

**NEBRASKA VR
Case Review - Quality**

INITIAL MEETING		
1. Does the initial meeting specifically identify job readiness factors that may interfere with the referral becoming successfully employed? (address prior VR closure reason(s), current barriers to employment, stability of disability/situation, identification of resources, and informed choice to apply).		
Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
Documentation lacks evidence of the individual's informed decision to apply for VR Services; there is limited information that job readiness factors were discussed, or job readiness factors are identified but no indication of how they may affect participation in services.	Documentation indicates the individuals' intent for competitive integrated employment; there is evidence some job readiness factors were discussed and assessed to determine if any will interfere with successful employment; next steps for addressing any barriers to employment are noted.	Documentation provides detailed evidence of client engagement in determining the individual's reason for seeking VR services and intent for competitive integrated employment; evidence all job readiness factors were discussed/assessed; barriers to employment are noted and an implementation plan of the additional steps is developed to include information and referral to community resources, as applicable, or documentation of no issues with readiness factors.
COMMENTS:		

2. Does the case contain documentation of an initial meeting that gives a holistic picture of the individual's reason for seeking VR Services by addressing impairment, impediment, general work history, education, legal, other agencies, economic situation, impressions, and next steps.		
Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
No task note documenting initial meeting, or task note lack details that give a holistic picture of the clients situation; task note(s) are vague or missing required topics, and no indication it is not an issue; meeting(s) is conducted without authorized representative, if applicable.	Task notes documenting initial meeting provides a brief overview of the applicant's situation; relevant topics listed in the question above are addressed	Task notes documenting initial meeting have enough detail to provide an in-depth picture of the individual' unique situation (e.g., gathering work history to determine patterns (gaps, termination reasons, difficulties, etc.) in securing, retaining, advancing in, or regaining employment consistent with their abilities); detailed information is provided about the impairment and resulting limitations; all topics not applicable are noted as n/a ; Next Action or Summary of Initial Meeting form completed with client.
COMMENTS:		

PRE-EMPLOYMENT TRANSITION SERVICES**1. Is there evidence of regular monthly contact, student engagement and the intentional delivery of services of practical importance?**

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
Documentation indicates sporadic contact with the student; tasks notes are vague and do not show that student is engaged with the services that are being provided; little or no indication the student is receiving one of the 5 pre-employment transitions services and/or evidence pre-employment transitions services have been provided but are not documented as a team service.	Documentation of monthly contact with the student, or if they were unable to meet, a task note indicates the reason why; evidence shows student engagement and the intentional delivery of services that are relevant to the student; indication the student was informed about pre-employment transitions services over the summer months; team services have been documented; contact or attempted contact with parent/ guardian at various points in the VR process is evident.	There is evidence that staff provided numerous opportunities to engage students monthly; the intent of student engagement is well documented and next steps are identified; multiple team services have been provided and documented; it is evident parent/guardian have been included, when needed; intentional conversations with the student and parent regarding potential pre-employment transition services in the summer is evident.

COMMENTS:

2. Is there documentation staff is:

- a. **Attending IEP meetings when invited (in person or using alternative methods such as phone, FaceTime, Skype, etc.?)**
- b. **working with local workforce development boards, one stop centers, and employers to develop work opportunities for students with disabilities, including internships, summer employment apprenticeships, and other employment opportunities?**
- c. **working with schools to coordinate and ensure the provision of pre-employment transition services? How?**
- d. **attending person-centered planning meetings when invited that assist individuals with disabilities and their families to plan for the future?**

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
<p>No evidence of an informed choice conversation about the need for work opportunities for the student.</p> <p>No evidence of contact with the student's IEP case manager regarding collaboration in providing pre-employment services and monthly contact with the student is not documented.</p>	<p>If invited to the IEP, evidence of invitation to and/or attendance at an IEP, or if unable to attend documentation of input provided.</p> <p>Evidence of informed choice with the student about the need for work opportunities and outreach to businesses. If there is a need, WBLE activity was documented in the student's case.</p> <p>Collaboration with the school regarding services is evident by monthly student meetings;</p> <p>If invited to person-center planning meetings, documentation of attendance.</p>	<p>Evidence the pre-employment transitions service staff attended an IEP meeting and details of the information that was shared; description of how staff utilized the information discussed at the IEP meeting or in the IEP to plan activities for the student;</p> <p>Evidence of informed choice with the student about work opportunities. If there is a need, there is documentation staff explored WBLE activities that provided an opportunity for the student; staff consulted with their BAM or local workforce development boards to obtain information about the labor market and information was provided to the student.</p> <p>Evidence of collaboration with the school regarding services is evident by monthly student meetings and documentation of collaboration with IEP case manager regarding the provision of pre-employment transition services;</p> <p>If invited to person-center planning meetings, documentation of attendance or information about the student is shared with DD Service Coordinator.</p>

