# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2017, five hundred and fifty-eight (558) assessments were performed for youth with disabilities through the PERT Program, located on the campus of Wilson Workforce and Rehabilitation Center (WWRC). The services received breakdown into these categories:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Initial Evaluations | 474 |
| Situation Assessments | 29 |
| Transition Academy | 35 |
| Summer Assessment | 09 |
| Manufacturing Academy \* | 00 |
| Total Assessments in SFY17 | 547 |

\*The Manufacturing Academy intake was in July of the next fiscal year.

PERT Performance Measures

PERT has two performance measures. The first measure is “Number of students enrolled in PERT Initial Evaluation Services.” The target for this measure for SFY17 was 450. PERT provided 474 Initial Evaluations. This was 105% of the target goal. The second performance measure was “Percentage of local school divisions across Virginia that participate in the PERT Program in the reported state fiscal year.” The target for this measure was 85%. This measure exceeded this year. PERT served 114 of 132 local school divisions across Virginia. This was 86% of the local school divisions in the State.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Performance Measures | Target Number SFY17 | Provided Number SFY17 | % of Target Goal |
| Number of Students Enrolled in PERT Initial Evaluation Services | 450 | 474 | 105% |
| School Division Participation in PERT Program | 112 (85%) | 114 (86%) | 101% |

School Districts that did not participate during this fiscal year by sending any students to any type of PERT programing included: Bath County, Dickenson County, Goochland County, Greyson County, Greene County, Manassas City, Manassas Park, Northumberland County, Norton City, Poquoson City, Radford City, Rappahannock County, Surry County, Tazewell County, Virginia Beach City, and West Point.

Student Demographics

The students served were 15-22 years of age. Sixty (63.4) % of the students served were males. The mean age for Initial Evaluations was (18.17). The mean age for Situational Assessments was (18.8). The average age for Transition Academy students are marginally younger at a mean age of (18.16). The average age for Community Assessments was (18.74).

The primary disability grouping for youth served was cognitive impairments. This has been true since FY06. The top two primary causes for impairment are Intellectual Disability and Autism. These two causes account for 48.8% of the clients served. This was the first year that Autism surpassed Specific Learning Disability which was the third most prevalent disability served.

Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) was also significant at 16.3 percent. Those disability groups added together account for 85% of the SFY17 PERT primary causes for impairment. There was a steady increase in the number of PERT students served with Autism from 48 in SFY11 to 123 in SFY16. For SFY17 the number did not increase but remained high (118). If secondary and tertiary disabilities are included 24.5% of PERT clients have some form of Autism.

English was the primary language for PERT Initials and Situational Assessments students in SFY17. Eleven (11) students had limited English speaking ability. Eight (8) were reporting American Sign Language (ASL) as their primary language this fiscal year which was more than last year. One student reported Spanish as his/her primary language. Ninety–eight (98) percent of PERT’s clients had functional English speaking ability.

Medical Ancillary Services Provided

Two hundred and fifty–eight (258) received ancillary services this year compared to one hundred and six (106) ancillary evaluations in SFY16. Ancillaries are additional assessments in a medical area, such as Speech and Audiology, Occupational Therapy (OT), Physical Therapy (PT), Neuro-psychology, Psychology, Brain Injury Services and WWRC Physician consults. Rothrock Attendant Care would also be counted among ancillaries.

Charge capture information indicates that in SFY17 additional charges were submitted for Attendant Care (13), OT Services (79 students), PT Services (10 students), Speech and Audiology (2 students), Neuro-psychology (1 students), and Physician Services (3). This was a slight decrease in all categories of service except Neuropsychology and Physician Services.

Students served through the Initial Evaluation Program were assessed in 26 vocational job families.  Preliminary data shows that over one thousand four hundred and forty-seven (1447) total evaluations were performed.  Students averaged almost three evaluations per student (2.8).  This year TA students were added to total number.

