



Rehabilitation Services
Commission

PROGRAMMATIC MONITORING & EVALUATION

REVIEW GUIDE

Division of Performance and Innovation
Program Integrity and Evaluation
Revised October 2012

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION	3
II.	EVALUATION PROCESS	4
III.	EVALUATION CATEGORY DEFINITIONS AND FACTORS	5
	A. Quality & Learning/Growing Areas Of Review	5
	<i>CASE PROCESS</i>	6
	B. VR Referral Areas of Review	6
	C. Application Areas of Review	7
	D. Eligibility Areas of Review	7
	E. Order of Selection Areas of Review	7
	F. IPE Development and Implementation Areas of Review	8
	G. Service Delivery Areas of Review	9
	H. Employment Outcomes Areas of Review	9
	I. Case Review Total Score Areas of Review	10
	J. Customer Satisfaction Areas of Review	10
	K. Reports Areas of Review	10
	L. General Areas of Review	11
	M. Need for Corrective Action/Follow-Up	12
	N. Risk Level	12
	O. Stakeholder Feedback	13
	P. Reviewer(s) Signature/Initials/Date	13
	Q. Program Integrity & Evaluation Reviewer(s) Signature/Initials/Date	13
IV.	ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND RESOLUTION PROCESS	14
V:	ADDENDUMS	
	Appendix A: Quarterly Performance Evaluation Procedure	15
	Appendix B: Initial Quarterly Email Language	16
	Appendix C: Final Quarterly Email Language	17
	Appendix D: Request for Administrative Review	18

I: INTRODUCTION

Effective October 1, 2012, the Ohio Rehabilitation Services Commission (RSC) implemented a [monitoring program](#)¹ for Third Party Cooperative Arrangements (TPCA), Interagency Agreements (IA), and other VR Programs as applicable. TPCAs will be interchangeably referred to as “Contracts” in this document and IAs will be interchangeably referred to as “Programs” in this document. Performance is defined as how a cooperating entity carries out the obligations of the agreement. This includes all requirements stated within the TPCA/IA scope of work and provisions, adherence to the budget or price and may include the provision of customer service.

The purpose of this document is to provide guidance for the accurate and consistent completion of the **Program Monitoring Review Form**². This form will be used to monitor program progress in accordance with the TPCA/IA on a routine basis in the following areas: Quality & Learning, *VR Referral, *Application, *Eligibility, *Order of Selection, *IPE Development and Implementation, *Service Delivery, *Employment Outcomes, *Case Review, Customer Satisfaction, Reports, General, Need for Corrective Action, and Risk Level. Each section of the form lists performance indicators to be referenced when evaluating each area.

This guide provides examples of documentation and other measurements that can be used to evaluate those indicators, but does not provide an all-inclusive list of items which provide sufficient evidence for each area. This document designates the differentiation of the primary responsibilities amongst RSC staff and stakeholders/partners for each area being reviewed.

All Program Monitoring Reviews should be coordinated by the Primary RSC contact and completed electronically. Results of the monitoring review will be saved in the QA web based application so that data can be evaluated for individual TPCAs/IAs as well as for aggregate programmatic evaluation purposes.

The top section of the form is to be completed as follows:

- Fill out the Program (IA)/Contract (TPCA) Name.
- Fill out the Program Administrator Name (PAN) and corresponding email address. The PAN is the primary contact associated with the contract or program.
- Fill out the Primary RSC Contact Name. This is the person identified by RSC to complete the review form and the person from RSC that will be contacted with any questions about the review unless otherwise noted.
- Check the Bureau/Division, then select the appropriate program associated with the checked box and enter the contract routing number.
- Indicate if the Program/Contract is utilizing case service funds or is administrative in nature; checking the appropriate box will dictate the availability of measures upon which the contract/program is to be evaluated.
- The last step will be to indicate the start date and end date of the program/contract.

In each section, performance is rated by selecting one of the following categories:

- **(MS) MEETS STANDARDS** – this rating should be used when the program is performing satisfactorily on the majority of the indicators in the area being reviewed and there is no implication of harm to consumers or improper use of funds.

¹ [Program Monitoring Policy](#)

² Program Monitoring Form

- **(NI) NEEDS IMPROVEMENT** – this rating should be used when the program is not meeting performance expectations in 50% or more of the indicators in the area being reviewed or immediate improvement from current practice(s) is necessary.
- **(N/A) NOT APPLICABLE** – this rating should be used when the reviewer is unable to rate the indicators in an area being reviewed because items do not apply to a particular program/contract, or the program/contract is too new to be rated, i.e. a new contract that has not yet developed any Individual Plans for Employment.

Prior to beginning the actual review, the RPS should access the “Standard Comments” section of the form and ensure all items that will be typically utilized throughout the monitoring process are selected from the drop down menu provided for each section. If a resource is utilized other than those identified in the drop down menu, the reviewer must type in the resource tool that was utilized.

For each section of the form, the review date will be auto-populated and a record will be retained of the last person who saved an entry; a check box relating to the review results will be available; and a comment box with space for up to 4,000 characters will permit the input of any additional comments. Reviewers are encouraged to use the comment section extensively while completing the review to make note of observations and additional evidence of each of the areas reviewed.