COMMENTS:

3. Is there evidence of communication with parent or authorized representative?

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
No evidence of staff contacts with a parent or authorized representative,	Evidence staff participated in an IEP meeting while the parent was at the meeting or documented task notes of contact with the parent or authorized representative or unsuccessful attempts to contact parent/authorized representative were noted.	Evidence of numerous contacts with the parent/authorized representative and updates provided regarding the activities that student engaged in; feedback from the parent/authorized representative is well documented.

COMMENTS:

ELIGIBILITY

1. Does the case record contain acceptable information to support the client has a physical or mental impairment? (QE2 Eligibility screen narrative and medical information)		
Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
Impairment: No medical documentation or medical information is not a valid document (not completed by an appropriate provider-see who can diagnosis - Eligibility Chapter); does not include all relevant impairments or acknowledge why certain impairments are not relevant. Observable impairment documentation in QE2 does not describe the physical impairment or this is used for an unobservable impairment.	Impairment: Medical verification is from an approved medical provider for all vocationally relevant impairments as outlined in the Eligibility Chapter and medical verification matches selected impairment(s) in QE2; if made eligible based on SSI/SSDI, current BPQY is uploaded. current and active BPQY is uploaded. Observable impairment is adequately described in the required QE2 Eligibility screen.	Impairment: Primary Impairment is justified as the most substantial impediment to employment;
COMMENTS:		

2. Does the case record contain acceptable information to support that the client's impairment results in a substantial impediment to employment? (QE2 Eligibility screen narrative and medical information)		
Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
Impediment: QE2 Eligibility Narrative does not provide case specific details of how the impairment(s) causes difficulty in securing, retaining, advancing in, or regaining employment consistent with the applicant's abilities and capabilities.	Impediment: QE2 Eligibility Narrative does not provide case specific details of how the impairment(s) causes difficulty in securing, retaining, advancing in, or regaining employment consistent with the applicant's abilities and capabilities.	Impediment: QE2 Eligibility Narrative does not provide case specific details of how the impairment(s) causes difficulty in securing, retaining, advancing in, or regaining employment consistent with the applicant's abilities and capabilities.
COMMENTS:		

3. Do the Functional Capacities rating/comments support the priority designation?		
Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
The narrative does not specifically address the specific functional limitations, but rather just a generic statement about limitations without any justification for the statement. Justification of selected category is not supported by case specific evidence or evidence does not support selected functional capacity category. Includes unsubstantiated disability as a justification or incorrect category was selected based on the justification narrative, or the same justification was used for different categories, etc.	All relevant and verified impairments are addressed and assigned the appropriate functional capacity limitation. Each selected functional limitation includes case specific evidence pertinent to each category to justify how the verified impairment hinders an individual and the severity (low or very low) rating. No duplicated justifications (same narrative for more than one functional capacity).	Evidence the applicant was included in the process, and VR did not just rely exclusively on medical documentation to determine the functional capacities and priority assignment. Work history was gathered to determine the difficulty of securing, retaining, advancing in, or regaining employment and identifying strengths
COMMENTS:		

4. If an eligibility extension was completed, was the reason for extension appropriate?		
Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
Reason for extension was not out of the control of VR (e.g. VR was not actively seeking records or keeping in regular contact with the client, referral for benefits services was not made timely, or VR did not use existing records from prior files); reason selected is not accurate based on task note documentation; or no Extension completed.	Extension was completed in QE2 prior to 60 days expiring, or if not completed, there is documentation of repeated attempts that weren't successful; evidence the applicant and authorized representative, as applicable were included.	Evidence client was kept engaged in the VR process while seeking medical records; VR did everything within their power to complete the extension on time and the reason matches the documentation in the task notes; it is evident VR exhausted all means of gathering medical records (using existing records, requesting records within days of application signature, following up on record requests).
COMMENTS:		

