance Consultants, local systems receive technical assistance through the following mechanisms:

- Biannual statewide meetings of all local system managers with State Lead Agency staff;
- The Infant & Toddler Connection of Virginia website and the Virginia Early Intervention Professional Development website;
- A monthly written Update from the State Lead Agency that includes answers to frequently asked questions, policy clarification, monitoring information and information on evidence-based practices and child and family outcomes;
- Written information combined with statewide webinars and conference calls to ensure all local system managers and/or providers have the opportunity to hear the same information when new policies or practices are introduced and explained. These webinars and calls are recorded and posted for those unable to attend; and
- Other written technical assistance and guidance.

Technical assistance and monitoring are closely linked functions in the Infant & Toddler Connection of Virginia system. Each Technical Assistance Consultant partners with one of the state Monitoring Consultants in supporting their assigned local systems. In addition, monitoring activities are one source for identifying statewide technical assistance needs as well as the technical assistance needs of individual local systems and specific regions.

#### **Professional Development System:**

**The mechanisms the State has in place to ensure that service providers are effectively providing services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families.**

The State Lead Agency contracts with the Partnership for People with Disabilities at Virginia Commonwealth University for the development and implementation of professional development for the Part C early intervention system. The following mechanisms are in place to ensure service providers have the skills to effectively provide services that improve results for infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families:

- An early intervention certification process that ensures providers are qualified within their discipline and have the basic knowledge and competencies necessary to serve infants and toddlers with disabilities and their families prior to employment in the Virginia early intervention system. In order to receive early intervention certification, providers must complete and pass competency tests for a series of state-required online modules that address child development, family-centered and evidence-based practices, Virginia's early intervention system, and provider responsibilities. In order to maintain their early intervention certification, providers must complete at least 30 hours of professional development applicable to early intervention every 3 years. Service coordinators also must complete the state-provided service coordination training within 12 months of initial early intervention certification.
- Varied professional development resources that include written documents, videos, webinars, online modules, in-person training, landing pads, laminated quick-reference cards, and "tools of the trade" to support local system managers and providers in delivering evidence-based practices. This variety of mechanisms for delivering professional development is designed to appeal to varied adult learning styles and maximize access to resources.
- A state website dedicated to early intervention professional development with varied and abundant state and national resources on evidence-based practices.
- An Integrated Training Collaborative that coordinates Virginia's Comprehensive System of Personnel Development for early intervention. Its members represent families, local system managers, providers, university faculty, other state initiatives that support young children and families, and staff from the State Lead Agency.
- A monthly email newsletter to all local system managers and service providers, including service coordinators, that spotlights resources available on a specific topic (e.g., coaching, assessment, etc.) and how these can be used at the local level.
- A blog, EI Strategies for Success, maintained by the professional development team. The blog addresses day-to-day issues associated with early intervention services. This can be helpful to individual providers and also can be used at the local level for professional development and team discussion.
- Relationships with 2-year and 4-year university faculty in early intervention-related fields. There is a web page on the Virginia early intervention professional development website dedicated to faculty and future early interventionists.
- Collaboration with other agencies and initiatives focused on professional development for providers serving young children and families to ensure a

broad, community-based focus for training, expanded partnerships and awareness of other community programs and resources among participants, and shared planning and funding.

- Regular communication between the professional development, technical assistance and monitoring teams to ensure planned professional development addresses priority issues identified through monitoring and technical assistance.

#### **Stakeholder Involvement:**

**The mechanism for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP/APR, and any subsequent revisions that the State has made to those targets, and the development and implementation of Indicator 11, the State's Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP).**

The State Lead Agency has in place and uses multiple mechanisms for soliciting broad stakeholder input on targets in the SPP and implementation of Indicator 11 (SSIP):

- State Interagency Coordinating Council meetings;
- Biannual statewide meetings and monthly regional meetings of local system managers;
- The New Path Family Support Network through the Arc of Virginia, which uses a newsletter, blog, Facebook page and webinars to share information with and solicit feedback from families who have or had children in Virginia's early intervention system;
- A monthly Update that is disseminated to a wide range of stakeholders, including service providers, and includes information about the SPP/APR and SSIP and how to submit ideas and feedback;
- Meetings with local lead agency executives and supervisors;
- The Infant & Toddler Connection of Virginia website, where drafts and supporting documentation are posted and available for stakeholder review and input; and
- Webinars and teleconferences.

Through these mechanisms, a wide variety of stakeholders (e.g., families, other state agencies, individuals working in personnel preparation, service providers, local system managers, local lead agency administrators, etc.) have the opportunity for participation and input.

#### **Apply stakeholder involvement from introduction to all Part C results indicators (y/n)**

NO

#### **Reporting to the Public:**

**How and where the State reported to the public on the FFY 2017 performance of each EIS Program located in the State on the targets in the SPP/APR as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days following the State's submission of its FFY 2017 APR, as required by 34 CFR §303.702(b)(1)(i)(A); and a description of where, on its website, a complete copy of the State's SPP/APR, including any revision if the State has revised the targets that it submitted with its FFY 2017 APR in 2019, is available.**

Virginia publicly reported on the performance of each local system by posting the required data in the "Supervision and Monitoring" section of the Infant & Toddler Connection of Virginia website and by disseminating that information to and through local systems and participating State agencies. Public reporting of state and local results also included dissemination through the Arc of Virginia - New Path Family Support Network list serve, website and Facebook page and sharing results with various advocacy and stakeholder groups.

Virginia's State Performance Plan is available in the Supervision and Monitoring section of the Infant & Toddler Connection of Virginia website ([www.infantva.org](http://www.infantva.org)).

#### **Intro - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

#### **Intro - OSEP Response**

States were instructed to submit Phase III Year Four of the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), indicator C-11, by April 1, 2020. The State provided the required information.

The State provided a FFY 2019 target for the SSIP, however, OSEP cannot accept the target because the State's end target for FFY 2019 does not reflect improvement over the baseline data. The State must revise its FFY 2019 target to reflect improvement.

#### **Intro - Required Actions**

In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must provide a FFY 2019 target that reflects improvement over baseline and report FFY 2019 data for the State-identified Measurable Result (SiMR). Additionally, the State must, consistent with its evaluation plan described in Phase II, assess and report on its progress in implementing the SSIP. Specifically, the State must provide: (1) a narrative or graphic representation of the principal activities implemented in Phase III, Year Five; (2) measures and outcomes that were implemented and achieved since the State's last SSIP submission (i.e., April 1, 2020); (3) a summary of the SSIP's coherent improvement strategies, including infrastructure improvement strategies and evidence-based practices that were implemented and progress toward short- and long-term outcomes that are intended to impact the SiMR; and (4) any supporting data that demonstrates that implementation of these activities are impacting the State's capacity to improve its SiMR data.

OSEP notes that one or more of the attachments included in the State's FFY 2018 SPP/APR submission are not in compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (Section 508), and will not be posted on the U.S. Department of Education's IDEA website. Therefore, the State must make the attachment(s) available to the public as soon as practicable, but no later than 120 days after the date of the determination letter.

#### **Intro - State Attachments**

The attachment(s) included are in compliance with Section 508. Non-compliant attachments will be made available by the State.



2020\_PartC\_ICCFor  
m - signed.pdf

# Indicator 1: Timely Provision of Services

## Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with Individual Family Service Plans(IFSPs) who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must be based on actual, not an average, number of days. Include the State's criteria for "timely" receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).

### Measurement

Percent = [(# 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.

Account for untimely receipt of services, including the reasons for delays.

### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select early intervention service (EIS) programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. States report in both the numerator and denominator under Indicator 1 on the number of children for whom the State ensured the timely initiation of new services identified on the IFSP. Include the timely initiation of new early intervention services from both initial IFSPs and subsequent IFSPs. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

The State's timeliness measure for this indicator must be either: (1) a time period that runs from when the parent consents to IFSP services; or (2) the IFSP initiation date (established by the IFSP Team, including the parent).

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in the Office of Special Education Programs' (OSEP's) response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 1 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	72.00%
-----------------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.02%	96.35%	98.60%	97.24%	96.94%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
613	836	96.94%	100%	96.77%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

### Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

*This number will be added to the "Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive their early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.*

**Include your State’s criteria for “timely” receipt of early intervention services (i.e., the time period from parent consent to when IFSP services are actually initiated).**

In order to be considered timely, the first date of service must be within 30 days of the date the parent signs the IFSP (providing consent for the services).

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

Data for FFY 2018 is based on monitoring data from all 40 local Part C early intervention systems in Virginia. The records of children who had an initial, periodic or annual IFSP developed on or after October 1, 2018 but no later than December 31, 2018 were reviewed to determine compliance with the requirement for timely start of services. The State Lead Agency randomly selected the children whose records were to be reviewed by the local system. The number of records to be reviewed was based on the local system’s annualized child count for the period 12/2/17 - 12/1/18: • Annualized count 0 - 200, reviewed 14 records • Annualized count 201 - 800, reviewed 22 records • Annualized count over 800, reviewed 30 records. The total number of infants and toddlers in the record review pool with an initial IFSP or an annual or periodic IFSP with new services added was 836.

**If needed, provide additional information about this indicator here.**

Exceptional family circumstances that resulted in untimely services included child/family ill, family scheduling preference, temporarily lost contact, and disaster/severe weather. System reasons for delays included provider unavailability and no reason documented.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	1	0	1

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

In order to verify correction of noncompliance on this indicator, the State Lead Agency selected a random sample of either 3 or 5 records (depending on the size of the local system) of children with recent IFSPs and IFSP reviews with new services added, and the local system submitted the documentation from those records showing start of services and the reasons for any delay in meeting the 30-day timeline for timely start of services. State staff members reviewed the documentation in order to verify that the local system is now correctly implementing the requirement for timely start of services.

The State Lead Agency has verified that, based on updated data, all EIS programs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and reported by Virginia under this indicator in the FFY 2017 APR are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For each local system with a finding of noncompliance on Indicator 1, state Part C staff used record review data documenting the actual start date for each service to verify that for each instance of noncompliance involved in the FFY 2017 finding, the child did begin receiving the services listed on his/her IFSP, though late. The State Lead Agency has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and reported by Virginia under this indicator in the FFY 2017 APR has initiated services for each child, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

For the one local system with noncompliance not yet corrected, noncompliance with Indicator 1 is due to provider shortages. Shortages in speech-language pathologists and physical therapists have been particularly difficult to remedy, though shortages in other professions have also occurred. The following enforcement actions have been taken (and continue to be used) by the State Lead Agency to support this local system in correcting the noncompliance:

- Required the local system to complete structured and supervised local monitoring in order to identify ongoing issues and establish a consistent and robust process for local oversight of timely initiation of services. Structured and supervised local monitoring requires the local system to review the timeline for start of services (and any related documentation) for all children each month using the annual record review form and to report findings to their Technical Assistance and Monitoring Consultants at the State Lead Agency.
- Required an on-site meeting between the local lead agency administration and the State Part C Administrator, Early Intervention Monitoring Team Leader, Technical Assistance and Monitoring Consultants to identify ongoing barriers and identify new strategies the local system will use to address the barriers to compliance.
- Required monthly progress updates from the local system on implementation of the strategies to address provider shortages and initiate services within 30 days that were developed during the on-site meeting between the local lead agency administration and the state Part C office.

Since the on-site meeting, the local lead agency reports that three provider agencies with which they contract have newly hired or are in the process of hiring speech-language pathologists, physical therapists and/or Developmental Services (special instruction) providers to add capacity for this local system. The local system also is in the process of contracting with an additional provider agency. They are also exploring options for hiring through temp agencies and talking with neighboring local systems to identify potential providers for border sections of their catchment area. Although they have not yet corrected noncompliance, recent monthly monitoring reports indicate significant progress.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

## **1 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

## **1 - OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 was corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 and each EIS program or provider with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2017: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

## **1 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 2: Services in Natural Environments

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

**Data Source**

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

**Measurement**

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

**Instructions**

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's 618 data reported in Table 2. If not, explain.

## 2 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	99.00%
-----------------	------	--------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%	98.00%
Data	99.76%	99.80%	98.71%	99.92%	99.96%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=	98.00%	98.00%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). During a VICC meeting on December 11, 2019, VICC members reviewed data on each indicator and approved maintaining the target for Indicator 2 for the FFY 2019 extension year. In addition, a draft of the SPP/APR was widely available in December 2019 for stakeholders to review and submit written input.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	10,093
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs	10,766

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Total number of Infants and toddlers with IFSPs	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
10,093	10,766	99.96%	98.00%	93.75%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

### Provide reasons for slippage, if applicable

The total count of children reported under Section 618 in Virginia, and listed in the pre-populated data above, includes children under age 3 served under Part B with an IEP. However, Virginia's targets and actual data for each year are based on the count of those children served under Part C with an IFSP. Using that data, the number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home and community-based settings was 9720, the total number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs was 9723, and Virginia's percentage for Indicator 2 for FFY 2018 is 99.97%. Therefore, Virginia met the FFY 2018 target and showed no slippage.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

N/A

**2 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**2 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**2 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 3: Early Childhood Outcomes

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

#### Data Source

State selected data source.

#### Measurement

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

#### Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes:

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those infants and toddlers who entered early intervention below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

##### Measurement for Summary Statement 1:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in category (d)) divided by (# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (a) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (b) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (c) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d))] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program.

##### Measurement for Summary Statement 2:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (d) plus # of infants and toddlers reported in progress category (e)) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e))] times 100.

#### Instructions

**Sampling of infants and toddlers with IFSPs** is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

In the measurement, include in the numerator and denominator only infants and toddlers with IFSPs who received early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Report: (1) the number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's Part C exiting data under Section 618 of the IDEA; and (2) the number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the targets. States will use the progress categories for each of the three Outcomes to calculate and report the two Summary Statements.

Report progress data and calculate Summary Statements to compare against the six targets. Provide the actual numbers and percentages for the five reporting categories for each of the three outcomes.

In presenting results, provide the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers." If a State is using the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Process (COS), then the criteria for defining "comparable to same-aged peers" has been defined as a child who has been assigned a score of 6 or 7 on the COS.

In addition, list the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator, including if the State is using the ECO COS.

If the State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i), the State must report data in two ways. First, it must report on all eligible children but exclude its at-risk infants and toddlers (i.e., include just those infants and toddlers experiencing developmental delay (or "developmentally delayed children") or having a diagnosed physical or mental condition that has a high probability of resulting in developmental delay (or "children with diagnosed conditions")). Second, the State must separately report outcome data on either: (1) just its at-risk infants and toddlers; or (2) aggregated performance data on all of the infants and toddlers it serves under Part C (including developmentally delayed children, children with diagnosed conditions, and at-risk infants and toddlers).