*** These sections of the form are only used for contracts and programs utilizing case service funds.**

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

II: EVALUATION PROCESS

Program monitoring must be based on a review of existing written documentation reflecting performance that has been provided by the contractor to RSC. Documentation can include, but is not limited to, program and fiscal reports, case service documentation, invoices, correspondence, notes to the file, meeting minutes, corrective action plans, case reviews, consumer surveys, etc. Both programmatic and fiscal documentation should be reviewed during the evaluation. Documentation should be in the form of electronic files to ensure more timely delivery of review findings. Any documentation reviewed as part of the evaluation process or documentation generated as a result of the evaluation process must be maintained in RSC files.

The RSC staff member conducting the evaluation will be familiar with the TPCA/IA and the program’s performance. This individual is identified as the “Primary RSC Contact” is interchangeably referred to as the “Reviewer” or “Evaluator” in RSC program monitoring and evaluation related materials. The Primary RSC Contact is usually a program staff member, although there may be some situations where fiscal staff is the primary monitor of a TPCA/IA.

Prior to the first evaluation of the TPCA/IA, the Evaluator must confirm the appropriate individual(s) within the organization to receive the performance evaluations. If multiple people are to receive the evaluation, a single individual must be identified as the party responsible for acknowledging receipt of the evaluation and providing comments back to the Evaluator concerning the evaluation, if any. The authorized primary contract contact is referred to as the Program Administrator (PA). The PA is provided the name of the individual responsible for monitoring the contract and conducting performance evaluations. The Reviewer must have access to the web based Program Monitoring Review database.

Multiple RSC program staff may be familiar with the TPCA/IA and may consult one another and/or fiscal staff to review documentation reflecting the performance for the review period. Upon the completion of the review of this material, the Program Monitoring Review Form will be completed by the reviewer.

A Completed review is emailed to the Program Administrator (PA) using [email language](#)³ provided. The PA is given **14 calendar days** to respond with comments. Any comments submitted beyond 14 days will not be included in the current review, but will be addressed in following review, if applicable. With the receipt of no comments within the allotted time, the reviewer will note an assumption the PA is in agreement with findings from Review.

Comments received from the PA will be archived with all documentation relating to the evaluation process. These documents include, but are not limited to the RSC Program Monitoring Review Form, Quality Reports, Fiscal Reports, Case Reviews, Tablecloth report, Exhibit A (contract deliverables), supervisor approval, and PA comments if any. These documents will be saved electronically. Submission of comments from the PA will provide the reviewer the opportunity to amend the report if warranted before completing the review.

After the review has been completed by the Primary RSC Contact and *commented on by the Program Administrator, it will be submitted to a Program Integrity and Evaluation (PIE) Reviewer for final approval.

The finalized program review is emailed to the PA using [email language](#)⁴ provided. If multiple people are to receive the evaluation, a single individual (PA) must be identified as the responsible party for acknowledging receipt of the evaluation. The finalized review is available to the public and will be posted on the internet.

*** If the PA disagrees with the findings of the review s/he will follow the policy for an Administrative Review and Resolution Process previous to its submission to a PIE Reviewer.**

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

III: EVALUATION CATEGORY DEFINITIONS & FACTORS

There are [14 categories](#) listed below that are used by RSC to assess each contract/program performance during the period of review. All fourteen categories are evaluated for Case Service Contracts and for Programs identified as having a case service delivery process available for review. Administrative programs and contracts will exclude Case Process Review Criteria and will be evaluated utilizing the following sections: A & J-N.

Each evaluation category is described and examples of possible factors are provided. Divisions/Programs are encouraged to identify factors within each category that are applicable to their contracts. As applicable, distinctions between primary responsibilities of RSC staff versus stakeholders/partners are identified within each area being reviewed.

While factors can be customized, the descriptions **CANNOT**. **DO NOT EDIT THE EVALUATION CATEGORY DESCRIPTIONS**. If the reviewer finds an area that does not fit that contract/program, a comment should be entered describing such circumstances.

Program staff should ensure that contractors are aware of the evaluation process and the categories used to evaluate performance, and should be aware that some contractors have multiple agreements with RSC and therefore will receive multiple evaluations throughout the year. Each TPCA/IA is unique and programs should utilize specific factors to evaluate performance under each category. This necessary flexibility may be confusing to contractors and will require thoughtful explanation. If the contractor requires clarification or additional information about the categories or evaluation process, direct them to the Contract/VR Program Manager.

A. QUALITY & LEARNING/GROWING AREAS OF REVIEW:

³ [Initial Quarterly Email](#)

⁴ [Final Quarterly Email](#)

This section of the form is used to evaluate the program's quality, growth, and learning by examining factors such as staffing levels, accreditation, staff skills and knowledge base, and professional development activities. High performance in this area is essential to helping ensure consumers receive quality services.