5. If there were case service expenditures prior to eligibility and functional capacity determination, were those expenditures documented in a case note as in support of an eligibility determination?		
Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
No documentation justifying the purchases made prior to eligibility; it's unclear how the authorized service ties to an assessment service for eligibility purposes;	Documentation for authorized service provides justification of why the service was needed to determine eligibility;	It's clear how the authorized service(s) contributed to the eligibility determination; informed choice was provided in the selection of service, provider, and/or location and documentation includes the outcome of the service(s) provided.
COMMENTS:		

CAREER PLANNING		
1. Were the clients' interests and preferences acknowledged and results documented?		
Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
No evidence the client's interests or preferences were acknowledged during career planning discussion(s).	Documentation provides evidence the client's reported vocational interests (goal, hours, conditions, etc.) on the VR Application, or any additional reported working conditions were discussed and addressed. There is evidence of VR support or non-support of the job goal.	VR addresses the client's preferred job goal, and it is clear through documentation and discussions with the client if the goal is supported by VR; if VR could not support the client's interests or preference, an explanation was provided, and other options were explored with the client.
COMMENTS:		

2. Does the case show evidence the specialist helped the client explore and/or engage in career planning activities (career counseling, labor market information, skills assessment, Discovery booklet, job shadow/ tours, progressive employment, etc.) to assist in the identification of a career goal or confirm the existing goal?		
Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
No evidence career planning was provided, or potential assessments discussed with client; evidence of career planning lack details to indicate how a career goal was identified;	Documentation provides evidence of what information was used to identify a job goal or support an existing job goal and was shared with the client; career planning activities used address the client's job interests, assets, limitations, and labor market information; the skills and abilities needed for the job were addressed and the client's functional limitations are consistent with the job requirements.	Case moved through the process efficiently and effectively; existing information is utilized as appropriate; documentation provides evidence the activities were value-added and purposeful and provided simultaneously with other services inside or outside the agency; evidence of informed choice being provided in selection of assessment services, job goal, services, entity providing the service, employment setting, and method of procuring the service.
COMMENTS:		

3. Were job readiness factors considered and addressed?		
Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
Job readiness factors were not identified or identified but not addressed.	Job readiness factors were identified, as applicable. If no job readiness factors were identified, it is evident there were none.	Job Readiness factors were identified, addressed, and a support plan was put into place for those factors that need it.
COMMENTS:		

4. Were job planning factors and work characteristics considered and addressed?		
Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
No evidence work characteristics were considered or addressed; no job planning factors were explored.	Job planning factors guidelines were explored, and evidence VR provided labor market information on the specific skills, abilities, and training required for the identified vocational area of interest.	Evidence of VR providing employment outlook and entry level wage information; documentation shows VR ensured the work characteristics/tasks are consistent with the client's impairment or identified accommodations needed.
COMMENTS:		

5. Is there evidence the job goal is consistent with the individual's unique strengths, resources, priorities, concerns, abilities, capabilities, interests, and informed choice?		
Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
There is not enough evidence to show all aspects were addressed or the goal seems inconsistent with the above criteria; goal does not match what the client stated at the Initial Meeting and no reason for the discrepancy identified.	IPE narrative justification in QE2 addresses why the job goal is a good match for the client and any inconsistencies are addressed; it is clear how the goal meets all the requirements above; Informed choice is evident through the task notes and/or IPE Narrative.	Documentation reflects VR addressed any potential inconsistencies with services and accommodation plans. Case notes provide evidence of career counseling.
COMMENTS:		

6. Upon completion of the evaluation, how well did the evaluator identify short-term or long-term activities or next-steps in the Summary and Recommendations section of the Voc. Eval. report in QE2?		
Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
No summary of the vocational evaluation in the Summary and Recommendations section or there is documentation but no clear direction of next steps or recommendations for job goal and/or services are documented.	Documentation provides clear evidence used to arrive at short-term or long-term activities or next steps for career planning; results are documented in the Summary and Recommendations section of the Vocational Eval Report.	Documentation of I&R resources provided; both short and long-term activities brainstormed, and clear next steps identified through informed choice discussion with client and documented in the Summary and Recommendations section of the Voc. Eval. Report.