The highest number of recommendations was in the Services Group (357, 24.7%).  Electrical/ Mechanical had the second highest number of recommendations (329, 22.7%). This was a higher percentage than last fiscal year. Business and Information Technology (256, 17.7%), and Building Trades (256, 17.7%), had an identical number of recommendations.  Humanitarian was slightly less (226, 15.6 %). Twenty – one (21) students received a Skills Assessment which was just slightly less than last year.  The most popular evaluation areas were Food Service (183), Material’s Management (129) and Child Care (111).  Of the three thousand five hundred and seventeen (3517) recommendations generated, recommendations can be broken down into the following categories:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Total Number of Recommendations By Category (Total Recommendations Made) | |
| Training | 31 |
| OJT | 181 |
| Supported Employment | 394 |
| Pre-Vocational Training | 77 |
| Non-Competitive Integrated | 63 |
| Academic | 566 |
| Other | 537 |
| Re-Eval | 259 |
| Not Recommended | 317 |
| Trial in Training | 371 |
| Not Interested | 44 |
| Incomplete | 11 |
| See Report | 0 |
| Life Skills/Prep | 708 |
| Total | 3324 |

Several differences stand out from last fiscal year. There were only half as many Training recommendations as last fiscal year. This was compensated by 368 more Trial in Training recommendations. So it appears evaluators are less willing to make a full Training recommendation. Non – Competitive recommendations increased by 20 which is 46%. Life Skill/PREP recommendations increased by 125 more recommendations.

PERT Program Satisfaction

Program satisfaction information was gathered at the PERT Advisory Council (PAC) meetings. The PERT Advisory Council is an interdisciplinary group of stake holders composed of former PERT students, parents, Field Rehabilitation Services staff and local educational area transition staff from all over the state of Virginia.

The first meeting of this cycle was on October 18, 2016. PAC monitors progress made by receiving reports from the PERT Director at the beginning of the next cycle relative to each initiative. Meeting content included a review of SFY16 demographic and outcome statistics. Topics that were discussed included Revision of PERT Reports, Low Participating Areas, PERT New Team Training, Manufacturing Academies in the 2017 Calendar, the new PERT Advisory Council Charter, an update on CRC/Aztec and discussion of potential Recreation Hall transportation issues. The PAC members were given an opportunity to provide feedback. The second meeting was May 10, 2017. This meeting was postponed due to PAC member schedule conflicts.

Satisfaction information was also gathered through PERT and Center student exit interviews, report implementation meetings held in the student’s community, and surveys that accompany the student’s summary completion report.

School and Parent/Guardian Satisfaction Surveys

PERT Transition Resource Specialists distributed satisfaction surveys during Report Implementation Meetings for PERT Initial Evaluation students. Of the 0 students who received this service, satisfaction survey responses were received from 166 school personnel (0% response rate) and 130 parents/guardians (0% response rate). These results are summarized below:

*School Satisfaction Survey Responses (166 Total Responses) (NR = no response)*

1. The PERT experience enabled the student to talk about his/her future goals?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 72% | Strongly Agree | 27 % | Agree | 1% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 0% NR |

Comments related to question 1:

* + Wants Customer Service.

2. PERT increased the student’s awareness of his/her strengths?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 67% | Strongly Agree | 32% | Agree | 1% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 0% NR |

Comments related to question 2:

* + Liked the charts of positive/negative.

3. PERT enabled the student to identify his/her career goals?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 58% | Strongly Agree | 39 % | Agree | 3% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 0% NR |

Comments related to question 3:

* + He has a better idea but still unsure of goals.
  + Now at least he is completely sure of goals. Each student was unsure at first of their goals.

4. PERT increased the student’s confidence and self-esteem?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 56% | Strongly Agree | 39 % | Agree | 3% Disagree | 1% Strongly Disagree | 1% NR |

Comments related to question 4:

* + Definitely! And gave dad increased awareness of student’s abilities.
  + They opened up more verbally during PERT.
  + He was nervous when he went and was pleased with himself that he faced his fear.

5. PERT allowed the student to explore a variety of leisure and independent living activities?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 74% | Strongly Agree | 24% | Agree | 1% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 1% NR |

6. The PERT report provided information to assist in the development of the student’s transition plan?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 85% | Strongly Agree | 14% | Agree | 1% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 0% NR |

Comments related to question 6:

* + Lots of great information to use in terms of likes and dislikes and weaknesses.
  + He just got hired for stocking (the area he scored high in).
  + Thank you for all your support for him!