STAKEHOLDER RESPONSIBILITY⁵

- Number of quality observations (*i.e. five [5] completed Counselor Session Observation forms per counselor/coordinator per year, onsite observations*)
- Systems in place to ensure quality services/outcomes (*i.e. presence of quality assurance policy/procedures; satisfaction surveys, reports tracking outcomes*)
- Current/appropriate staff credentials (*i.e. current professional licenses/certifications, college transcripts, diplomas*)
- Demonstrating knowledge of RSC policies and policy updates including confidentiality of personally identifiable information (*i.e. VRC case documentation demonstrating knowledge and compliance with [RSC policies](#) and has demonstrated protection of consumers' [confidentiality](#)*)

RSC RESPONSIBILITY⁶

- Staffing levels in accordance with contract (*i.e. staffing levels information in contract, payroll documentation*)
- Using extranet/internet resources when necessary (*i.e. demonstrates ability to access Intranet resources, i.e. [VR Manual](#), [AWARE Business Process Manual](#), [Contract Services Unit information](#), etc.*)
- Using IT Helpdesk as appropriate (*i.e. [submitting IT Helpdesk Tickets](#)/calling Helpdesk (800-704-7983) as needed*)
- Current/appropriate accreditation (*i.e. letter/certificate from accrediting organization*)
- Participating in RSC training programs (*i.e. staff's names on sign-in sheets from training sessions*)
- Participating in RSC/Contractor meetings (*i.e. appropriate staff in attendance at mentoring meetings*)

Once the above information is completed, describe any obstacles that have hindered progress towards achieving the contract deliverables. Make use of drop down boxes to reference materials commonly used to substantiate findings.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

CASE PROCESS⁷

Section B. through Section I. of this form is used to [evaluate the program's performance](#) throughout the various stages of the vocational rehabilitation process from referral/application to case closure. This section of the form is only used for contracts and programs utilizing case service funds. The identification of strengths and weaknesses in the VR process will pinpoint areas needing additional attention and guide decision-making about how to best improve performance. Case Review Scores reference the [Case Review Form](#) that is completed in conjunction for Case Reviews by VR Supervisors and Quality Assurance Staff.

B. VR REFERRAL AREAS OF REVIEW⁸:

STAKEHOLDER RESPONSIBILITY

- Outreach in developing/maintaining referral sources (*i.e. agendas/notes from meetings with referral sources; appointments with referral sources documented in calendar, PSA's, marketing materials, etc.*)

⁵ [RSC Policy on Extranet](#), [Confidentiality Policy](#), VR Programmatic Case Review Policy

⁶ [VR Policy Manual](#), [AWARE Business Process Manual](#), [VRP3 Homepage](#), [IT Helpdesk webpage](#)

⁷ [QA Case Review Policy](#), [Case Review Form](#)

⁸ [CFR 361.28](#), [CFR 361.41](#), [OAC 3304-2-51](#), [Application and Intake Procedure](#), [Casework Development Service Delivery Timeline Policy](#), [Fiscal Management of Case Service Dollars CS](#), [IPE Policy](#),

- Scheduling new referrals (*i.e. letters/case notes in case management system documenting scheduled appointments*)
- Using consumer's chosen mode of communication (*i.e. case notes/letters showing the use of the consumer's preferred mode of communication, i.e. letter in Spanish; forms provided in large print, etc.*)
- Following [RSC procedure](#) of scheduling an initial appointment within five (5) business days of referral (*i.e. case notes, letters, applications for services, completed case management screens, etc. indicating contact within the required timeframe*)

RSC RESPONSIBILITY

- Case Review Referral Score: (*Score from quarterly QA reports. Questions: 8, 9*)

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

C. APPLICATION AREAS OF REVIEW⁹: STAKEHOLDER RESPONSIBILITY

- Processing applications completely and timely (*i.e. demonstrate case moved into application status and application was signed in a timely and accurate manner*)
- New VR participants intake/orientation process in place (*i.e. case notes/letters demonstrating an intake/orientation process is in place*)

RSC RESPONSIBILITY

- Case Review Score (*Score from quarterly QA reports. Questions: 1-4, 10-11*)

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

D. ELIGIBILITY AREAS OF REVIEW¹⁰:

STAKEHOLDER RESPONSIBILITY

- Conducting [assessment](#) to determine [eligibility](#) and priority under [order of selection](#) (*i.e. case documentation reflective of assessment process, i.e. [records requests](#), completed intake appointment, functional limitations documentation, etc.*)
- Obtaining appropriate/sufficient diagnostic information to support the eligibility decision (*i.e. documentation VRC referred consumer for diagnostics needed to make the eligibility determination*)
- Verifying eligibility under Title II or Title XVI of the Social Security Act for purposes of presumptive eligibility (*i.e. documentation of Social Security beneficiary status, when appropriate*)
- Providing trial work experiences (*i.e. case notes/assessment reports showing trial work experiences were provided when there were doubts about the consumer's ability to benefit from VR services*)
- Addressing recidivism, i.e., the issue of individuals returning for services (*i.e. case notes documenting VRC discussed past case(s) with consumer, expectations for current case, etc.*)

RSC RESPONSIBILITY

- Case Review Score (*Score from quarterly QA reports. Questions: 12-17, 19, 22, 24, 27-29*)

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

⁹ [CFR 361.28 ?](#), [CFR 361.41](#), [CFR 361.38](#), [OAC 3304-2-51](#), [OAC 3304-2-54 \(F\)\(1\)](#), [OAC 3304-2-63](#), [Application and Intake Policy](#), [Application and Intake Procedure](#), [Confidentiality Policy](#), [Comprehensive Assessment Policy](#), [Use of Release Forms Policy](#)

¹⁰ [CFR 361.5](#), [CFR 361.28 ?](#), [CFR 361.41](#), [CFR 361.42](#), [CFR 361.43](#), [OAC 3304-2-51](#), [OAC 3304-2-54](#), [OAC 3304-2-61](#), [Application and Intake Procedure](#), [Assessment Policy](#), [Casework Development Service Delivery Timeline Policy](#), [Case Closure Policy](#), [Eligibility Policy](#), [Informing Consumer His- Her Rights Policy](#), [Order of Selection Policy](#), [Providing DD Rights Brochure Policy](#),