### 3 - Indicator Data

**Does your State's Part C eligibility criteria include infants and toddlers who are at risk of having substantial developmental delays (or "at-risk infants and toddlers") under IDEA section 632(5)(B)(i)? (yes/no)**

NO

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). During a VICC meeting on December 11, 2019, VICC members reviewed data on each indicator and discussed and approved the targets for Indicator 3 for the FFY 2019 extension year. In addition, a draft of the SPP/APR was widely available in December 2019 for stakeholders to review and submit written input.

Virginia is proposing to reset the baseline at the FFY 2018 results for each sub-part of Indicator 3 and to set the FFY 2019 targets just above that level to show improvement from this new baseline. Resetting the baseline is appropriate given that a change in methodology occurred early in FFY 2018. Because use of the decision tree became a mandatory part of the child outcome rating process for all assessments and all children in FFY 2018, the FFY 2018 data for Indicator 3 is not comparable to previous years. Data from Virginia's annual provider survey demonstrates that not only was the new decision tree requirement instituted, but it also resulted in actual change in practice. At the time the requirement went into effect, survey results indicate 55.4% of providers were always (24.9%) or almost always (30.5%) using the decision tree to determine a child's functioning compared to same-aged peers. One year later, 88.7% of providers were always (65.6%) or almost always (23.1%) using the decision tree. Anecdotal information also supports the assertion that data gathered in FFY 2018, when the decision tree became mandatory, is not comparable to data gathered in previous years. Comments from multiple local systems during the webinars that introduced the decision tree requirement conveyed that, previously, teams had chosen the rating summary statement based on how they felt that statement matched the child's functioning rather than using the decision questions to lead them to the appropriate rating summary statement. More specifically, many providers have commented that following the decision tree exactly has resulted in selecting a lower outcome rating than would have been chosen previously.

Using this new baseline data, Virginia is proposing targets for FFY 2019 that show a modest improvement from FFY 2018 since these targets represent only one year of improvement. Virginia looks forward to projecting additional improvements in the next full SPP/APR cycle.

#### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
<b>A1</b>	2018	Target>=	69.50%	69.50%	69.50%	64.10%	64.10%
<b>A1</b>	64.07%	Data	69.48%	65.14%	64.07%	66.05%	66.28%
<b>A2</b>	2018	Target>=	66.40%	66.40%	66.40%	63.30%	63.30%
<b>A2</b>	63.28%	Data	66.43%	64.47%	63.28%	60.71%	60.05%
<b>B1</b>	2018	Target>=	74.70%	74.70%	74.70%	68.30%	68.30%
<b>B1</b>	68.29%	Data	74.73%	71.29%	68.29%	70.10%	69.96%
<b>B2</b>	2018	Target>=	55.30%	55.30%	55.30%	51.50%	51.50%
<b>B2</b>	51.53%	Data	55.27%	53.00%	51.53%	49.62%	48.69%
<b>C1</b>	2018	Target>=	78.70%	78.70%	78.70%	70.70%	70.70%
<b>C1</b>	70.69%	Data	78.74%	73.37%	70.69%	70.38%	70.16%
<b>C2</b>	2018	Target>=	56.40%	56.40%	56.40%	55.20%	55.20%
<b>C2</b>	55.23%	Data	56.43%	55.46%	55.23%	53.84%	54.10%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A1>=	66.00%	64.94%
Target A2>=	65.00%	57.55%
Target B1>=	70.00%	68.74%
Target B2>=	54.00%	46.93%
Target C1>=	73.00%	68.57%
Target C2>=	57.00%	50.74%

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

**Number of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed**

6,891

**Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)**

	Number of children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	11	0.16%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,735	25.18%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,180	17.12%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,053	29.79%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	1,912	27.75%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	3,233	4,979	66.28%	66.00%	64.93%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
A2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	3,965	6,891	60.05%	65.00%	57.54%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for A1 slippage, if applicable**

Anecdotal data suggests that the most likely reason for the decreases in child outcome results from FFY 2017 to FFY 2018 is Virginia's September 2018 statewide requirement to use the Decision Tree when determining a child's functioning compared to same-age peers. Revisions to Virginia's Practice Manual, a new family handout, a new online tutorial and two new webinars were released with this new requirement and specified the expectation for teams to follow the Decision Tree exactly, answering each question and thinking of specific examples to support each answer. Comments from multiple local systems during the webinars that introduced the Decision Tree requirement conveyed that, previously, teams had chosen the rating summary statement based on how they felt that statement matched the child's functioning rather than using the decision questions to lead them to the appropriate rating summary statement. Many providers have commented that following the Decision Tree exactly has resulted in selecting a lower outcome rating than would have been chosen previously.

Virginia has also focused monitoring and technical assistance efforts on functional assessment and the child outcome summary process in FFY 2018 and FFY 2019. Based on feedback from local system managers and service providers, these activities are further increasing awareness and knowledge about functional versus discrete skills, supporting efforts to rely on more than just assessment tool items when determining functioning compared to same-aged peers, and increasing family engagement in the child outcome summary process.

Previous efforts to improve the quality and consistency of outcome ratings (e.g., completeness of data, reviewing outliers, etc.) also have resulted in initial decreases in results. As new practices associated with the Decision Tree are fully implemented, Indicator 3 results are expected to level off again and then improve over time.

The State Lead Agency continues to support local systems to analyze their local child outcome data in order to identify and implement improvement strategies, as needed, to improve outcomes.

In addition, while the current statewide data system, anecdotal reporting and local data analysis do not indicate any specific service delivery factor impacting performance on this indicator and no specific group that accounts for the slippage, Virginia is working to develop a more robust statewide data system that will eventually allow for more complex analysis of factors that potentially impact child outcomes.

**Provide reasons for A2 slippage, if applicable**

Please see A1.

**Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication)**

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	9	0.13%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,873	27.18%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,776	25.77%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,361	34.26%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	872	12.65%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
B1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	4,137	6,019	69.96%	70.00%	68.73%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
B2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	3,233	6,891	48.69%	54.00%	46.92%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for B1 slippage, if applicable**

Although Virginia's results declined from the previous year for Indicator B1, that decrease was not meaningfully different (based on the meaningful differences calculator developed by DaSY) from FFY 2017, and the change may be attributable to random fluctuation alone.

**Provide reasons for B2 slippage, if applicable**

Please see A1.

**Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs**

	Number of Children	Percentage of Total
a. Infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning	8	0.12%
b. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1,892	27.46%
c. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it	1,494	21.69%
d. Infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	2,650	38.47%
e. Infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	845	12.27%

	Numerator	Denominator	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
C1. Of those children who entered or exited the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	4,144	6,044	70.16%	73.00%	68.56%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage
C2. The percent of infants and toddlers who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 3 years of age or exited the program	3,495	6,889	54.10%	57.00%	50.73%	Did Not Meet Target	Slippage

**Provide reasons for C1 slippage, if applicable**

Please see A1.

**Provide reasons for C2 slippage, if applicable**

Please see A1.

**The number of infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.**

The number of infants and toddlers who exited the Part C program during the reporting period, as reported in the State's part C exiting 618 data	9,993
The number of those infants and toddlers who did not receive early intervention services for at least six months before exiting the Part C program.	2,673

Was sampling used?	NO
--------------------	----

**Did you use the Early Childhood Outcomes Center (ECO) Child Outcomes Summary Form (COS) process? (yes/no)**

YES

**List the instruments and procedures used to gather data for this indicator.**

Although the COSF (form) itself is not used, Virginia uses the COS process to set the criteria for "same-aged peers."