7. The PERT Report Implementation meeting allowed us time to discuss and plan for the student’s future?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 87% | Strongly Agree | 13% | Agree | 0% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 0% NR |

Comments related to question 7:

* Very good team interaction.
* Love the recommendations!
* Would like to have before IEP’s.

8. PERT recommendations will be incorporated into the student’s IEP?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 78% | Strongly Agree | 19% | Agree | 0% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 3% NR |

Comments related to question 8:

* + Student has a 504 not an IEP.
  + Being done!
  + Especially measurements used in the Kitchen, tsp vs tbsp.
  + He began to understand the relevancy of academics related to career.

9. PERT increased the students Awareness of academic skills relevant to his/her career goals?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 64% | Strongly Agree | 34% | Agree | 1% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 1% NR |

Comments related to question 9:

* + Student’s academic skills are below what is required for career goal. I think the parents were looking for some more specific alternative career goals.
  + Excellent comment/suggestions provided by WWRC and DARs staff for parent and school to follow up on.

PERT School Survey comments: There were forty-seven (47) general written school comments. Of those one (1) comments were neutral, two (2) were negative, and forty-four (44) were positive. The neutral comment was related to future steps for the student. “Family will discuss the recommendations further with student.” One negative comment was about the desire for more data to be tailored to the goals of the school. The second negative comment said the student felt their counselor was putting them down. An example of a positive school written comment was, “It allowed the student to explore their independence and self-advocacy. Great experiences and information to assist with transition planning.”

*Parent/Guardian Satisfaction Survey Responses (130 Total Responses)*

1. PERT helped me talk to my child about their future?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 73% | Strongly Agree | 23% | Agree | 3% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 1% NR |

Comments related to question 1:

* + It allowed realistic discussion of options.
  + Very through on all aspects.
  + He saw a plan and a purpose for his future.

2. PERT increased my awareness of my child’s abilities and strengths?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 68% | Strongly Agree | 30% | Agree | 2% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 0% NR |

Comments related to question 2:

* Very much-gives a picture of opportunity in spite of “limitations.”
* Excellent detailed report.
* He was able to show us his strengths and his interests.
* The reports were very through of his vocational and life living skills.
* The in-depth and through analysis of his self-independence reassures me that I am doing great teaching him to be an adult.

3. PERT helped my child identify his/her career goals?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 57% | Strongly Agree | 36% | Agree | 5% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 2% NR |

Comments related to question 3:

* + PERT showed him how strengths could turn into a career.
  + Somewhat agree-really still limited on career goals.
  + Yes- realistically and ability wise – helped him to understand also that his life is “his” life.

4. PERT increased my child’s confidence and self-esteem?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 58% | Strongly Agree | 35% | Agree | 4% Disagree | 2% Strongly Disagree | 1% NR |

Comments related to question 4:

* She was confident before the evaluation process, but somewhat discouraged during.
* Very much-gave him a “success” when (when) he usually is not the “star.”
* I love the additional programs offered to assist him in this area.
* He grew up a lot after the program.
* First time away from home.

5. PERT allowed my child to explore a variety of leisure and independent living activities?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 72% | Strongly Agree | 28% | Agree | 0% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 0% NR |

Comments related to question 5:

* Yes-in a safe setting-allowed him to be “independent” but not “unsupervised.”
* Yes. He tried things he usually wouldn’t have with peers.
* Being self-sufficient in the WWRC setting was a great growth opportunity…

6. My child described the PERT assessment process as helpful?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 65% | Strongly Agree | 32% | Agree | 2% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 1% NR |

Comments related to question 6:

* It helped show him his needs and strengths.
* I’m very proud of my son.
* Yes-he loved it, loved doing his room (and hearing it was clean) much enjoyed the assessment.

1. The PERT written report was received in time for review prior to the PERT Implementation meeting?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 75% | Strongly Agree | 23% | Agree | 0% Disagree | 2% Strongly Disagree | 0% NR |

Comments related to question 7:

* Two weeks before meeting-allowed time to read alone, discuss, and look at the website.
* Never received.