E. ORDER OF SELECTION AREAS OF REVIEW¹¹:

STAKEHOLDER RESPONSIBILITY

- Soliciting input about the OOS and its implementation (*i.e. contract staff providing input about releases from wait list, OOS process, etc.*)
- Communicating OOS priority categories to consumers (*i.e. Certificate Of Eligibility/OOS letter in case record*)
- Managing capacity to better serve all eligible individuals (*i.e. compare on-hand capacity at this point in the contractual year to the amount agreed upon in contract to evaluate if on tract*)
- Adhering to OOS requirements (*i.e. case record demonstrates compliance with OOS policy and procedures*)

RSC RESPONSIBILITY

- Case Review OOS Score: (*Score from quarterly QA reports. Questions: 18, 20-21, 23, 30-31*)

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

F. IPE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION AREAS OF REVIEW¹²:

STAKEHOLDER RESPONSIBILITY

- Making pertinent information available (including in accessible formats) to individuals with disabilities in order for them to make informed decisions throughout the rehabilitation process, including options for developing the IPE, information about types of services available, qualifications of potential service providers, and consumer satisfaction with services; (*i.e. informed choice documented in case notes and on the CA*)
 - Ensuring the timely development and implementation of individual IPEs (*i.e. IPE's developed within 120 days of eligibility and documentation of reason(s) for delay if applicable*)
 - Ensuring the IPE is consistent with and supports the IPE employment goal (*i.e. CA documenting the IPE and its services are consistent with the consumer's needs and will support the consumer in reaching the employment outcome*)
 - Determining financial need and potential cost sharing by eligible VR participants (*i.e. consumer contribution and comparable benefits documented in the case record and reflected on the IPE, when appropriate*)
 - Providing direct job development and placement services, purchase those services, or use other strategies for these services (*i.e. job development services reflected on the IPE; job development/placement reports in the case record; case notes documenting progress*)
 - Writing a comprehensive assessment that accurately and completely supports IPE (summarizes assessments, justifies/explains service needs and supports goal selection) (*i.e. CAs completed in its entirety, CA in line with IPE, and reflective of the previously-stated criteria*)
 - Writing plans that detail all the necessary services for consumer to achieve employment outcome (*i.e. CA and IPE that document all necessary services are included*)
 - Case documentation demonstrating that coordinator engaged consumer in an informed choice process for all major decision points including employment goal,

¹¹ [CFR 361.28 ?](#), [CFR 361.41](#), [OAC 3304-2-54](#), [OAC 3304-2-65](#), [Application and Intake Procedure](#), [Assessment Policy](#), [Eligibility Policy](#), [Order of Selection Policy](#), [Operation of the Statewide Waiting List VR Manual Chapter 7](#)

¹² [CFR 361.28 ?](#), [CFR 361.1](#) [CFR 361.5](#) [CFR 361.41](#) [CFR 361.42](#) [CFR 361.45](#) [CFR 361.46](#) [CFE 361.47](#) [CFR 361.48](#) , [CFR 361.50](#), [CRF 361.52](#), [OAC 3304-2-51](#), [OAC 3304-2-52](#), [OAC 3304-2-54](#), [OAC 3304-2-56](#), [Case Record Policy](#), [Casework Development Service Delivery Timeline Policy](#), [Comprehensive Assessment Policy](#), [IPE Policy](#), [Use of Comparable Benefits Policy](#)

- services and providers (*i.e. case notes and CA demonstrate ongoing consumer involvement in decision making process*)
- Utilizing assistive technology services to enhance consumer capacity to obtain or maintain employment (*i.e. CAs and IPEs documenting assistive technology services were provided when necessary*)
- Developing resources for long-term supports for individuals in supported employment (*i.e. supported employment services documented on the CA and IPE*)

RSC RESPONSIBILITY

- Case Review IPE Score: (*Score from quarterly QA reports. Questions: 32- 46, 51, 64-67* double check policy*)

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

G. SERVICE DELIVERY AREAS OF REVIEW¹³:

STAKEHOLDER RESPONSIBILITY

- Understanding importance of case documentation including:
 - Summary of consumer’s progress which includes a narrative description of consumer at various points in the process to demonstrate improvements and benefit (*i.e. VRC progress notes, vendor progress reports, annual reviews, diplomas, certificates of completion, etc.*)
 - Communications with consumer (*i.e. ongoing case notes, letters, emails, etc.*)
 - How decisions were arrived at (*i.e. case notes documenting decision-making process/informed choice*)
 - Partnership with consumer (*i.e. case notes, emails, letters, etc. demonstrating ongoing, working relationship between the VRC and consumer after IPE development*)
 - Reason for successful or unsuccessful closure (*i.e. case note or documentation on closure letter indicating reason for case closure*)
 - What needs to be different for case to proceed if consumer returns to VR program (*For unsuccessful closures, documentation in closure case note or closure letter indicating what consumer needs to do before returning to RSC*)
- Providing feedback as needed to ensure timely and quality service (*i.e. case notes, emails, etc. responding to vendor/consumer questions and concerns*)
- Providing appropriate and sufficient referral questions (*i.e. referral forms that clearly explain service(s) requested and questions to be answered*)
- Communicating with CRP/provider during course of service; maintaining involvement with consumer and service providers and documenting communication (*i.e. in person/staffing, phone, e-mail, documentation of interactions with vendors and consumers through case notes, emails, staffing reports, phone calls, etc.*)
- Determining methods to sustain program (*i.e. case notes documenting problem-solving/ decision-making that took place when problems arose during service delivery and how this enabled consumer to continue in program*)