Virginia does not require the use of a specific assessment tool(s). Specific procedures and practices related to the child outcome summary process are detailed in the Infant & Toddler Connection of Virginia Practice Manual and summarized here:

AT ENTRY AND EACH ANNUAL IFSP: The assessment narrative section of Virginia's IFSP is organized by the three child outcome areas. The service coordinator facilitates the team summary of assessment results in terms of the three child outcomes (positive social relationships, acquiring and using knowledge and skills, and use of appropriate behaviors to meet needs) and determination and documentation of entry ratings for the three child outcomes for all eligible children.

- Assessment information is derived from multiple sources - results from developmental instruments and observation; the family, including information about the child's performance in relation to the three child outcomes across situations and settings and with different people; and any other source (e.g., child care provider, medical records, etc.).
- Considering the information above and functional skills of same-aged peers, the team determines the appropriate rating statement for each of the three child outcomes. Beginning September 2018, teams are required to use the Decision Tree in determining the appropriate rating.
- The assessment process and documentation of assessment results are the same for all children; however, child outcome rating numbers (1-7) that correspond to the child outcome rating statements are only required to be recorded in ITOTS, the statewide data system, for children who are new to early intervention and who are 30 months or younger at the time of the initial IFSP. This includes children who have received early intervention from other states, but who are new to early intervention in Virginia.
- The entry ratings recorded in ITOTS follow the child. A child who moves within Virginia from one early intervention system to another will already have entry assessment data, and the new local system does not need to do a new entry-level assessment. If a child is discharged from the Infant & Toddler Connection system and returns within 6 months of leaving the system, then the initial child outcome ratings continue to be used as the entry ratings. If the child is out of the system for more than six months but returns to the system when he/she is still 30 months old or younger then new entry child outcome ratings are completed.

AT EXIT: The service coordinators ensures exit ratings on all three child outcomes (positive social relationships, acquiring and using knowledge and skills, and use of appropriate behaviors to meet needs) are done prior to exit for all children who had an entry rating AND who have been in the system for 6 months or longer since their initial IFSP (i.e., there have been 6 months between the initial IFSP and the exit assessment). The rating must be done no more than 6 months prior to exit from early intervention. To complete the exit ratings:

- Using information from parent report, an assessment instrument, observation and other sources, and the Decision Tree, determine the child's status (rating) for each of the three child outcomes. A formal assessment is not required. Instead, the provider(s) determines the child's functional status on the three child outcomes through ongoing assessment (which can occur over multiple sessions). The provider must document the child's abilities by filling in an assessment instrument (such as the HELP, ELAP, etc.). The reason for documenting what has been observed through ongoing assessment on an assessment tool is not to generate age levels but to serve as an anchor for the assessment and to provide a standard measure to be used in combination with other assessment sources for determining the child's functional status on the three child outcomes in relation to same-age peers. It is not necessary to use the same instrument that was used for the entry assessment. -OR- Obtain entry ratings from the local school division to use as the exit ratings for the Infant & Toddler Connection system. If Part B entry assessment data is being used for the early intervention exit assessment data, then that Part B assessment information must be available prior to the child's discharge from early intervention.
- The IFSP team considers information from the sources listed above to determine the child's status to same-age peers for all three child outcomes. Unless the exit ratings are being determined and documented as part of an annual IFSP, document the child's functional status on the three child outcomes (including the child outcome rating statement) in a contact note or on an IFSP Review page. Also document the sources of information used in the assessment process. When documenting whether the child has made progress for each child outcome (in order to respond to the yes/no progress question in ITOTS), remember that the answer to that question must always be based on the child's progress since the initial assessment, even if there have been one or more interim assessments. Information to support the yes/no answer to whether the child has made progress may be documented on an IFSP Review page, an annual IFSP or in a contact note(s).
- Since the ratings reflect the child's status at the time of the assessment, it is important to time the exit assessment/rating as close to exit as possible in order to capture results for the full time the child was receiving early intervention services. This may mean using ongoing assessment information to update the ratings just before exit, even if there was an annual IFSP developed within the last 6 months.

The date of the exit assessment is one of the following:

- The last date on which assessment information was collected (e.g., date of the last visit during which ongoing assessment information was documented);
- If completed within the 6 months prior to the child's discharge and it reflects the most up-to-date assessment information available, then the date of the most recent IFSP in which the child outcome ratings were documented; or
- If completed within the 6 months prior to the child's discharge and they reflect the most up-to-date assessment information available and they are available to the local early intervention system by the date of the child's discharge, the date that child outcome entry ratings were determined by the local school division.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Virginia continues to implement the data quality and program improvement activities detailed in the State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP), which is described and included in Indicator 11. While the SSIP is focused on improving results on Indicator 3c, the improvement strategies, activities and steps are expected to have a positive impact on all child outcomes over time.

**3 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**3 - OSEP Response**

The State has revised the baseline for this indicator, using data from FFY 2018, and OSEP accepts that revision.

**3 - Required Actions**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts the targets for A1 and B1, but OSEP cannot accept the targets for A2, B2, C1, and C2 because the State's end targets for FFY 2019 do not reflect improvement over the baseline data. The State must revise its FFY 2019 targets for A2, B2, C1, and C2 to reflect improvement.

## Indicator 4: Family Involvement

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

**Results indicator:** 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; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

#### Data Source

State selected data source. State must describe the data source in the SPP/APR.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent families participating in Part C})] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent families participating in Part C})] \times 100$ .
- C. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn}) \div (\# \text{ of respondent families participating in Part C})] \times 100$ .

#### Instructions

Sampling of families participating in Part C is allowed. When sampling is used, submit a description of the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates. (See General Instructions page 2 for additional instructions on sampling.)

Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

While a survey is not required for this indicator, a State using a survey must submit a copy of any new or revised survey with its SPP/APR.

Report the number of families to whom the surveys were distributed.

Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program. States should consider categories such as race and ethnicity, age of the infant or toddler, and geographic location in the State.

If the analysis shows that the demographics of the families responding are not representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program, describe the strategies that the State will use to ensure that in the future the response data are representative of those demographics. In identifying such strategies, the State should consider factors such as how the State distributed the survey to families (e.g., by mail, by e-mail, on-line, by telephone, in-person), if a survey was used, and how responses were collected.

States are encouraged to work in collaboration with their OSEP-funded parent centers in collecting data.

## 4 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

	Baseline	FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
A	2011	Target>=	76.40%	76.40%	76.40%	76.40%	76.40%
A	72.30%	Data	76.44%	75.59%	77.47%	79.55%	76.01%
B	2011	Target>=	73.20%	74.40%	74.40%	74.40%	74.40%
B	70.30%	Data	74.39%	72.10%	74.57%	75.65%	74.34%
C	2011	Target>=	84.90%	84.90%	84.90%	84.90%	84.90%
C	81.90%	Data	83.87%	85.44%	85.70%	88.66%	85.74%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target A>=	80.00%	76.12%
Target B>=	77.00%	73.59%
Target C>=	88.00%	85.44%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). During a VICC meeting on December 11, 2019, VICC members reviewed data on each indicator and discussed and approved the targets for Indicator 4 for the FFY 2019 extension year. In addition, a draft of the SPP/APR was widely available in December 2019 for stakeholders to review and submit written input.

Since FFY 2019 would normally be the first year of the next 6-year SPP/APR cycle, Virginia is using the FFY 2018 data as the FFY 2019 target for each

sub-part of Indicator 4. This is consistent with the way Virginia has previously set targets for the SPP/APR. Virginia's approach to each 6-year cycle has been to set the starting target as the previous year's actual performance level and use the meaningful differences calculator developed by DaSY to determine the increase necessary to show a meaningful improvement from the beginning of the cycle to the end.

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

The number of families to whom surveys were distributed	8,787
Number of respondent families participating in Part C	1,844
A1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	784
A2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family know their rights	1,030
B1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	758
B2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs	1,030
C1. Number of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	880
C2. Number of responses to the question of whether early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn	1,030

	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
A. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights (A1 divided by A2)	76.01%	80.00%	76.12%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
B. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs (B1 divided by B2)	74.34%	77.00%	73.59%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage
C. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn (C1 divided by C2)	85.74%	88.00%	85.44%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Was sampling used?	YES
If yes, has your previously-approved sampling plan changed?	NO

**Describe the sampling methodology outlining how the design will yield valid and reliable estimates.**

Virginia's Indicator 4 family outcome data is based on results from an annual administration of the NCSEAM survey. A survey is sent to all families enrolled on December 1. A second mailing is sent about 2-1/2 weeks later to those families who did not respond to the first mailing. Finally, the contract agency attempts to contact by phone families who have not yet responded to the survey and who reside in localities that have fewer than 15 completed surveys after the second-wave mailing.

In order to ensure the family outcomes results reported in the SPP/APR are representative of the population of families served in Virginia's early intervention system, the evaluator uses the following process to select a statistically valid random sample:

Step 1: Determine the Analytic Sample Size for Each Race/Ethnicity Category. With knowledge of Virginia's early intervention population percentage in each race/ethnicity category, the first step involves determining the actual analytic sample size that will be used for each race/ethnicity category. To accomplish this, a trial and error process is used to arrive at the analytic sample size for each race/ethnicity category that satisfies the condition that the analytic sample size for each race/ethnicity category is less than or equal to the observed sample size for each race/ethnicity category (i.e., the analytic sample size for each race/ethnicity category cannot exceed the actual sample size for the race/ethnicity category having an IFS measure, a complete survey). The resulting number of respondents included in the analytic sample for each race/ethnicity category is referred to here as N(category). For example, the number of respondents in the analytic sample having the race/ethnicity category of White would be denoted by N(White).

Step 2: Assign a Random Outcome. Each respondent in the total sample having a valid IFS measure is assigned a random outcome from a 0/1 uniform distribution. This random number (outcome) can range between 0 and 1, and can be any value between 0 and 1. For example, it can be 0.2876, or 0.8921, or 0.0008, etc. In addition, by virtue of being drawn from a uniform distribution, each possible value between 0 and 1 is equally likely to be assigned (i.e., 0.2876 is just as likely to be assigned as is 0.8921 or 0.0008, etc.). The resulting random number assigned to each respondent will be referred hereafter as U. Thus, each respondent is assigned a value of U randomly, and U will range between 0 and 1 such that each possible value between 0 and 1 is equally likely to be assigned. This form of assignment of U to each respondent ensures that each respondent within a given race/ethnicity category in the total sample has an equal chance of being selected for the final analytic sample.

Step 3: Select Respondents for the Analytic Sample. Within each race/ethnicity category, respondents are ordered from lowest to highest with respect to U, and the first N(category) respondents are selected for inclusion in the analytic sample. For example, if N(White) = 502, then the first 502 respondents in the race/ethnicity category of White (i.e., the 502 respondents in the White race/ethnicity category having the lowest values of U) would be selected for the analytic sample. The ordering of the respondents with respect to U within each race/ethnicity category accomplishes the random selection of respondents to the analytic sample.

Was a collection tool used?	YES
If yes, is it a new or revised collection tool?	NO
The demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.	YES

**Include the State's analysis of the extent to which the demographics of the families responding are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers, and families enrolled in the Part C program.**

Virginia's family survey uses the Impact on Families Scale developed and validated by the National Center for Special Education Accountability Monitoring (NCSEAM). Surveys were mailed to all families receiving early intervention supports and services on December 1, 2018. Surveys were returned (via mail, online submission or phone) by 1,844 families receiving early intervention services. This represents a response rate of 20.99%. When the number of surveys sent is reduced by the number returned due to bad or insufficient addresses, the response rate is 22.4%.

From the 1,844 responses to the FFY 2018 Family Survey, a random sample of 1,030 families reflecting the distribution of race/ethnicity in the larger population was selected for data analysis. Although not selected specifically for gender, the representative sample was also representative of the gender of children receiving services under Part C in Virginia. In addition, the representative sample includes families representing all local early intervention systems in Virginia. The sample of 1,030 families exceeds the minimum number required for an adequate confidence level based on established survey sample guidelines, providing a high degree of confidence that the results of the survey accurately reflect the degree to which families have achieved the outcomes in Indicator 4.

Please see the attachment (Ind4Representative) for additional data on the extent to which families responding to the survey and the outcome results are representative of the demographics of infants, toddlers and families enrolled in Virginia's early intervention system.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Since FFY 2018 is the final year in the 6-year SPP cycle, Virginia's FFY 2018 targets represent a statistically significant change over Virginia's status at the beginning of that planning period (FFY 2013). Although Virginia did not reach the FFY 2018 targets, there have been statistically significant increases in all three family outcomes since baseline data was collected in FFY 2011.

**4 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**4 - OSEP Response**

The State provided targets for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts those targets.

**4 - Required Actions**

**4 - State Attachments**

The attachment(s) included are in compliance with Section 508. Non-compliant attachments will be made available by the State.



Indicator 4 - Representativeness.

## Indicator 5: Child Find (Birth to One)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

## 5 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	0.51%
-----------------	------	-------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	1.03%	1.20%	1.20%	1.20%	1.20%
Data	1.20%	1.05%	1.47%	1.38%	1.50%

### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	1.26%	1.58%

### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). During a VICC meeting on December 11, 2019, VICC members reviewed data on each indicator and discussed and approved the target for Indicator 5 for the FFY 2019 extension year. In addition, a draft of the SPP/APR was widely available in December 2019 for stakeholders to review and submit written input.

Since FFY 2019 would normally be the first year of the next 6-year SPP/APR cycle, Virginia is using the FFY 2018 data as the FFY 2019 target for Indicator 5. This is consistent with the way Virginia has previously set targets for the SPP/APR. Virginia's approach to each 6-year cycle has been to set the starting target as the previous year's actual performance level and use the meaningful differences calculator developed by DaSY to determine the increase necessary to show a meaningful improvement from the beginning of the cycle to the end.

### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	1,570
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	99,261

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 1	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
1,570	99,261	1.50%	1.26%	1.58%	Met Target	No Slippage

### Compare your results to the national data

Virginia exceeded the FFY 2018 national percentage (1.25%) of the birth to one population served in Part C.

### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

## 5 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

**5 - OSEP Response**

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

**5 - Required Actions**

## Indicator 6: Child Find (Birth to Three)

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

**Results indicator:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to national data. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data collected under IDEA section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Child Count and Settings data collection in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)) and Census (for the denominator).

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target and to national data. The data reported in this indicator should be consistent with the State's reported 618 data reported in Table 1. If not, explain why.

### 6 - Indicator Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	1.72%
-----------------	------	-------

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target >=	2.88%	2.76%	2.76%	2.76%	2.89%
Data	2.76%	2.87%	2.97%	3.18%	3.29%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target >=	2.89%	3.54%

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

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 State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR). During a VICC meeting on December 11, 2019, VICC members reviewed data on each indicator and discussed and approved the target for Indicator 6 for the FFY 2019 extension year. In addition, a draft of the SPP/APR was widely available in December 2019 for stakeholders to review and submit written input.