1. During the PERT Implementation meeting, the PERT report was explained to me?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 78% | Strongly Agree | 20% | Agree | 1% Disagree | 1% Strongly Disagree | 0% NR |

Comments related to question 8:

* Good review of options.
* Not able to attend meeting.
* Could not answer questions about driving assessment and Food Services eligibility criteria.

1. The PERT implementation meeting helped me to assist my child in preparing for his/her future?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 75% | Strongly Agree | 23% | Agree | 1% Disagree | 1% Strongly Disagree | 0% NR |

Comments related to question 9:

* Very much so-in giving a realistic opportunity for him.

1. I would recommend the PERT program to another family?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 85% | Strongly Agree | 15% | Agree | 0% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 0% NR |

Comments related to question 10:

* It has changed our lives.
* PERT helped my son look forward to the workforce.
* Absolutely-already have!
* Great program!

Parent general comments: There were fifty (50) general written parent comments. Of those five (5) were negative, four (4) were neutral and forty-one (41) were positive or very positive. The negative comments related to: food offered at the center, communications between counselor and student, communication between parents and counselors, allowing more time to choose vocational evaluation areas, and the reliability and validity of the program. The neutral comments was related to 1) questions on the survey 2) a desire for information to be discussed outside of the IEP discussion 3) a desire for masonry and welding certifications to be offered at WWRC and 4) a comment about testing. The following is an example of the positive comments. “This program showed talents and skills we had never considered before. PERT has been a tremendous help in developing her goals and her own advocacy. She has learned to question when things don’t make sense and to be appreciative of all assistance given. It made her think what she really does and does not like to do. As a parent, this program has been invaluable.”

*DARS Satisfaction Survey Responses (158 Total Responses)*

1. The recommendations included in the PERT Summary Report were useful?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 88% | Strongly Agree | 11% | Agree | 1% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 0% NR |

Comments related to question 1:

* + Not realistic for training, given rural area employment.
  + The recommendations were on target for this client.
  + Very informative.

2. PERT increased my awareness of my client’s abilities and strengths?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 77% | Strongly Agree | 23% | Agree | 0% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 0% NR |

Comments related to question 2:

* + Absolutely.

3. The recommendation will be used to develop the client’s IPE?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 79% | Strongly Agree | 20% | Agree | 0% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 1% NR |

Comments related to question 3:

* + Will also be used to develop IEP.
  + Helpful feedback on areas needing further development.
  + Helpful feedback for steering client in direction after school.

4. PERT increased my client’s confidence and self-esteem?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 59% | Strongly Agree | 34% | Agree | 3% Disagree | 1% Strongly Disagree | 3% NR |

Comments related to question 4:

* + He appeared to be comfortable and ventured out of his comfort zone to try new things.
  + Neither agree nor disagree.
  + Not in this case.
  + I saw an increase in maturity level.
  + Client was not happy with some of the results.
  + Surprised high rating in peer relations.

5. PERT allowed my client to explore a variety of leisure and independent living activities?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 74% | Strongly Agree | 25% | Agree | 1% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 0% NR |

Comments related to question 5:

* He was afforded the opportunity but chose not to.
* Enjoyed playing games/meeting new people.
* He did not participate actively.

6. My client described the PERT assessment process as helpful.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 66% | Strongly Agree | 32% | Agree | 1% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 1% NR |

Comments related to question 6:

* Client stated that he felt some of the assessments (IT in particular) was not representative of real IT work.
* Broke out of his comfort zone by attending.

7. The PERT written report was received in time for review prior to the PERT Implementation meeting?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 89% | Strongly Agree | 10% | Agree | 1% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 0% NR |

1. During the PERT Implementation meeting, the PERT representative clearly explained the report?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 91% | Strongly Agree | 9% | Agree | 0% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 0% NR |

* Excellent
* Billy explained everything clearly and gave some suggestions for future vocational planning.

1. I have a good working relationship with the PERT representative in my area?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 91% | Strongly Agree | 8% | Agree | 0% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 1% NR |

Comments related to question 9:

* Very flexible, always willing to accommodate client needs.
* I love working with Billy. He is respectful but honest with the clients about options.
* Desiree is most helpful.

1. Contact with the PERT case manager was satisfactory.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 84% | Strongly Agree | 14% | Agree | 0% Disagree | 0% Strongly Disagree | 2% NR |

DARS Survey general comments: There were nineteen (19) general written DARS comments. Of those, five (5) were negative and related to counselor interaction with client, an implementation meeting not scheduled in a timely manner, and incorrect territories used in a report. One (1) was neutral and related to skipping questions on the questionnaire. The other thirteen (13) comments were all positive. The comments complimented the report and recommendations, commented on the good PERT experience, and discussed how the recommendations would be implemented at school.

WWRC Center Satisfaction Survey

The Center Client Satisfaction Survey was not yet available.

Staffing in SFY17

For PERT this was a relatively stable staffing year.

Fulltime positions: A Transition Resource Specialist Field position (Central) was vacated and filled.

A PERT On-site Counselor Position was vacated.

Part time positions: Three part time residential positions were vacated and filled during this period. An Independent Living Skills Instructor position was also vacated and filled.

Transition Academies

Four Transition Academies were completed in SFY17. The students selected are usually students that would fall outside of PERT admission selection guidelines. These students would have a difficult time functioning in the campus environment in a traditional 10-day PERT program. Support on campus was provided by the local DRS counselor and a school teacher from that LEA. A level one career assessment was requested to be performed in the field to allow the student to target areas of vocational interest. Students selected two potential vocational evaluation areas. During their three days on campus students were exposed to the WWRC intake process, participated in an orientation and campus tour, participated in a teambuilding activity, participated in two independent living assessments, participated in structured recreation activities, developed work behaviors, and toured the center training areas.

Thirty-five (35) students total were served. Students were from Alexandria, Bedford, Chesterfield, Colonial Heights, Dinwiddie City, Frederick, Middlesex, Newport News, Page, Petersburg, Prince William, and Warren.

Summer Assessment Academy in Fairfax

Fairfax was the original Summer Assessment Program. It was a collaborative effort between Fairfax schools and the Department for Aging and Rehabilitative Services (DARS) occurred in July and was designed to meet the needs of complex students. Nine (9) students were targeted for this program. The students had been referred to the PERT program, and the selection team determined that the students may not be ready to attend Wilson Workforce and Rehabilitation Center (WWRC) residential setting for a 5-10 day Initial Evaluation Program. PERT staff traveled to the Northern region to provide services with a local Vocational Evaluator, and a contracted Job Coach through DARS. This community effort provided two days of vocational assessment – interest inventories, situational assessment at the Davis Center and a community work experience based upon their interests; two days of Independent Living Assessment – developing a budget for real life situations game, cooking, kitchen safety, medication management, hygiene, self-esteem, problem-solving and hygiene assessments; and will act as a screener for the potential of additional services on-site at WWRC.

PERT New Team Training

The Department of Education budgeted for an on-site PERT Team Training to be held at the Wilson Workforce and Rehabilitation Center (WWRC), in Fishersville, VA on Thursday, November 17th and Friday, November 18th, 2016 and December 7th and 8th. PERT did not have students on campus at this time. This training focused on PERT on-site activities from a student perspective. Field paperwork was covered at Regional Trainings.

Forty (40) local PERT team members that were Department of Education transition staff and DARS Transition Counselors came to WWRC and participated in two training days. The training heightened participants understanding of the PERT process and provided exposure to a student’s perspective on PERT assessment.

Participants would select vocational areas of interest prior to the training using the Wilson Workforce and Rehabilitation Center’s Interest Checklist. During two half days of on-site training, participants resided in the student rooms, ate cafeteria food, experienced vocational evaluation, independent living assessments and recreational activities. This better allowed DOE staff to explain what happens at WWRC during a PERT intake to prospective student referrals. The DOE grant paid for lodging cost for Switzer (dormitory housing), travel, and some food.

Tours

PERT Staff toured 1,155 visitors to Wilson Workforce and Rehabilitation Center during SFY17.