RSC RESPONSIBILITY

- Case Review Service Delivery Score: (*Score from quarterly QA reports. Questions: 5-7, 25-26, 47-50, 52-54, 60-62*)

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

¹³ [CFR 361.28 2](#), [CFR 361.42](#), [CFR 361.45](#), [CFR 361.46](#), [CFR 361.48](#), [CFR 361.47](#), [CFR 361.47\(a\)\(7\)](#), [CFR 361.48](#), [CFR 361.52](#), [OAC 3304-2-51](#), [OAC 3304-2-55](#), [OAC 3304-2-56](#), [OAC 3304-2-61](#), [Case Closure Policy](#), [Case Record Policy](#), [Comprehensive Assessment Policy](#), [Informed Choice Policy](#), [Informing Consumer His-Her Rights Policy](#), [IPE Policy](#), [VR Counseling Guidance Policy](#)

H. EMPLOYMENT OUTCOMES AREAS OF REVIEW¹⁴:

RSC RESPONSIBILITY

- Ensuring quality outcomes for consumers that are permanent and competitive (*i.e. documentation that outcome is consistent with the consumer's abilities, limitations, etc., the job is permanent rather than seasonal, and that the consumer is earning a competitive wage*)
- Case Review Closure/Outcome Scores: (*Score from quarterly QA reports. Questions: 55-59. 63* double check policy*)

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

I. CASE REVIEW TOTAL SCORE AREAS OF REVIEW¹⁵:

RSC RESPONSIBILITY

- Case Review Overall Scores: (*Score from quarterly QA reports. 1-63.*)

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

J. CUSTOMER SATISFACTION AREAS OF REVIEW:

This section evaluates the program's performance in obtaining feedback from consumers and the public and in using that feedback to improve service delivery and satisfaction. This process is essential to continuous quality improvement.

STAKEHOLDER RESPONSIBILITY

- Using results of consumer satisfaction surveys (*i.e. completed consumer satisfaction surveys, documentation summarizing survey results and outlining plans to incorporate feedback*)
- Establishing due process procedures (*i.e. copy of program's due process procedures*)
- Communicating due process provisions to consumers (*i.e. documentation in a letter, case note, form, etc. that consumers were informed of due process procedures*)
- Soliciting input from consumers, the public, and RSC about the service delivery system (*i.e. documentation input was requested, i.e. completed surveys, meeting minutes from forums with the public; notes from meetings with RSC, etc.*)
- Using information solicited from consumers, the public, and RSC to improve the service delivery system (*i.e. documentation showing what changes/improvements were made as a result of input*)

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

K. REPORTS AREAS OF REVIEW:

This section evaluates the program's utilization of available reports and data for tracking progress on deliverables/outcomes, ensuring fiscal responsibility, monitoring program efficiency, and developing/revising policies.

¹⁴ [CFR 361.28](#), [CFR 361.1](#), [CFR 361.5](#), [CFR 361.43](#), [CFR 361.44](#), [CFR 361.47](#), [CFR 361.48](#), [CFR 361.52](#), [CFR 361.56](#), OAC 3304-2-54, [OAC 3304-2-61](#)
[Case Closure Policy](#) [Case Record Policy](#)

¹⁵ Review footnotes 18-14

STAKEHOLDER RESPONSIBILITY

- Generating service provision reports from the VRP3's MIS system and using reports to improve performance and/or revise policies/standards to improve service delivery (*i.e. documentation showing how reports were used to improve service provision, i.e. planning documents, internal correspondence, etc.*)
- Securing thorough reports for all services rendered (*i.e. reports about services the program uses*)
- Reviewing reports from service providers and ensuring that all services requested were provided, report is complete, billing coincides with report dates, times and elements (*i.e. vendor reports in the case management system for each authorization and all information listed above was verified*)

RSC RESPONSIBILITY

- Utilizing RSC case management system (*i.e. case review results, input from RSC Liaison Counselors, observation of use of case management system*)
- Utilizing RSC Master List report and movement of cases through services in a timely manner and in a sufficient manner to support contractual goal(s) (*i.e. Master List showing that cases are moving through statuses/services in a timely manner*)
- Utilizing case management system reports (master list, caseload summary, current year activity and fiscal reports) in order to achieve production goal for current contract deliverables; meeting RSA performance indicators (*i.e. ask about use of reports, review reports to verify contract deliverables and RSA performance indicators are being met*)

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

L. GENERAL AREAS OF REVIEW:

This section evaluates the program's support needs, major accomplishments, and ability to collaborate with vocational rehabilitation professionals, including RSC Program/Contract Services Unit staff. This review will ensure that the program has the resources it needs to be successful.