COMMENTS:

INDIVIDUALIZED PLAN FOR EMPLOYMENT**1. Is there clear evidence in the case that the specialist supported the client in making an informed choice about their career goal and maximizing their employment?**

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
Client's presenting job interest on VR Application and Initial Meeting is not addressed, or a different goal is developed without documenting the justification and how this change occurred; documentation indicates VR was directive rather than informed choice was provided, only statements of non-support without the rationale of why.	Goal identified at application and Initial Meeting were discussed to ensure they met the criteria of the IPE (strengths, resources, priorities, concerns, abilities, capabilities, interests, and labor market information); indication of client making informed choice of their vocational options.	Documentation provides evidence when it appears there may be inconsistencies with meeting the IPE criteria (strengths, resources, priorities, concerns, abilities, capabilities, interests, and labor market information) were addressed, and appropriate I&R referrals were made; there is evidence career pathways were discussed within the vocational area of interest.

COMMENTS:

2. Does the IPE include the specific rehabilitation services necessary to achieve the employment outcome?

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
There is evidence of services that might be needed but were not included on the plan OR many or all services were selected without justification (e.g. to avoid the need for an IPE Amendment); it is not evident from the documentation why some services were included on the IPE.	There is justification of how services included on the IPE will help client reach their job goal; if services require specific skills or training, the client's aptitude for training was also addressed prior to writing the IPE.	Documentation of IPE discussion with the client addresses how services will be measured; evidence client was included as part of the discussion and understands their responsibilities in participating in services; informed choice regarding services, providers, etc. is clear.

COMMENTS:

3. If the individual is a student with a disability receiving Special Education services was the information in the IEP considered in development of the IPE.

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
There is little to no evidence that pre-employment transition staff aligned the IPE with goals from the IEP.	There is some evidence of how the goals from the IEP will align with the IPE; documentation includes student involvement in determining their goal, and participation in discussing services.	Based on the information in the IEP, the IPE includes the services required to address the needs of the student to reach their job goal; clear documentation of how the services on the IPE will help the student achieve their goal.

COMMENTS:

4. Prior to providing any VR services, evidence shows comparable services or benefits were explored to determine whether they were available to the client. (NOTE: Assessment, counseling, referral, job-related such as job search/ placement/job retention and rehabilitation technology do not require search for or use of comparable services.)

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
Little to no documentation of existing benefits and/or comparable services search, as applicable; no indication of discussion of comparable benefits or services, least cost option, etc.; client contribution was not addressed if exceeding cost containment limits; no documentation justifying the purchase.	Documentation clearly explains how the authorized service(s) relate to the IPE; evidence comparable services and existing benefits were explored prior to authorizing the service and if any were available, they were added to comparable services screen; required quotes were obtained when needed; for items above VR's cost containment limits, client contribution (non-SSI/SSDI) was addressed and justification task note was included for any VR funds above this amount.	Documentation provides evidence of informed choice in the selection of the service, provider, etc.; evidence of client involvement in conversations regarding comparable services; results of search for comparable services is clearly documented.

COMMENTS:

5. Was the timeframe between the date the IPE was approved and the start date of the initial VR service acceptable?

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
There amount of time between IPE approval and start of VR services was not documented or seemed to be a result of lack of VR follow through; indication that client was not kept engaged and no explanation.	There is documentation services started in a relatively short amount of time after the IPE was approved, or there is documentation of why services started when they did; any delay did not result in the client waiting for services; client was kept engaged in the process.	Documentation indicates that client engagement was a priority, and services were provided with a timeframe that assisted the client in meeting their identified IPE job start date; client was kept informed of any delays.

COMMENTS:

SERVICE PROVISION

1. Does the case record reflect the client exercised informed choice throughout the VR process?

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
Little or no documented evidence the client participated in decisions about their job goal, services, and/or service providers.	Some indication options/choices were provided, and limited evidence of client participation in decisions about their job goal, services, and service providers.	Evidence options/choices were provided at various decision points and discussed with client; throughout the case, it is evident client was given the opportunity to indicate their preference independently or with support/assistance arranged.

COMMENTS:

2. Does the case reflect timely (30 day) and value-added contact and engagement efforts by the VR staff, as defined in policy?