Since FFY 2019 would normally be the first year of the next 6-year SPP/APR cycle, Virginia is using the FFY 2018 data as the FFY 2019 target for Indicator 6. This is consistent with the way Virginia has previously set targets for the SPP/APR. Virginia's approach to each 6-year cycle has been to set the starting target as the previous year's actual performance level and use the meaningful differences calculator developed by DaSY to determine the increase necessary to show a meaningful improvement from the beginning of the cycle to the end.

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 Child Count/Educational Environment Data Groups	07/10/2019	Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	10,766
Annual State Resident Population Estimates for 6 Race Groups (5 Race Alone Groups and Two or More Races) by Age, Sex, and Hispanic Origin	06/20/2019	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	304,143

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Number of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Population of infants and toddlers birth to 3	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
10,766	304,143	3.29%	2.89%	3.54%	Met Target	No Slippage

#### Compare your results to the national data

Virginia exceeded the FFY 2018 national percentage (3.48%) of the birth to three population served in Part C.

#### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

### 6 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 6 - OSEP Response

The State provided a target for FFY 2019 for this indicator, and OSEP accepts that target.

### 6 - Required Actions

## Indicator 7: 45-Day Timeline

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find

**Compliance indicator:** Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system and must address the timeline from point of referral to initial IFSP meeting based on actual, not an average, number of days.

#### Measurement

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and initial assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations, assessments, and initial IFSP meetings, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

If data are from State monitoring, describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data and if data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. Provide actual numbers used in the calculation.

States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 7 - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	98.00%
-----------------	------	--------

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	91.83%	98.99%	99.56%	99.91%	97.51%

### Targets

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>
Target	100%	100%

### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

<b>Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline</b>	<b>Number of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted</b>	<b>FFY 2017 Data</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Target</b>	<b>FFY 2018 Data</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Slippage</b>
1,733	2,371	97.51%	100%	99.70%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

### Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an initial evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline" field above to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

631

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State database

**Provide the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period).**

Data reflects all children referred from October 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018 and evaluated and assessed and for whom an IFSP meeting was required to be conducted.

**Describe how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.**

Although the data collected for FFY 2017 were from the second quarter of the fiscal year, Virginia has determined that these data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full fiscal year based on the following:

- The Commonwealth's compliance percentage was similar each year from FFY 2008 through FFY 2012 (97% - 99%) when data were collected in the second quarter of the fiscal year as they were in FFY 2007 (98%) when data were from the fourth quarter. There appears to be no difference in performance at different times of the year.

- The data collected in FFY 2017 included all children who were referred in the given quarter who were evaluated and assessed and for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted. Therefore, the data is representative of all local systems and of the population of children served in Virginia's Part C system in terms of race/ethnicity, gender, age and reason for eligibility.

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Exceptional family circumstances that resulted in delays in the 45-day timeline included child/family ill, family scheduling preference, temporarily lost contact, and disaster/severe weather. Systems reasons were provider unavailability or no reason documented.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

In order to verify that the local system is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements for Indicator 7, the State Lead Agency reviewed data from ITOTS, the state Part C data system, for either 3 or 5 (depending on the size of the local system) state-selected, eligible infants and toddlers who were referred to the given local system during a recent 1-month period, and for whom an initial IFSP meeting was required to be conducted, to determine whether the initial evaluation, assessment and IFSP meeting were held within the required 45-day timeline. To confirm the accuracy of the ITOTS data used for verification of correction, local systems were required to submit (or state staff view on site) the documentation from the records of these children showing completion of the initial evaluation, assessment and IFSP meeting and documenting the mitigating circumstances if the timeline was exceeded.

The State Lead Agency has verified that, based on updated data, all EIS programs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and reported by Virginia under this indicator in the FFY 2017 APR are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For each local system with a finding of noncompliance on Indicator 7, state Part C staff used ITOTS to verify that for each instance of noncompliance involved in the FFY 2017 finding, the child did have an initial evaluation, assessment and IFSP meeting, though late. The State Lead Agency has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and reported by Virginia under this indicator in the FFY 2017 APR has held an initial evaluation, assessment and IFSP meeting for each child, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**7 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**7 - OSEP Response**

The State reported that it used data from a State database to report on this indicator. The State further reported that it did not use data for the full reporting period (July 1, 2018-June 30, 2019). The State described how the time period in which the data were collected accurately reflects data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

## 7 - Required Actions

### Indicator 8A: Early Childhood Transition

#### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

### 8A - Indicator Data

#### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	86.00%			
<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Data	99.60%	98.23%	84.90%	82.85%	96.19%

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

Data include only those toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday. (yes/no)

YES

Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
470	544	96.19%	100%	97.79%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

#### Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

62

#### What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?

State monitoring

#### Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

Data for FFY 2018 is based on monitoring data from all 40 local systems in Virginia and was gathered through record reviews. The State Lead Agency randomly selected the children whose records were to be reviewed for each local system from those children who exited early intervention between August 1, 2018 and December 31, 2018. The number of records to be reviewed was based on the number of children in the local system who exited early intervention between August 1, 2018 and December 31, 2018 with a transition destination of public school/Part B eligible or Part B Referral, Eligibility Not Yet Determined.

- 0-9 children exited, reviewed all records
- 10-20 children exited, reviewed 10 records
- 21-100 children exited, reviewed 15 records
- 101-300 children exited, reviewed 20 records
- Over 300 children exited, reviewed 30 records

#### Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

Exceptional family circumstances reasons for untimely transition planning included family scheduling preference and late referral to Part C. System reasons were all due to no documentation of a mitigating circumstance.

#### Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

#### FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected

##### Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements

In order to verify correction of noncompliance on Indicators 8A, 8B and 8C, the State Lead Agency selected a random sample of either 3 or 5 records (depending on the size of the local system) of children who had recently transitioned out of early intervention, and the local system submitted the documentation from those records showing the transition steps and services, notification and/or transition conference and the reasons for any deviation from the required timeline for the given transition activity. State staff members reviewed the documentation in order to verify that the local system is now correctly implementing the transition requirement.

The State Lead Agency has verified that based on updated data, all EIS programs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and reported by Virginia under this indicator in the FFY 2017 APR are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

##### Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected

For each local system with a finding of noncompliance on Indicator 8A, state Part C staff used record review data to verify that for each instance of noncompliance involved in a FFY 2017 finding, the child had transition steps and services added to the IFSP, though late, unless the child had already transitioned out of the Part C early intervention system by the time the noncompliance was identified. The State Lead Agency has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and reported by Virginia in the FFY 2017 APR has added transition steps and services in the IFSP for each child, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**8A - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**8A - OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

**8A - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8B: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B) divided by the (# of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8B - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

Baseline	2005	89.00%			
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	89.27%	91.34%	92.48%	93.16%	96.39%

**Targets**

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

Data include notification to both the SEA and LEA

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
507	533	96.39%	100%	96.20%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

**Number of parents who opted out**

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

6

**Describe the method used to collect these data**

Data for FFY 2018 is based on monitoring data from all 40 local Part C systems in Virginia and was gathered through local record reviews. The number of records reviewed and the process for selecting local records for review are described below in the section on methods used to select EIS programs for monitoring.

**Do you have a written opt-out policy? (yes/no)**

YES

**If yes, is the policy on file with the Department? (yes/no)**

YES

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

Data for FFY 2018 is based on monitoring data from all 40 local systems in Virginia and was gathered through local record reviews. The State Lead Agency randomly selected the children whose records were to be reviewed by the local system from those children who exited early intervention between August 1, 2018 and December 31, 2018. The number of records to be reviewed was based on the number of children in the local system who exited early intervention between August 1, 2018 and December 31, 2018 with a transition destination of public school/Part B eligible or Part B Referral, Eligibility Not Yet Determined:

- 0-9 children exited, reviewed all records
- 10-20 children exited, reviewed 10 records
- 21-100 children exited, reviewed 15 records
- 101-300 children exited, reviewed 20 records
- Over 300 children exited, reviewed 30 records

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Exceptional family circumstances for untimely transition notifications included family scheduling preference, late referral to Part C, and disaster/severe weather. System reasons included system delays in sending the notification and no reason documented.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
1	1	0	0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

In order to verify correction of noncompliance on Indicators 8A, 8B and 8C, the State Lead Agency selected a random sample of either 3 or 5 records (depending on the size of the local system) of children who had recently transitioned out of early intervention, and the local system submitted the documentation from those records showing the transition steps and services, notification and/or transition conference and the reasons for any deviation from the required timeline for the given transition activity. State staff members reviewed the documentation in order to verify that the local system is now correctly implementing the transition requirement.

The State Lead Agency has verified that based on updated data, all EIS programs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and reported by Virginia under this indicator in the FFY 2017 APR are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For each local system with a finding of noncompliance on Indicator 8B, state Part C staff used record review data to verify that for each instance of noncompliance involved in a FFY 2017 finding, transition notification occurred, though late, unless the child had already transitioned out of the Part C early intervention system by the time the noncompliance was identified. The State Lead Agency has verified that each EIS program with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and reported by Virginia in the FFY 2017 APR has completed the transition notification for each child, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected

**8B - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**8B - OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

**8B - Required Actions**

## Indicator 8C: Early Childhood Transition

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition

**Compliance indicator:** The percentage of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C with timely transition planning for whom the Lead Agency has:

- A. Developed an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday;
- B. Notified (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) the SEA and the LEA where the toddler resides at least 90 days prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services; and
- C. Conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data to be taken from monitoring or State data system.

#### Measurement

- A. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to their third birthday}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C})] \times 100$ .
- B. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where notification (consistent with any opt-out policy adopted by the State) to the SEA and LEA occurred at least 90 days prior to their third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B})] \times 100$ .
- C. Percent =  $[(\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B}) \div (\# \text{ of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B})] \times 100$ .

Account for untimely transition planning under 8A, 8B, and 8C, including the reasons for delays.

#### Instructions

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Targets must be 100%.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target. Describe the method used to collect these data. Provide the actual numbers used in the calculation.

Indicators 8A and 8C: If data are from the State's monitoring, describe the procedures used to collect these data. If data are from State monitoring, also describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring. If data are from a State database, describe the time period in which the data were collected (e.g., September through December, fourth quarter, selection from the full reporting period) and how the data accurately reflect data for infants and toddlers with IFSPs for the full reporting period.

Indicators 8A and 8C: States are not required to report in their calculation the number of children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances, as defined in 34 CFR §303.310(b), documented in the child's record. If a State chooses to report in its calculation children for whom the State has identified the cause for the delay as exceptional family circumstances documented in the child's record, the numbers of these children are to be included in the numerator and denominator. Include in the discussion of the data, the numbers the State used to determine its calculation under this indicator and report separately the number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances.

Indicator 8B: Under 34 CFR §303.401(e), the State may adopt a written policy that requires the lead agency to provide notice to the parent of an eligible child with an IFSP of the impending notification to the SEA and LEA under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §303.209(b)(1) and (2) and permits the parent within a specified time period to "opt-out" of the referral. Under the State's opt-out policy, the State is not required to include in the calculation under 8B (in either the numerator or denominator) the number of children for whom the parents have opted out. However, the State must include in the discussion of data, the number of parents who opted out. In addition, any written opt-out policy must be on file with the Department of Education as part of the State's Part C application under IDEA section 637(a)(9)(A)(ii)(I) and 34 CFR §§303.209(b) and 303.401(d).

Indicator 8C: The measurement is intended to capture those children for whom a transition conference must be held within the required timeline and, as such, only children between 2 years 3 months and age 3 should be included in the denominator.

Indicator 8C: Do not include in the calculation, but provide a separate number for those toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference.

Indicators 8A, 8B, and 8C: Provide detailed information about the timely correction of noncompliance as noted in OSEP's response table for the previous SPP/APR. If the State did not ensure timely correction of the previous noncompliance, provide information on the extent to which noncompliance was subsequently corrected (more than one year after identification). In addition, provide information regarding the nature of any continuing noncompliance, methods to ensure correction, and any enforcement actions that were taken.

If the State reported less than 100% compliance for the previous reporting period (e.g., for the FFY 2018 SPP/APR, the data for FFY 2017), and the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance.

## 8C - Indicator Data

### Historical Data

<b>Baseline</b>	2005	87.00%
-----------------	------	--------

<b>FFY</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>
Target	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Data	98.60%	97.90%	88.62%	79.01%	97.43%

**Targets**

FFY	2018	2019
Target	100%	100%

**FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data**

Data reflect only those toddlers for whom the Lead Agency has conducted the transition conference held with the approval of the family at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties, not more than nine months, prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B preschool services (yes/no)

YES

Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B	Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
250	533	97.43%	100%	98.39%	Did Not Meet Target	No Slippage

Number of toddlers for whom the parent did not provide approval for the transition conference

This number will be subtracted from the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the denominator for this indicator.

223

Number of documented delays attributable to exceptional family circumstances

This number will be added to the "Number of toddlers with disabilities exiting Part C where the transition conference occurred at least 90 days, and at the discretion of all parties not more than nine months prior to the toddler's third birthday for toddlers potentially eligible for Part B" field to calculate the numerator for this indicator.

55

**What is the source of the data provided for this indicator?**

State monitoring

**Describe the method used to select EIS programs for monitoring.**

Data for FFY 2018 is based on monitoring data from all 40 local systems in Virginia and was gathered through local record reviews. The State Lead Agency randomly selected the children whose records were to be reviewed by the local system from those children who exited early intervention between August 1, 2018 and December 31, 2018. The number of records to be reviewed was based on the number of children in the local system who exited early intervention between August 1, 2018 and December 31, 2018 with a transition destination of public school/Part B eligible or Part B Referral, Eligibility Not Yet Determined:

- 0-9 children exited, reviewed all records
- 10-20 children exited, reviewed 10 records
- 21-100 children exited, reviewed 15 records
- 101-300 children exited, reviewed 20 records
- Over 300 children exited, reviewed 30 records

**Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)**

Exceptional family circumstances for untimely transition conferences included family scheduling preference, late referral to Part C, and disaster/severe weather. System reasons included system delays in scheduling and no reason documented.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified in FFY 2017**

Findings of Noncompliance Identified	Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected Within One Year	Findings of Noncompliance Subsequently Corrected	Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected
2	2	0	0

**FFY 2017 Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected**

**Describe how the State verified that the source of noncompliance is correctly implementing the regulatory requirements**

In order to verify correction of noncompliance on Indicators 8A, 8B and 8C, the State Lead Agency selected a random sample of either 3 or 5 records (depending on the size of the local system) of children who had recently transitioned out of early intervention, and the local system submitted the documentation from those records showing the transition steps and services, notification and/or transition conference and the reasons for any deviation from the required timeline for the given transition activity. State staff members reviewed the documentation in order to verify that the local system is now correctly implementing the transition requirement.

The State Lead Agency has verified that based on updated data, all EIS programs with noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and reported by Virginia under this indicator in the FFY 2017 APR are correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Describe how the State verified that each individual case of noncompliance was corrected**

For each local system with a finding of noncompliance on Indicator 8C, state Part C staff used record review data to verify that for each instance of noncompliance involved in a FFY 2017 finding, the transition conference occurred, though late, unless the child had already transitioned out of the Part C early intervention system by the time the noncompliance was identified. The State Lead Agency has verified that each EIS program with

noncompliance identified in FFY 2017 and reported by Virginia in the FFY 2017 APR held a transition conference for each child, although late, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program, consistent with OSEP Memorandum 09-02, dated October 17, 2008.

**Correction of Findings of Noncompliance Identified Prior to FFY 2017**

<b>Year Findings of Noncompliance Were Identified</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected as of FFY 2017 APR</b>	<b>Findings of Noncompliance Verified as Corrected</b>	<b>Findings Not Yet Verified as Corrected</b>
FFY 2016	1	0	1

**FFY 2016**

**Findings of Noncompliance Not Yet Verified as Corrected**

**Actions taken if noncompliance not corrected**

The initial reasons for noncompliance continued for this local system: misunderstandings within the local system about the transition conference requirements (due to frequent staff turnover) and insufficient local oversight to ensure these requirements were being met. As a result of continuing non-compliance, the following enforcement actions were imposed in FFY 2018 to support the local system in making the changes necessary to correct the noncompliance and have been conducted within the last year.

- Required the local system to continue completing structured and supervised local monitoring in order to identify ongoing issues and establish a more consistent and robust process for local oversight of transition requirements. Structured and supervised local monitoring requires the local system to review the transition section of the IFSP (and any related documentation) for all children each month using the annual record review form and to report findings to their Technical Assistance and Monitoring Consultants at the State Lead Agency.
- Required monthly meetings between the local system manager and state Technical Assistance and Monitoring staff to review, and revise as needed, the improvement plan developed in FFY 2017.
- Required an on-site meeting between the local lead agency administration, the State Part C Administrator and the assigned Technical Assistance and Monitoring Consultants from the state office to discuss continuing barriers and identify additional strategies to address the barriers.
- Required targeted Technical Assistance (TA) and Training, which included:
  - a. Required participation by the Local System Manager, all service coordinators and developmental service providers in a weekly, chapter-by-chapter review of the Part C Practice Manual conducted by their Technical Assistance and Monitoring Consultants at the State Lead Agency;
  - b. Required on-site training and process review activities with the local system manager and providers;
  - c. Required observation by the local system manager, service coordinators and developmental service providers of all steps in the EI process at a neighboring local system that demonstrates promising practices
- Required the early intervention annual staff development plan to include professional development related to the area(s) of noncompliance.

Despite the additional efforts described above, this local system has been unable to correct noncompliance or demonstrate progress on this indicator. During FFY 2018, several additional areas of noncompliance were identified. Due to these and other factors, on November 7, 2019 the State Lead Agency provided the state-required 90-days notice of intent to terminate the contract with this local lead agency, and a new local lead agency will begin operating this local system.

**8C - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**8C - OSEP Response**

Because the State reported less than 100% compliance for FFY 2018, the State must report on the status of correction of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 for this indicator. In addition, the State must demonstrate, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that the remaining one uncorrected finding of noncompliance identified in FFY 2016 was corrected. When reporting on the correction of noncompliance, the State must report, in the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, that it has verified that each EIS program or provider with findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2018 and each EIS program or provider with remaining noncompliance identified in FFY 2016: (1) is correctly implementing the specific regulatory requirements (i.e., achieved 100% compliance) based on a review of updated data such as data subsequently collected through on-site monitoring or a State data system; and (2) has corrected each individual case of noncompliance, unless the child is no longer within the jurisdiction of the EIS program or provider, consistent with OSEP Memo 09-02. In the FFY 2019 SPP/APR, the State must describe the specific actions that were taken to verify the correction.

If the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018, although its FFY 2018 data reflect less than 100% compliance, provide an explanation of why the State did not identify any findings of noncompliance in FFY 2018.

**8C - Required Actions**

## Indicator 9: Resolution Sessions

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted). (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the EDFacts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

This indicator is not applicable to a State that has adopted Part C due process procedures under section 639 of the IDEA.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of resolution sessions is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of resolution sessions reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

### 9 - Indicator Data

#### Not Applicable

**Select yes if this indicator is not applicable.**

YES

**Provide an explanation of why it is not applicable below.**

Virginia has not adopted Part B due process procedures.

### 9 - Prior FFY Required Actions

None

### 9 - OSEP Response

OSEP notes that this indicator is not applicable.

### 9 - Required Actions

## Indicator 10: Mediation

### Instructions and Measurement

**Monitoring Priority:** Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

**Results indicator:** Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements. (20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

#### Data Source

Data collected under section 618 of the IDEA (IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey in the ED Facts Metadata and Process System (EMAPS)).

#### Measurement

Percent = ((2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1) times 100.

#### Instructions

Sampling from the State's 618 data is not allowed.

Describe the results of the calculations and compare the results to the target.

States are not required to establish baseline or targets if the number of mediations is less than 10. In a reporting period when the number of mediations reaches 10 or greater, the State must develop baseline and targets and report them in the corresponding SPP/APR.

States may express their targets in a range (e.g., 75-85%).

If the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's 618 data, explain.

States are not required to report data at the EIS program level.

### 10 - Indicator Data

#### Select yes to use target ranges

Target Range not used

**Select yes if the data reported in this indicator are not the same as the State's data reported under section 618 of the IDEA.**

NO

#### Prepopulated Data

Source	Date	Description	Data
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1 Mediations held	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.a.i Mediations agreements related to due process complaints	0
SY 2018-19 EMAPS IDEA Part C Dispute Resolution Survey; Section B: Mediation Requests	11/11/2019	2.1.b.i Mediations agreements not related to due process complaints	0

#### Targets: Description of Stakeholder Input

Virginia has not reached the OSEP-identified threshold (10 mediations in a year) that requires targets to be set.

#### Historical Data

Baseline	2005				
FFY	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Target>=					
Data		100.00%			

#### Targets

FFY	2018	2019
Target>=		

#### FFY 2018 SPP/APR Data

2.1.a.i Mediation agreements related to due process complaints	2.1.b.i Mediation agreements not related to due process complaints	2.1 Number of mediations held	FFY 2017 Data	FFY 2018 Target	FFY 2018 Data	Status	Slippage
		0				N/A	N/A

Provide additional information about this indicator (optional)

**10 - Prior FFY Required Actions**

None

**10 - OSEP Response**

The State reported fewer than ten mediations held in FFY 2018. The State is not required to provide targets until any fiscal year in which ten or more mediations were held.

**10 - Required Actions**

**Indicator 11: State Systemic Improvement Plan**

The State did not submit 508 compliant attachments. Non-compliant attachments will be made available by the State.

## **Certification**

### **Instructions**

Choose the appropriate selection and complete all the certification information fields. Then click the "Submit" button to submit your APR.

#### **Certify**

I certify that I am the Director of the State's Lead Agency under Part C of the IDEA, or his or her designee, and that the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report is accurate.

#### **Select the certifier's role**

Designated Lead Agency Director

**Name and title of the individual certifying the accuracy of the State's submission of its IDEA Part C State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report.**

#### **Name:**

Catherine Hancock

#### **Title:**

Early Intervention Administrator - Part C Coordinator

#### **Email:**

catherine.hancock@dbhds.virginia.gov

#### **Phone:**

8043716592

#### **Submitted on:**

04/22/20 3:29:15 PM

## ED Attachment



2020 HTDMD Part  
C.pdf



VA  
-resultsmatrix-2020c



VA-aprltr-2020c.pdf



VA-C Dispute  
Resolution 2018-19.



VA-2020DataRubric  
PartC.pdf