STAKEHOLDER RESPONSIBILITY

- Promoting/maintaining collaborative working relationships with the service delivery network, including employers, other state agencies, community-based programs, WIA partners, state education agencies, centers for independent living, and institutions of higher education (*i.e. case record documentation showing coordination of services with the above listed entities; minutes from meetings with these organizations; calendar showing meetings with organizations*)
- Accessing other VR related information such as VR casework policy manual, CRP manual and other inter/extranet resources. (*i.e. demonstration of ability to answer questions about how to access VR related information*)
- RSC Liaison relationship supportive of Eligibility, Order of Selection, Individual Plan for Employment (IPE), IPE Amendments, Case Closure, and final billing approval (*i.e. contract VRS/Regional Manager providing feedback about relationship with RSC Liaison*)
- RSC Liaison and RPS providing monthly support to projects during the first year and bi-monthly support to projects greater than one year; RPS providing tools and strategies to support the VRP3 (*i.e. contract VRS/Regional Manager providing feedback about support provided by RSC Liaison and RPS*)
- RPS providing support as a liaison between the VRP3 project and the local RSC office as needed (*i.e. contract VRS/Regional Manager providing feedback about support provided by RPS*)

- List below and briefly describe the project's three major accomplishments for the review period that reinforces the new and innovative aspects of the program (*i.e. establishing outreach activities, identifying new employment opportunities, staff or consumer accomplishments*)

RSC RESPONSIBILITY

- Demonstrating appropriate use of system processes (*i.e. tasking protocol, email, phone calls*); monitoring and evaluation systems in place to ensure the quality of services and outcomes (*i.e. input from RSC Liaison Counselor; ask staff to explain the tasking protocol and evaluation systems, review any problems that have occurred in this area during the past quarter*)
- Providing appropriate information and resources to assist in completion of the Program Monitoring Review Form (*i.e. quarterly reports, feedback from RSC Liaison Counselors, etc.*)
- List (below) any notable challenges or obstacles requiring support since last review

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

M. NEED FOR CORRECTIVE ACTION/FOLLOW-UP

This section provides a summary of the corrective action/follow up needs identified during the completion of the Program Monitoring Review Form. This is essential to the continuous quality improvement process.

- Check the box to indicate whether or not corrective action/follow up is needed.

Areas for Corrective Action/Follow Up:

- Describe areas of Corrective Action/Follow-up needed, including any findings from the RSC Primary Contact review and Fiscal Monitoring Tools for this period. (Be specific.)

Previous Action/Follow-up Completed/Staff Initials:

- Describe areas of Corrective Action/Follow-up completed since the last review, including findings from the Liaison Counselor's review and Fiscal Monitoring Tools from the previous period. (Be specific.)

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

N. RISK LEVEL

The following 3 ratings make up the evaluation rating structure. These rating definitions and factors **should not** be customized.

HIGH RISK: Contractor/Program performance has been less than standard or satisfactory. This rating encompasses programs whose performance does not consistently meet expectations defined in the TPCA/IA.

FACTOR

- Performance does not consistently meet expectations defined in the agreement
- Close supervision of the program was required to progress the work
- Work was unsatisfactory and consistently failed to meet expectations
- Lack of cooperation
- Most performance requirements were not met
- Significant and consistent ineffective use of allocated funds

- Lack of user satisfaction
- Lack of exhibition of necessary progress to meet deliverables as agreed
- Potential implication of fiscal or programmatic irresponsibility
- Questionable interaction(s) with consumer(s)

MEDIUM RISK: Contractor/Program has met all specifications and requirements. This rating includes a range of expected performance as stated in the contract/scope of work to support the project.

FACTOR

- Contractor exhibits competency in the assignments and consistently meets the desired expectations of the project
- TPCA/IA meets standards and objectives and all performance requirements
- TPCA/IA sometimes exceeds expectations
- TPCA/IA met expectations
- On schedule to meet deliverables
- Adequate user satisfaction
- Efficient collaboration with RSC liaison(s)

LOW RISK: Contractor performance exceeds standards and is satisfactory. This rating represents consistent and exceptional performance or consistently superior achievement beyond regular assignments and expectations as state in the contract/scope of work.

FACTOR

- Meeting and exceeding performance requirements
- Significant positive impact with the TPCA/IA
- Reduced costs while meeting contract deliverables
- Exemplary collaboration with RSC liaison(s)
- Significantly exceeded expectations
- High user satisfaction
- Highly responsive and proactive

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

O. STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK (must be provided within 14 days) - include RPS response to feedback. Disagreement with findings will be provided within this same period of time and will need to follow the administrative review and resolution process.

P. REVIEWER(S) SIGNATURE/INITIALS/DATE: Complete electronic signature, initials, and date next to the appropriate quarter.

Q. Program Integrity & Evaluation Reviewer(s) Signature/Initials/Date:
 PIE staff will review the form in its entirety and make any additional comments in relation to the review. Complete electronic signature, initials, and date next to the appropriate quarter.

IV: ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND RESOLUTION PROCESS

If a contract service provider disagrees with the results of the program monitoring review completed by the Authorized RSC Representative, he/she shall contact RSC within 14 calendar (14) days of the completion of the review and provide supporting written documentation contrary to the findings.

The RSC Representative shall then discuss the situation with a supervisor/manager to determine if the results of the review will be revised. The supervisor/manager shall contact the contract service provider to discuss the issue in further detail prior to making a decision.

If there is still disagreement related to the results, the contract service provider must complete the “Request for Administrative Review” form within ten business (10) days of the written request and send it to the attention of the RSC Supervisor.