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
Contact with the client does not meet the 30-day contact requirements, or there is no documentation of contact; Contacts documented are data gathering and not problem solving, addressing issues, or moving toward a goal; Unnecessary activities are required by VR, when adequate data already exists.	Documented contacts meet the 30-day contact requirements, and evidence the contacts add value by moving the client toward their goal, addressing issues, providing informed choice. Activities and interactions were tailored to the client's functioning level; and informed choice is evident throughout the process; Contacts provide relevant vocational information and client informed choice is evident.	Contacts indicated VR is inquiring into the why of situations to provide additional support, and when a case is "at risk" due to disability or situational factors, a support plan is put into place and contact is increased. Additional contact, above the required 30 days, was initiated when needed.

COMMENTS:

3. Is justification for VR expenditures well documented to include informed choice and how the client may assume costs in the future?

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
No TASK note justifying purchase(s); <u>and</u> No indication of a search for or discussion of comparable benefits or services, least cost option, etc. Did not address client contribution, if exceptions.	It is evident how authorized service(s) directly tied to client participation in services and documented in a TASK note; Comparable services and existing benefits were explored prior to authorizing; For exceptions, client contribution (non-SSI/SSDI) was addressed, and task notes show existing benefits and services were explored; There is evidence of discussion with client regarding future costs, if applicable.	Indication that VR addressed and assisted with budgeting or referral services to help with future planning; VR provided and documented informed choice in the selection of the provider, service, environment provided, etc.

COMMENTS:

4. If there are services that require an exception, is there adequate justification in task notes?

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
No documentation explaining the additional cost for the expenditure; no indication comparable services or benefits were explored prior to approving.	Documentation justifies why the service is required/needed; there is little evidence comparable services and existing benefits were considered; prior to VR requesting an exception.	There is documentation of the outcome of the search for comparable services and existing benefits (e.g. loan, client contribution, etc.) and includes why alternative resources were not an option; discussion regarding client contribution and loans (non-SSI/SSDI) are documented

COMMENTS:

SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT

1. Does documentation show the right individuals were involved in communications, activities and meetings that led to IPE development? Should others have been involved?

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
Lack of documentation indicating client, and authorized rep, as applicable, was involved in communications, activities and meetings that led to IPE development; individuals that should be involved (e.g. authorized rep, service provider, etc) were not a part of the IPE development or there is no evidence why they were not included.	There is evidence the individuals involved in the development of the IPE (e.g. client, authorized rep (as applicable), SE provider agency rep., DD SC (as applicable)) were necessary, and the client consented to their participation.	Documentation or task notes provide details about the role of the individuals in the development of the IPE, and how their participation assisted in the development of the IPE.
COMMENTS:		

2. Does the information in QE2 support the decision for an SE Plan?

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
Rationale for SE is not documented in QE2 or documentation does not support the need for SE (most significant disability, little/no or interrupted and intermittent employment/ work experience, need for extended services after VR closure); no documentation of work history in Employment History or Task notes.	Record contains documentation of most significant disability, history of little/no, or interrupted and intermittent CIE (documented on the Employment History screen or elsewhere); adequate rationale for SE plan is included in record.	Evidence or discussion in task notes that all support options (supported and non-supported) were considered or discussed;
COMMENTS:		

3. Is there regular contact (minimum of monthly) with the SE provider for the purposes of monitoring progress and ensuring service delivery?

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
No evidence of regular contact with the SE provider; documented contacts do not provide specific details on how services are being delivered or how the client is progressing towards their goal; no attempts to follow up with the client and/or authorized representative.	There is evidence of regular contact with the SE provider and client; documentation provides details of the progress achieved and how services are being delivered; case record provides evidence of collaboration and problem-solving with the SE provider.	Frequent contact with the SE provider and client to ensure services are progressing; documentation provides specific detail of how services are being delivered, what progress has been achieved, and agreed upon next steps; documentation of client satisfaction or concerns are included in case record; also noting plans to resolve any shared concerns.
COMMENTS:		

PLACEMENT

1. Was advocacy provided on behalf of the client?

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
No evidence of client advocacy needs; little or no documentation of relevant outreach provided to employers/providers on client's behalf; limited or irrelevant job leads provided, no indication of interviews set up or contact with employers/ providers to inquire about job leads.	Level of advocacy needed by client is clear in case documentation; there is evidence the job leads provided are relevant to the client's area(s) of interest and abilities; documented contact with employers/providers to inquire about job leads; follow up with employers/ providers is documented, or reason follow up was not provided is evident.	Documentation of repeated advocacy based on client needs, including assisting the client with self-advocacy related to job leads and employer/provider outreach; repeated contact with employers/providers to inquire about relevant job leads, follow up with employers/providers about applications or interviews is documented, and there is evidence interviews were set up and/or attended with client; worksite experiences set up as appropriate and follow up provided.