The RSC Supervisor shall review the request and rescind or revise the results if the documentation warrants such action.

If the RSC Supervisor does not rescind or revise the results, he/she shall convene a panel including a representative from the following areas: contract service provider, legal counsel, VR Administration or designee, PIE, and RPS.

- a. The panel shall meet so each member may state his/her opinion and the rationale for the opinion.
- b. If all panel members are in agreement, no further discussion takes place. However, if there is disagreement, the panel should discuss the issues amongst themselves and then vote as to what the decision should be. The vote does not have to be a secret ballot, but should be kept confidential. The majority rules when the result of the vote is not unanimous.
- c. After a decision has been reached, the VR Administrator (or designee) shall prepare a written summary of the decision within ten (10) working days and forward to the members of the panel for review to ensure the written decision is in accordance with what the panel had decided..

This entire process shall be completed so the final decision can be responded to in writing within thirty (30) calendar days from the date of receipt of the “Request for Administrative Review”.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

DRAFT

APPENDIX: A



Rehabilitation Services
Commission

PROGRAM MONITORING PROCEDURE

Step	Action	Responsible
1	Identify Primary RSC Contact; this person is also referred to as the Reviewer/Evaluator.	Contract/Program Manager/Supervisor
1.1	The authorized primary contract contact is referred to as the Provide “Program Administrator (PA).” Provide the PA the name of the individual responsible for monitoring the contract and conducting performance evaluations. The Reviewer must have access to the Program Monitoring Review Database.	Reviewer or Manager/Supervisor of Reviewer
2 – Early in the first quarter of the contract period	Confirm appropriate individual(s) within contractor’s organization to receive all performance evaluation results. If multiple people are to receive the evaluation, a single individual (PA) must be identified as the responsible party for acknowledging receipt of the evaluation and providing comments if any.	Reviewer
2.1	Set up a “tickler” system for reminders to conduct evaluations according to schedule.	Reviewer
2.2	Reviewer contacts TPCA/IAs to be reviewed to provide a schedule for expected dates of review.	Reviewer
3 – End of Quarter	Consult with other program staff (if applicable) and fiscal staff to review documentation reflecting performance for the quarter.	Reviewer
3.1	Complete the RSC Quarterly Program Monitoring Review Form . (insert web link)	Reviewer
3.2	Reviewer consults with manager/supervisor if the evaluation results in a “High Risk” Determination.	Reviewer
3.3	Completed review is emailed to PA using email language provided. PA is given 14 calendar days to respond with comments. Any comments submitted beyond 14 days will not be included in current review, but will be addressed in following quarterly review, if applicable. With the receipt of no comments, the reviewer will note an assumption the PA is in agreement with findings from Review.	Reviewer
3.4	If the PA responds with *comments, archive the comments and all documentation relating to the evaluation process. These documents include, but are not limited to the RSC Program Monitoring Review Form, supervisor approval and contractor comments if any. These documents will be kept electronically. Submission of comments from contract will provide the reviewer the opportunity to amend report before completing the review	Reviewer
3.5	Completed review is provided to a Program Integrity and Evaluation Reviewer for final approval.	PIE Reviewer
4-	Finalized program review is emailed to PA using email language provided. If multiple people are to receive the evaluation, a single individual (PA) must be identified as the responsible party for acknowledging receipt of the evaluation. The finalized review is available to the public and will be posted on the internet.	Evaluator and/or Fiscal Staff

* Program Administrators expressing an interest in the dispute process should be directed to the Contract/Program Manager.

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

APPENDIX: B

INITIAL QUARTERLY EMAIL LANGUAGE

Communicating evaluation results to Contractor

Instructions: Upon RPS completion of a program monitoring review the system will generate an email message. The text in **red** is prepopulated from the Program Monitoring Form to customize the information. The third paragraph is prepopulated based on the findings in Section M – Corrective Action/Follow-Up Plan.

The **Cover Letter**, the **Program Monitoring Review**, **Program Monitoring SWOT Report**, and the **Program Monitoring Review Form Guide** will be attached in Portable Document Format (PDF) to the email which will be sent to the Program Administrator designated on the top of the review form.

Hi (Name of Contactor Representative),

The Ohio Rehabilitation Services Commission has implemented a policy to conduct quarterly contractor performance evaluations as part of its routine contract administration activities. This policy applies to all contracts entered into or amended on or after October 1, 2012. The program monitoring and evaluation process is designed to provide feedback concerning your organization's compliance with contract requirements and obligations for each quarter of the contract period.

Your organization's performance under contract (enter contract routing number) was evaluated based on documentation maintained in our fiscal and program files. The result of the (choose 1st, 2nd, 3rd, or 4th) quarter evaluation is attached to this email. The overall result for this quarter of the contract period is found in the attached Program Monitoring SWOT Report. Additionally, we have attached a copy of the Program Monitoring Form that provides specific details about the review along with a copy of the Program Monitoring Review Form Guide which provides specific guidance and interpretation about the functional use of the review form.

Based on the overall findings of this review it is determined that your contract is considered a (Low Risk, Medium Risk, High Risk), which is explained in detail on the Program Monitoring SWOT Report.

(This paragraph will include comments from Section M – Corrective Action Plan/Follow-Up and must describe next steps to address the issue(s). For example – “This evaluation resulted in a [Low Risk, Medium Risk, High Risk] rating due to inaccuracies found in the fiscal and program reports reviewed” If the findings do not list any compliance issues, this paragraph will state “This review results in no significant findings and does not require a corrective action plan.”)

Please **respond to this email within 14 calendar days of receipt** indicating you received the evaluation and provide comments, if any. A lack of response will be construed as acceptance of the evaluation and rating.

Thank you,
(RPS name and contact information)

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

APPENDIX: C

FINAL QUARTERLY EMAIL LANGUAGE

Communicating final evaluation results to Contractor

Instructions: Upon RPS completion of a program monitoring review the system will generate an email message. The text in **red** is prepopulated from the Program Monitoring Form to customize the information. The third paragraph is prepopulated based on the findings in Section M – Corrective Action/Follow-Up Plan.

The **cover letter**, the **Program Monitoring review**, **Program Monitoring SWOT Report**, and the **Program Monitoring Review Form Guide** will be attached in pdf format to the email which will be sent to the Program Administrator designated on the top of the review form

Hi (Name of Contactor Representative),

The Ohio Rehabilitation Services Commission has implemented a policy to conduct quarterly contractor performance evaluations as part of its routine contract administration activities. This policy applies to all contracts entered into or amended on or after October 1, 2012. The program monitoring and evaluation process is designed to provide feedback concerning your organization's compliance with contract requirements and obligations for each quarter of the contract period.

The final evaluation includes the ability for the contractor to have presented feedback to RSC program staff about the evaluation findings. All such feedback must be accompanied by specific and clearly-defined written documentation supporting any finding(s) that is in question. Lack of supporting evidence will result in the original findings being upheld. This report is designed to provide feedback to you concerning your organization's overall compliance with contract requirements and obligations throughout the contract period.

Your organization's performance under contract (enter contract routing number) was evaluated based on documentation maintained in our fiscal and program files. The result of the final evaluation is attached to this email. The overall result for this quarter of the contract period is found in the attached Program Monitoring SWOT Report. Additionally, we have attached a copy of the Program Monitoring Form that provides specific details about the review along with a copy of the Program Monitoring Review Form Guide which provides specific guidance and interpretation about the functional use of the review form.

Based on the overall findings of this review it is determined that your contract is considered a (Low Risk, Medium Risk, High Risk), which is explained in detail on the Program Monitoring SWOT Report.

(This paragraph will include comments from Section M – Corrective Action Plan/Follow-Up and must describe next steps to address the issue(s). For example – “This evaluation resulted in a [Low Risk, Medium Risk, High Risk] rating due to inaccuracies found in the fiscal and program reports reviewed” If the findings do not list any compliance issues, this paragraph will state “This review results in no significant findings and does not require a corrective action plan.”)

Please contact me if you have any questions or need further clarification about this process.

Thank you,
(RPS name and contact information)

[Back to Table of Contents](#)

APPENDIX: B



**Rehabilitation Services
Commission**

Date Received by Authorized
RSC Representative: _____

REQUEST FOR ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

[After following the steps indicated in the Program Monitoring policy, the Program Administrator must complete this form within ten business (10) days of the written request and send it to the attention of the Manager of the Primary RSC Contact Indicated on the Review]

PROGRAM/CONTRACT NAME

(incl. contract routing number, if applicable): _____

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR REQUESTING REVIEW: _____

BUREAU/PROGRAM: _____ **REVIEWER(S):** _____

REVIEW DATE(S): _____ **DATE OF EXIT DISCUSSION:** _____

STEP 1: INFORMAL RESOLUTION

Please list the findings with which you disagree and provide documentation to support your interpretation: _____

(The Program/Contract Manager shall review the request and rescind the finding if documentation warrants such action. If not, the Manager shall convene a panel as noted on pg. 2 of this form.)

Based on discussion with the Reviewer and the Program/Contract Manager, Program Administrator reached the following decision: _____

Review resolved? Yes No - If no, refer to page 2.

REQUEST FOR ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

STEP 2: REQUEST FOR RESOLUTION BY PROGRAM/CONTRACT MANAGER

(The panel shall meet so that each member may state his/her opinion and the rationale for such. If all panel members are in agreement, then no further discussion takes place. However, if there is disagreement, the panel should discuss the issues and then vote as to what the decision should be. The vote does not have to be a secret ballot, but should be kept confidential. The majority rules when the result of the vote is not unanimous.)

PANEL MEETING DATE: _____ **TIME:** _____

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT

Legal Counsel Representative: _____

VR Deputy Director/Assistant Deputy Director: _____

Manager of Contract/Program: _____

Reviewer: _____

Program Administrator: _____

PANEL DECISION: _____

(After a decision has been reached, the Program/Contract Manager (or his/her designee) shall prepare a written summary of the decision within ten (10) working days and forward this to the members of the panel for review to ensure the written decision is in accordance with what the panel had decided. Again, the majority will rule if there are differing opinions.)

DATE PROGRAM/CONTRACT MANAGER SENT WRITTEN SUMMARY OF DECISION TO PANEL: _____

FINAL WRITTEN DECISION: _____

(Must be completed within 30 calendar days from the date of receipt of the Request for Administrative Review.)

DATE FINAL WRITTEN DECISION SENT TO INDIVIDUAL REQUESTING THE REVIEW: _____