COMMENTS:

2. Was the correct process followed in completing and/or updating the Job Search Agreement (JSA) as listed in the Placement Service Chapter?

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
JSA not completed for clients engaged in job search or completed and not documented in QE2; JSA completed but no documentation of interactively completing with client; timeframe from placement referral and outreach to client does not meet contact guidelines and reason not noted; JSA 90-day review not completed and/or documented.	Evidence the JSA was completed interactively with client prior to active job search; JSA review 90 reviews completed on time and documented; evidence of client interaction.	Evidence case input was sought from team members prior to the 90 day review; client obtained employment that matched criteria on JSA; at 90 day time frames there is evidence of staffing case with others, including WIN meeting, for suggestions and input on JSA; documentation of input and next steps as a result; discussion with client about changing job search parameters, if appropriate, is documented.

COMMENTS:

3. If in Placement Services, were Job Search activities provided appropriate for the client's needs?

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
No JSS was completed or documented; weekly contact not regularly provided or documented; no evidence application assistance, job leads, employer advocacy, and interviewing skills were provided; no evidence of assistance with resume skills.	JSS completed and documented; evidence that in general, weekly contact (or attempt) was provided unless client preference is otherwise documented; services provided match services identified on the Job Search agreement or it's noted why services weren't needed/provided, including client refusal if applicable; team services are documented as provided.	Follow up JSS completed relevant to client needs; weekly contact is predominately meetings (in person or virtual) with client engagement, rather than just email, text, phone call, etc.; all team services provided are documented and detailed description of their relevance to clients' needs is evident.

COMMENTS:

4. Is employer outreach well documented?

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
No evidence of contact with employers and no contacts documented in the Employer Database.	Documentation of outreach to some employers, most of these were documented in the Employer Database; if client refused to have employers contacted, this is documented.	Contact documented with several employers on behalf of client; documented advocacy of various types of engagement efforts with employers; all business engagements were thoroughly documented in Employer Database.

COMMENTS:

5. Is employer satisfaction with job placement and/or progress documented during follow-up?

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
No evidence of follow-up with employer after job placement or documentation of client refusal of follow-up with employer. No documentation of conversation with employer in the team service.	Follow-up with employer was provided and team service documented. Basic information provided regarding conversation with employer. If a client refused to have the employer contacted, this is documented.	Documentation in team service details follow-up with employer. Multiple outreaches to employer based on client or employer needs, and concerns voiced by employer noted and resolved. All contacted documentation in Employer Database.

COMMENTS:

6. Is client (authorized representative, as applicable) satisfaction with job/progress documented?

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
No documentation in team service, or team service documented but no details of client satisfaction included.	Documentation of Team Service notes client satisfaction with progress; information provided includes description of client's progress on the job; of client concerns are identified, they are addressed and documented.	All follow-up contacts completed with client and included thorough documentation of client satisfaction with employment; there is evidence conversations with client during follow-up include, as appropriate, I&R, possibilities of advancement, specifics of job satisfaction; potential

		accommodation needs are addressed; documentation that all client concerns are resolved.
SUCCESSFUL CLOSURE		
1. Did VR provide substantial services that contributes to the employment outcome?		
Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
There is no documented evidence VR provided substantial services that resulted in the client achieving or maintaining employment, or there is evidence of VR involvement but no documentation that services provided affected the outcome of the case.	Documentation provides evidence substantial services were provided to support the client in their employment outcome; evidence indicates VR engaged the client in services, provided counseling and guidance, and direction throughout the case.	Documentation indicates the client's perspective is also evident in the case record; the need for services was well documented and clearly tied to the outcome of the case.
COMMENTS:		

2. Is the outcome consistent with the individual's strengths, resources, priorities, concerns, abilities, capabilities, interests, and informed choice?		
Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
The employment outcome appears inconsistent with the above criteria and there is no justification provided to show why.	Employment outcome is consistent with the above criteria and any perceived inconsistencies show evidence of being addressed with the client.	There is evidence the job meets the client's needs and there is planning for client support after VR case is closed.
COMMENTS:		

3. Does the case record support the client and VR specialist both consider the outcome to be satisfactory and agree the client is performing well in the same job with the same employer for 90 days?		
Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
No evidence client and authorized representative, as applicable, were provided with consultation on the case closure; problems noted on the job during follow-up still appear to be an issue or not addressed prior to closure.	Documentation shows the client and, as applicable, authorized representative were provided full consultation on case closure and the case meets all successful closure criteria; any issues noted during follow up have been addressed; follow-up provides evidence of stability on the job and if needed, additional time was taken to ensure stability prior to closure.	There is evidence the client, employer and all partners involved in the case were consulted, as applicable, prior to closure; documentation reflects VR considered and addressed any job readiness and/or impairment issues during follow-up, and the client has been stable during the employment follow-up period.
COMMENTS:		

4. Is the client working at or above the # of weekly work hours on the IPE, and is the # of hours working consistent with the person's unique strengths, resources, priorities, concerns, abilities, and capabilities? If not, is the justification adequate?		
Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
Case was closed with client working weekly work hours that were less than what was agreed to on the IPE and there is no documentation explaining why or the documentation is inadequate; indication the client would like to work more hours, but no evidence this was discussed or considered; based on the documentation the # of hours the client is working does not seem consistent with the above criteria.	Case is closed, at or above the weekly work hours agreed to on the IPE, and indication the client is satisfied with the # of hours working; if weekly hours are less than what was agreed to on the IPE, there is adequate documentation and indication of client agreement; there is evidence provided that the number of hours working are consistent with the above criteria.	Evidence benefits services were utilized to assist the client in making an informed choice about maximizing hours; clear discussion with the client about potentially maximizing their employment (health, stamina, benefits), and indication of discussion results and agreement by client; any discrepancies/inconsistencies with # of hours worked, and the above criteria are noted and addressed.
COMMENTS:		

5. Is employer satisfaction with progress and stability of client in employment role documented prior to case closure?		
Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
No evidence of outreach with employer after job placement or documentation of client refusal for follow-up with employer. No documentation of conversation with employer in the team service.	Follow-up with employer was provided and team service documented. Basic information provided regarding conversation with employer, to include the employer feeling confident with client's employment stability. If client refused to have employers contacted, this is documented.	Documentation in team service details follow-up with employer. This includes the employer's confidence in the client's stability of employment and current level of competency in their position. Any concerns the employer has had throughout follow-up have been addressed and resolved. All pertinent documentation in Employer Database.
COMMENTS:		

6. Is there documentation of VR discussion with client & authorized representative (as applicable), prior to closure?		
Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
No indication of full consultation with client and, as applicable, authorized representative prior to closure; no evidence of being unable to reach client/authorized representative before the case was closed.	Some indication of case closure discussion with both client, and, as applicable, authorized representative, or documentation of attempts to reach client/authorized representative.	Documentation shows full consultation with both client and, as applicable, authorized representative, completed.

COMMENTS:

TERMINATION**1. Is the reason for termination accurately documented in the case file and was the correct reason for termination selected?**

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
Documentation does not support reason selected for closure or there is no documentation explaining the closure reason.	Documentation supports the reasons selected for case closure.	Full consultation was provided to the client and authorized representative, as applicable for the case closure reason and referrals, made to appropriate community resources.

COMMENTS:

2. Is there documentation VR provided full consultation with client and as appropriate, authorized representative, prior to closure?

Developing	Satisfactory	Excellent
No evidence VR attempted contact with client and as applicable, authorized representative prior to termination of case; indications that case closure procedures were not followed.	Evidence of consultation with the client and as applicable, authorized representative, and documentation of agreement by all parties; documentation of required multiple contact attempts in a variety of formats (text, phone, email, letters) for client and as applicable, authorized representative, regarding termination of case.	Detailed evidence of consultation directly with the client and authorized representative, as applicable, rather than a vender; indication of client response/agreement to case closure; information and referral provided to appropriate community resources documented, as applicable.

COMMENTS: