

**Protection and Advocacy for Developmental Disabilities (PADD)
Annual Program Performance Report (PPR)**

Reporting Period: October 1, 2006 through September 30, 2007

Section I—Designated Agency Identification	
Name: Virginia Office For Protection and Advocacy	
Address: 1910 Byrd Avenue, Suite 5 Richmond, Virginia 23230	
E-mail Address (if applicable): general.vopa@vopa.virginia.gov	
Website Address (if applicable): www.vopa.state.va.us	
Phone: (804) 225-2042	TTY: (804) 225-2042
Toll-free Phone: (800) 552-3962	Toll-free TTY: (800) 552-3962
Fax: (804) 662-7057	

Name of Director:	Colleen Miller, Esq.
Person to Contact Regarding Report:	Sherry Confer, LCSW
Contact Person's Phone:	(804) 662-7375

Section II—Individual Clients Served

This section is for reporting of persons with developmental disabilities who received individual advocacy addressing at least one disability-related problem. Do not report the same individual more than once even if they received multiple services, and do not include individuals who were only represented as part of a group or class action.

A. Number of Individual Clients (Persons with Developmental Disabilities Receiving Individual Advocacy)	
1. Number of clients receiving advocacy at start of fiscal year:	49
2. Number of new/reviewed clients represented during fiscal year:	74
Total	123

1. Number of Case Problems* of Individual Clients *This number may be more than the total number of clients serviced since each client may have more than one presenting problem to be addressed.	149
---	-----

2. Age of Individual Clients	
0-2	1
3-4	4
5-22	69
23-59	41
60 and over	8
Total	123

D. Sex of Individual Clients	
Male	85
Female	38
Total	123

E. Racial/Ethnic Background of Individual Clients Data is self-reported. Select only one category for each client.	
Asian	1
Black, not Hispanic/Latino origin	20
Hispanic/Latino	3
North American Indian or Alaskan Native	1
Pacific Islander	0
White, not Hispanic/Latino origin	89
Multi cultural (identified with more than one of above)	7
Information Not Provided	2
Total Clients	123

F. Individual Client’s Geographic Location

Number of clients living out of state	0
List states include number of clients living in each state:	
Number of Individual Clients by Geographic Location	In State
Rural	60
Urban	63
Data by County (see instructions; use additional space as needed). Please provide the following:	
County Name	

	County Name	Total Population	Number of Individual Clients
1	Accomack	39,345	1
2	Amherst	32,239	2
3	Arlington	199,776	1
4	Caroline	26,731	1
5	Carroll	29,450	7
6	Charlottesville (city)	40,315	3
7	Chesapeake (city)	220,560	10
8	Chesterfield	296,718	1
9	Clarke	14,565	2
10	Covington (city)	6,073	1
11	Dinwiddie	25,695	9
12	Fairfax (city)	22,422	3
13	Fairfax	1,010,443	9
14	Fauquier	66,170	1
15	Floyd	14,789	1
16	Frederick	71,187	5
17	Fredericksburg (city)	21,273	4
18	Grayson	16,159	1
19	Hampton (city)	145,017	2
20	Hanover	98,983	2
21	Harrisonburg (city)	40,885	1
22	Henrico	284,399	2
23	Hopewell (city)	22,731	2
24	Isle of Wight	34,723	1
25	King George	21,780	1
26	Loudoun	268,817	3
27	Lynchburg (city)	67,720	2
28	Madison	13,613	1
29	Mathews	9,184	1
30	Mecklenburg	32,381	1
31	Nelson	15,161	1
32	Newport News (city)	178,281	1
33	Norfolk (city)	229,112	5
34	Nottoway	15,572	1

35	Patrick	19,212	1
36	Petersburg (city)	32,445	4
37	Powhatan	27,649	2
38	Prince George	36,184	1
39	Prince William	357,503	2
40	Richmond (city)	192,913	3
41	Richmond	9,142	1
42	Roanoke	90,482	1
43	Rockbridge	21,337	1
44	Rockingham	72,564	1
45	Southampton	17,814	1
46	Spotsylvania	119,529	2
47	Stafford	120,170	3
48	Staunton (city)	23,334	1
49	Suffolk (city)	81,071	1
50	Virginia Beach (city)	435,619	4
51	Warren	36,102	1
52	Washington	51,984	1
53	Wise	41,905	2
54	Wythe	28,640	2
55	York	61,879	1
			123

Total Population	7,642,884
Is County Mostly Rural (fewer than 100 persons per square mile on average)	
Number of Individual Clients	
Total number of clients living in and out of state	123

G. Clients' Living Arrangements	
Independent	2
Parental or other Family Home	69
Community Residential Home (e.g. supervised apartment, semi-independent, halfway house, board & care, small group home 3 or less)	4
Foster Care	1
*Nursing Home (includes ICF, SNF, etc.)	1
*Public (State Operated) Institutional Living Arrangement (e.g., hospital treatment center/school or large ICF/MR group home more than 3 beds)	36
*Private Institutional Living Arrangement (e.g. hospital or treatment center, school group home more than 3 beds)	9
*Legal Detention/Jail/Prison/Detention Center	1
Homeless	0
*Federal Facility (List)	0

Other	0
Total Client Cases by Living Arrangement	123

(*Is considered an institution for the purposes of completing Section III A-1)

H. Individual Clients' Disability	
Identify the client's primary disability. This is the disability which directly impacts or allows the individual to be considered developmental disabled and results in the need for advocacy.	
Autism	28
Cerebral Palsy	6
AIDS/HIV	0
Epilepsy	4
Mental Illness	4
Mental Retardation	45
Muscular Dystrophy	0
Spina Bifida	0
Learning Disabilities	18
Traumatic Brain Injuries (TBI) and other head injuries	2
Tourette Syndrome	0
Visual Impairment/Blind	1
Heard of Hearing/Deaf	4
Other Physical/Orthopedic*	11
Deaf-Blind	3
Muscular/Skeletal Impairment	1
Neurological Disorder	3
Quadriplegia	2
Other Health Impaired	2
Other Emotional/Behavioral*	0
Other Intellectual*	0
Total Disabilities	123

*Breakout of Other Disability

Section III. Case Problem Areas (Complaints) of Individual Clients Served

This is the total number of problems addressed by the PADD program and collected at case closure. This will allow the PADD program to better determine the outcome of its work. This can be more than the number of problems presented upon intake that is the total number reported in Section II B.

A. The outcome of problems addressed for Individual Clients

1. Number of persons with developmental disabilities living in institutions* served by the P&A whose complaint of abuse, neglect, discrimination of their rights was remedied by the P&A. (*see living arrangements to determine definition of institution)	27
(GPRA Outcome)—Number of persons with developmental disabilities living in the community who were served by the P&A and whose complaint of abuse, neglect, discrimination of their rights was remedied by the P&A during the course of the plan year.	44

This GPRA Outcome will be included in a national total reported to Congress, in compliance with the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA). This Outcome will be compared with the Target/Objective in the SGP previously submitted in the Plan Year.

B. Types of problems addressed by areas of emphasis

1. Quality Assurance including abuse, neglect & other violations of rights	38
2. Education and early intervention	49
3. Child care	0
4. Health care	4
5. Employment	3
6. Housing	1
7. Transportation	1
8. Recreation	4
Total Case Problem Areas of Individual Clients Addressed upon closure	100

C. Reasons for Closing Individual's Case Files:

1. Issues resolved partially or completely in the individual's favor	71
2. Other representation found	0
3. Individual withdrew complaint	6
4. Appeals were unsuccessful	1
5. PADD services not needed due to individual's death, relocation, etc.	4
6. PADD withdrew because individual would not cooperate	12
7. PADD unable to take case because of lack of resources	0
8. Individual's case lacks legal merit	6

3. Intervention Strategies Used in Serving Individuals (List the highest level of Interventions used by PADD prior to closing each case file.)	
1. Technical assistance in self-advocacy	18
2. Short-term assistance	18
3. Investigation/monitoring	20
4. Negotiation	17
5. Mediation/alternative dispute resolution	4
6. Administrative hearings	1
7. Litigation	3

E. Satisfaction of Individuals Served	
1. Number of satisfaction surveys distributed	31
2. Number of satisfaction surveys returned during the year (may not be the same number sent out.)	10
3. Of the total number of surveys returned, indicate how many individuals rated their overall satisfaction with PADD in the following ways:	
a. satisfied	9
b. not satisfied	1
4. Number of client grievances filed under the client grievance procedure	

Section IV. Interventions on Behalf of Groups of Clients

A. Summary Information

Type of Intervention	Number of Groups	Potential # Individuals Impacted	Concluded Successfully	Concluded Unsuccessfully	Pending
Group Advocacy	HR Regs	110,861	1	0	1
	DMHMRSAS No Smoking Policy	1500			
Investigations	Training Center		0	0	3
	• Off Campus Activities	560			
	• Vocational Training	560			
	Death	300			
Monitoring	MR Institutions	1500	2	0	1
	Assisted Living Facilities	300			
	Juvenile Facilities	454			
Court-Ordered Monitoring	Brice's Villa	41	0	0	1
Systemic or Class-Action Litigation			0	0	0
Total	9	116,076	3		6

B. Group Advocacy:

- 1. What are the major issues addressed?**
Rights for people with disabilities protections
- 2. Which groups are likely to be affected?**
People with disabilities living in congregate segregated institutions or receiving services from public providers
- 3. What have been the major outcomes during the fiscal year?**
Increased awareness helps with educating policy makers, decreasing abuse and neglect, and increasing opportunities for genuine community integration.
- 4. How do these outcomes contribute to the long-term objectives as stated in the Statement of Objectives and Priorities?**
This increased awareness helps with educating policy makers, decreasing abuse and neglect, and increasing opportunities for genuine community integration.

C. Full Investigation

- 1. What are the major areas of investigation?**
Person centered care plans
- 2. Which groups are likely to be affected?**
Residents of State operated mental retardation institutions
- 3. What have been the major outcomes during the fiscal year?**
Expert findings being reviewed

4. How do these outcomes contribute to the long-term objectives as stated in the Statement of Objectives and Priorities?

Directly related to Priority 4

D. Monitoring

1. What are the major areas of non-court ordered monitoring?

Rights for people with disabilities protections

2. Which groups are likely to be affected?

Residents of community based congregate settings (civil and criminal)

3. What have been the major outcomes during the fiscal year?

Increased awareness by staff and residents of disability related rights and the P&A's role

4. How do these outcomes contribute to the long-term objectives as stated in the Statement of Objectives and Priorities?

The increased awareness helps with educating policy makers decreasing abuse and neglect, and increasing opportunities for genuine community integration

E. Court Ordered Monitoring

1. What are the major areas of court ordered monitoring?

Neglect of people with disabilities

2. Which groups are likely to be affected?

Residents of community-based congregate settings

3. What have been the major outcomes during the fiscal year?

Better medication management during monitoring visits

4. How do these outcomes contribute to the long-term objectives as stated in the Statement of Objectives and Priorities?

Directly related to Priority 2

F. Systems or Class Action Litigation

1. What are the major areas of litigation?

Not applicable

2. Which groups are likely to be affected?

Not applicable

3. What have been the major outcomes during the fiscal year?

Not applicable

4. How do these outcomes contribute to the long-term objectives as stated in the Statement of Objectives and Priorities?

Not applicable

G. Other Systems Change Activities

1. What are the major areas of systems change activities?

Not applicable

2. Which groups are likely to be affected?

Not applicable

3. What have been the major outcomes during the fiscal year?

Not applicable

4. How do these outcomes contribute to the long-term objectives as stated in the Statement of Objectives and Priorities?

Not applicable

5. Number of people with disabilities impacted?

Not applicable

Section V. Non Case Directed Services	
A. Information and Referral Services (see glossary for definition (Individual Non Case I&R) Total I&R	3187

B. Public Education and Training Activities (see glossary for definition) Number of persons with disabilities (or their family members) who received education or training about their rights, enabling them to be more effective self advocates.	348
--	-----

C. Information Dissemination Activities	Number of Items
1. radio/TV appearances	1
2. newspaper articles (attach select articles)	
3. PSAs/videos/films/etc. aired	4
4. reports disseminated	1
5. publications disseminated	6663
6. Information about P&A disseminated (include general training/outreach or presentations not included in training activities)	
7. Number of hits on Website	24239
8. Describe other media activities:	

D. Consumer Involvement in P&A Organization

Please provide the following information on the number of individuals who self identify.

Number of consumers (DD)	Primary Consumers	Secondary Consumers	Other Disabilities	Out of Total
On governing board				

E. Racial/Ethnic Involvement in P&A Organization

Number of persons in a minority group in the P&A system:

	African American	Hispanic American	Asian American	Native American	Other	Out of Total
Staff						
Governing Board						

Does the PADD program utilize volunteers? If so how?

No.

Section VI. Outcomes of Priorities and Objectives

1. **Priority #1 - -People with Disabilities are Free from Abuse and Neglect**
2. **Indicator #(1):**
VOPA will review all reports of deaths that it receives. Five will be selected for investigation where abuse or neglect is suspected.
Indicator was Met.
3. **List other outcomes realized (if applicable)**
4. **Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If do, describe this collaboration:**
VOPA collaborates with residents, clients, family members, advocates, and providers alleging abuse and neglect complaints and when investigating complaints. In addition, VOPA collaborates with law enforcement, providers and experts.
5. **If this was addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under this priority.**
25
6. **If this priority addresses systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.**
By statute, VOPA receives Critical Incident Reports (CIR) submitted by the mental retardation institutions. Every CIR is read by VOPA staff and pertinent information is entered into a database. All CIRs that involve injuries within current program priorities and other alarming or unusual reports are identified and further reviewed. In addition, the VOPA Executive Director conducts a weekly meeting to address the reports, their implications, and remedial action. In conjunction with VOPA's review of CIRs, VOPA routinely requests that the Department of Mental Health, Mental Retardation and Substance Abuse Services (DMHMRSAS) produce internal investigation reports and supporting materials. VOPA received a total of 480 CIRs from the state mental retardation institutions in FY07. Of those, 45 were reports of resident deaths.
7. **Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.**
VOPA considers residents of state institutions and juvenile facilities to be underserved in the area of disability rights. In addition, in Virginia, there may be a higher proportion of minority populations in these facilities. Because VOPA's case selection criteria includes selecting cases that have a potential for systemic impact, we believe that any case we open has the potential to increase the number of individuals served.

8. **Describe at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.**
VOPA is investigating a death of a resident, known to have a diagnosis of pica, who died following surgery to have two latex examination gloves removed from his intestines. This case is part of our recently filed federal case to gain access to peer review records.
 9. **Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars, how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?**
\$235,652
 10. **Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?**
Yes
-

1. **Priority #1 People with Disabilities are Free from Abuse and Neglect**

2. **Indicator #(2)**

VOPA will combat abuse and neglect in community settings. This will be done by conducting 14 investigations, completing 1 case of court ordered monitoring, monitoring 10 facilities, systemic advocacy, and collaboration

Indicator is: Met

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed.

VOPA conducted over 14 investigations but only used DD funding for 10 of them. VOPA completed the court ordered monitoring of an ALF with no additional issues. VOPA routinely provides comment and recommendations to relevant policy makers regarding legislation, administrative regulations and organizational policies. In addition, VOPA serves on several task forces and work groups. VOPA provided public comment on DMHMRSAS licensing regulations. VOPA stressed the need for strengthening the requirement for reporting abuse and neglect. We also strongly recommended that the regulations include concepts of self-determination and genuine community integration. VOPA monitored 10 ALFS in the areas of medication practices and staff training. Additional indicators were developed for FY08 based on this.

3. **List other outcomes realized (if applicable)**

VOPA serves on the Dept of Aging's (VDA) Public Guardianship program's Advisory Board. The Advisory Board, in conjunction with the VDA developed administrative regulations for the program and responded to the public comment. During that process VOPA and the Advisory Board learned that agencies under contract with VDA to provide guardianship services had been advised to pursue full guardianship for all new wards. The Board was alarmed and drafted a letter to VDA to ascertain if this indeed was the guidance from the VDA. Because of this,

VOPA has additional indicators re: guardianship for FY08.

8. Describe at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

VOPA initiated a human rights complaint against a community ICF-MR facility. Staff at the facility failed to provide adequate overnight supervision to our client which resulted in our client sustaining injuries (9 bruises) and our client was improperly physically restrained (glove taped to her right hand). We filed a formal human rights complaint with the facility director requesting that the facility develop, implement and provide to VOPA a corrective action plan. The facility responded with a corrective action plan that included having terminated the two offending employees and the facility will provide VOPA with copies of all Adult Protective Service reports generated by facility staff for a period of one year. The facility also provided and documented refresher Human Rights training to all employees.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars, how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?

See Priority 1: Indicator 1

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?

Yes

1. Priority #1 People with Disabilities are Free from Abuse and Neglect

2. Indicator #(3)

VOPA will combat abuse and neglect in institutions. This will be done through 15 investigations, systemic advocacy, monitoring and collaboration.

Indicator is: Met

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed.

VOPA completed over 15 investigations and 11 of them were with DD funding. In general, the incidences of abuse and neglect that were investigated can be attributed to a shortage of trained and experienced staff, failure to implement individualized care plans and environmental conditions that contributed to the possibility of injury.

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

VOPA is investigating the adequacy of DMHMRSAS internal abuse/neglect investigations. This will be continued in FY08. VOPA is monitoring DMHMRSAS system transformation grant implementation. We are on an Advisory group that is considering a centralized interagency electronic reporting mechanism for abuse and neglect. This would apply to community reporting as well.

8. Describe at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

VOPA conducted an inquiry into an incident that involved a resident of a state training center which resulted in a broken leg. VOPA found that our client may have been injured during an inappropriate one-person transfer. As a result of this incident, the state training center made policy changes and implemented new procedures. These system-wide improvements include that the Pain Sensitivity Committee will work with all teams to make sure that clients with identified pain sensitivity issues have been evaluated and pain sensitivity issues have been properly communicated and integrated into each individual's treatment plan. Also, a vacation planning guide was developed to ensure that hotels that are selected in the future are ADA compliant and have beds that will accommodate ARJO lifts – this vacation guide has been added to the approval process for vacations. The Physical Therapy Department re-evaluated how positioning is done and made appropriate recommendations.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars, how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?

See Priority 1: Indicator 1

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?

Yes

1. Priority #1- - People with Disabilities are Free from Abuse and Neglect

2. Indicator # (4)

VOPA will combat physical abuse in juvenile facilities by monitoring 8 facilities, conducting 8 investigations and training of 25 individuals about juvenile rights while in facilities.

Indicator is: Met

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed.

VOPA conducted 8 investigations of juvenile facilities where DD-eligible children may be served; 7 involved serious injuries sustained during restraint. Five juvenile facilities were monitored across the state. Each monitoring visit included providing juvenile rights information to staff and residents. Staff reviewed the use of seclusion and restraint, educational services and screening and disability-related services provided.

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable)

VOPA provided public comment on the interdepartmental administrative regulations for juvenile facilities.

8. Describe at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the

priority.

VOPA did not identify any DD-eligible consumers under this indicator. However, the systemic and collaboration efforts gained will have a positive impact on DD-eligible juveniles if they are being served in these facilities.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars, how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?

See Priority 1: Indicator 1

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?

Yes

1. Priority #1- - People with Disabilities are Free from Abuse and Neglect

2. Indicator # (5)

Complete the investigation of Central Virginia Training Center and obtain corrective action as appropriate.

Indicator is: Partially Met/Continuing

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed.

The investigation of the Central Virginia Training Center (CVTC) has progressed slowly in part due to activity at the legislative and executive branch levels. The General Assembly appropriated additional funds to re-build the facility and DMHMRSAS developed a plan to do that. Throughout this planning, advocates opposed additional funding to re-build an institution and pleaded for the DMHMRSAS to consider other alternatives. VOPA sent a letter to the Secretary alerting the executive branch of the potential Olmstead issues they were facing. The plan has been shelved and dialogue is resuming about next steps.

8. Describe at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

VOPA continues to meet with representatives of CVTC and DMHMRSAS to review their efforts to address concerns raised by the investigation into the provision of care and treatment at CVTC.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars, how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?

See Priority 1: Indicator 1

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?

Yes

1. Priority #2 - - Children and Youth with Disabilities will Receive an

Appropriate Education

2. Indicator #1

VOPA will protect the rights of children and youths with disabilities to receive an appropriate education by representing 20 individuals and enforcing special education administrative regulations compliance by Virginia Department of Education.

Indicator is: Met

If “Met or Partially Met” was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed.

VOPA served 22 children with DD funding for this indicator. VOPA represented 2 children denied appropriate applied behavioral analysis programs by their schools. For one, the school refused to even consider ABA for the child. A second child had ABA denied. Via mediation, both children were evaluated by their schools as candidates for ABA.

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable)

VOPA has represented children to ensure that the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) complies with its own administrative regulations until it promulgates new ones. VDOE’s position is that the new federal IDEA regulations override the state’s.

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If do, describe this collaboration

VOPA collaborates with students, clients, family members, advocates, and school representatives alleging violations of IDEA and when investigating complaints. In addition, VOPA collaborates with other State agencies and experts.

5. If this was addressed through individual through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

VOPA represented 26 children within this priority.

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if there were any class actions.

See below for systemic advocacy.

7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.

Virginia appears to have a large number of minority populations in its special education programs.

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the

priority.

The current VDOE's regulations require that benchmarks be included in all IEPs; but the new federal IDEA regulations do not. VDOE and a locality refused to incorporate benchmarks into a child's IEP. VOPA filed due process complaint against the locality and VDOE arguing that the refusal to comply with existing regulations violated the child's rights. The hearing office, held that the current regulations do require benchmarks and that the federal regs do not pre-empt the State's. However the officer also held that the failure to provide benchmarks did not deny a FAPE to the child. VOPA was able to resolve the issue to the parent's satisfaction.

- 9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?**
\$391,678.
 - 10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?**
Yes
-

1. Priority #2- - Children and Youth with Disabilities will Receive an Appropriate Education

2. Indicator #2

VOPA will protect the rights of children and youths with disabilities to receive an appropriate education by representing 7 children who are at risk of or have been suspended due to inadequate BIPS or FBAs and by representing 1 individual to ensure free independent evaluations when the parent disagrees with the school's.

Indicator is: Met

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed.

VOPA represented a child who at the time of suspension had been found not eligible for special education services, although the parent had requested an FBA repeatedly.

VOPA represented a child in a due process case, arguing that the child should be provided with a Manifestation Determination Review (MDR) hearing on his suspension. The school argued that the child was not entitled to an MDR because at the time of his suspension, he was not eligible for special education services. The hearing officer held that the child was entitled to an MDR.

- 9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?**
See Priority #2; Indicator #1

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?
Yes

1. **Priority #2- - Children and Youth with Disabilities will Receive an Appropriate Education**

2. **Indicator #3**

VOPA will provide technical assistance to private bar, legal services agencies and parent advocacy groups regarding the changes in IDEA 2004 by providing technical assistance for 5 individuals, 3 trainings, and systemic advocacy.

Indicator is: Met

If “Met or Partially Met” was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed.

VOPA provided technical assistance on IDEA 2004 to 5 individuals and 3 trainings to at least 70 people on IDEA 2004.

3. **List other outcomes realized (if applicable):**

Other outcomes: VOPA coordinated with 4 private attorneys providing representation for children in special education matters. VOPA partnered with attorneys to submit amicus curiae briefs in 3 special education cases including 1 brief to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit.

8. **Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.**

VOPA worked with a private counsel to help a child’s grandparents become the sole decision makers for the child’s educational services since they had sole custody of the child.

9. **Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year’s grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?**

See Priority #2; Indicator #1

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?
Yes

1. **Priority #3- - People with Disabilities have Equal Access to Government Services**

2. **Indicator #1**

VOPA will ensure services and supports are available to individuals with disabilities to move into the community by representing 3 children with issues related to nursing homes, an investigation related to nursing homes, representing 5 individuals with Medicaid issues, and providing 3 trainings about EPSDT.

VOPA will also address the need for accessible housing via individual

representation and systemic advocacy; the Olmstead integration mandate will be addressed through systemic advocacy and investigations.

Indicator is: Partially Met

If “Met or Partially Met” was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed.

VOPA represented 3 children who were at risk of nursing home placement due to not being able to access EPSDT or waiver services. In one, VOPA ensured that a child received assistive technology products and services, an afterschool program and a 1:1 aide he needed. VOPA did not pursue an investigation into children being placed in nursing homes, as DMHRMSAS and DMAS received a federal grant to address this issue. VOPA discussed the intent of the grant with the Office of Community Integration and voiced our concern about this issue.

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

VOPA investigated Virginia’s plan to build segregated settings for people with disabilities. VOPA determined that the plan most likely violated federal law. VOPA informed policy makers of this and strongly recommended that they consider community based service options. The State has announced it will not be building new segregated institutions at this time.

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

VOPA collaborates with individuals, clients, family members, advocates, providers and government representatives when advocating for access to government services. At times, VOPA may collaborate with experts. The other outcome noted above also involved significant communication and collaboration with state wide advocacy groups and the DD Network Partners.

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

VOPA served 8 children in this priority.

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.

Please see “other outcomes” above.

7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.

VOPA considers residents of institutional placements (state operated mental retardation institutions and nursing homes) to be underserved in the area of disability rights.

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the

priority.

VOPA provided 3 trainings on EPSDT to at least 50 people. After each presentation, VOPA staff are approached by audience members with additional questions and anecdotal complaints about accessing this service. VOPA recently opened 4 cases as a result of this targeted outreach strategy.

9. **Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?**

\$34,646

10. **Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?**

Yes

-
1. **Priority #4- - People with Disabilities Live in the Most Integrated Environment Possible**

2. **Indicator #1**

VOPA will advocate for appropriate and timely discharge plans at state mental retardation institutions through case level services for 15 individuals; VOPA will also ensure that employment training and planning is a part of all discharge plans.

Indicator is : Partially Met/Continuing

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed.

VOPA served 12 individuals related to discharge planning. Each plan is reviewed to ensure that it is comprehensive and includes employment training and options. Many individuals in Virginia's state mental retardation institutions have lost their right to make their own decisions; providers and substitute decision makers are hesitant to have the resident be considered for any other living setting.

3. **List other outcomes realized (if applicable)**

VOPA has spent more time educating providers and decision makers about community options and dignity of risk than actively pressing for discharge.

4. **Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:**

VOPA collaborates with individuals, clients, family members, advocates, providers and government representatives when advocating for access to government services. At times, VOPA may collaborate with experts. The other outcome noted above also involved significant communication and collaboration with state wide advocacy groups and the DD Network Partners.

5. **If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.**

VOPA served 12 individuals under this priority.

- 6. If this priority addressed through individual advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating of any were class actions.**

Please see other outcomes above.

- 7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.**

VOPA considers residents of state mental retardation institutions to be underserved in the area of disability rights.

- 8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrated the impact of the priority.**

VOPA monitored discharge planning to track the progress and of the institutions' adherence to individual goals. Several individuals were removed from the ready-for-discharge status per authorized representatives' requests. Others' discharges are dependent upon MR Waiver funding availability.

- 9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars, how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?**

\$70,482

- 10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?**

Yes

-
- 1. Priority #4 - People with Disabilities Live in the Most Integrated Environment Possible**

- 2. Indicator #2**

VOPA will promote the usage of alternatives to full guardianship through publications, website, representing 4 individuals for case level services, 1 investigation and systemic advocacy.

Indicator is: Partially Met/Continuing

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed.

VOPA wrote a fictional story about a family that was considering pursuing guardianship for a loved one. The article addressed how the advocate discussed other substitute decision making strategies and legal options along with what guardianship really allows and its limits. This article was mailed to all 344 of the adult guardians ad litem in Virginia along with a cover letter urging alternatives and limited guardianships whenever possible. Webpage materials were developed, but due to IT difficulties they were not posted on website.

- 3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):**

VOPA represented 4 individuals, however with other funding. VOPA serves on the Department of Aging's (VDA) Public Guardianship program's Advisory Board. The Advisory Board, in conjunction with the VDA developed administrative regulations for the program and responded to the public comment. During that process VOPA and the Advisory Board learned that agencies under contract with VDA to provide guardianship services had been advised to pursue full guardianship for all new wards. The Board was alarmed and drafted a letter to VDA to ascertain if this indeed was the guidance from the VDA. Because of this, VOPA has additional indicators relating to guardianship for FY08.

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrated the impact of the priority.

VOPA screens each CIR from state operated mental retardation institutions to identify cases where a DNR is in place. We are currently reviewing cases to assess the appropriateness of DNRs, focusing, in particular, on cases where the individual who is the subject of the DNR has no apparent medical concern that would justify such an order.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars, how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?

\$70,482

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?

Yes

1. Priority #4 People with Disabilities Live in the Most Integrated Environment Possible

2. Indicator #3

VOPA will identify best practices in off-campus activities and represent 3 MR institution residents to obtain increased off-campus activities in their habilitation plans.

Indicator is: Partially Met/Continuing

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed.

VOPA served 2 individual under this indicator. VOPA is reviewing the provision of off-campus opportunities at all of the state operated mental retardation institutions.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars, how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?

See Priority #4, Indicator #1

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?

Yes

1. Priority #5- -People with Disabilities are Employed to their Maximum Potential

2. Indicator #1

VOPA will promote increased vocational training for MR institution residents by providing 3 trainings for residents about employment rights and investigating the nature and availability of vocational training for MR institution residents.

Indicator is: Partially Met/Continuing

If “Met or Partially Met” was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed.

VOPA represents 2 residents in order to obtain appropriate vocational training. We are also reviewing the provision of vocational training opportunities at each of the institutions.

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

VOPA retained an expert in the area of vocational training for individuals with mental retardation. The expert reviewed the vocational training practices of one of the institutions.

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

VOPA collaborated with the expert, residents, and family members.

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

VOPA considers residents of state mental retardation institutions to be underserved in the area of disability rights.

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

VOPA successfully advocated for a resident of a state-operated ICF/MR to receive access to and training on a laptop computer, use of a voice generating program and internet access. The individual is able to communicate and develop employable skills.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars, how much of this year’s grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?

\$5,297

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?

Yes

1. Priority #6- - People with Disabilities Have Equal Access to Appropriate and

Necessary Health Care

2. Indicator #1

VOPA will investigate 7 allegations of inadequate medical care and 2 deaths related to aspiration.

Indicator is: Partially Met

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

VOPA reviewed every CIR for aspiration-related incidents. Mealtime practices were observed at each state-operated mental retardation institution.

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

VOPA collaborates with individuals, clients, family members, advocates, providers and government representatives when advocating for access to appropriate and necessary.

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

VOPA served 9 individuals related to allegations of inadequate medical care. Two investigations have been completed.

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.

7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted populations resulted in an increase in clients served.

VOPA considers residents of state operated mental retardation institutions to be underserved in the area of disability rights.

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

A resident of a mental retardation institution died during postoperative care following surgery for placement of a feeding tube due to problems of chronic weight loss, and recurrent vomiting and aspiration. This case has been added to VOPA's ongoing review of aspiration-related incidents.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars, how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?

\$24,031

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?

Yes

1. Priority #6- - People with Disabilities Have Equal Access to Appropriate and Necessary Health Care

2. Indicator #2

VOPA will impact the Medicaid system through advocacy, litigation and collaboration

Indicator is: Met

If “Met or Partially Met” was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed.

VOPA represented a child in a lawsuit alleging that the Medicaid Appeal Process denied due process rights to claimants. VOPA claimed that the child’s appeal was tainted by improper ex parte communication between DMAS and the DMAS hearing officer. VOPA moved to recuse the hearing officer and DMAS appeals division from further involvement in the case. The decision is still pending.

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable)

VOPA monitors the efforts of the Medicaid Waiver Network in order to learn of current Medicaid Waiver issues facing people with disabilities and developments being considered on behalf of people with disabilities.

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

VOPA’s client had a 1:1 aide during the school day, but the afterschool program could only offer a 1:4 staffing. Living in a rural area, his family’s options for respite were very limited. VOPA worked with the pediatrician to define medical necessity regarding the 1:1 aide under EPSDT. VOPA also educated the family of the child’s rights under the DD Waiver and to receive other necessary and beneficial services, including environmental modifications, assistive technology, respite care and a new case manager.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars, how much of this year’s grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?

See priority #6, indicator #1

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?

Yes

1. Priority #7- - People with Disabilities in the Commonwealth of Virginia are Aware of VOPA’s Services

2. Indicator #1

In order to better serve underserved populations VOPA will implement and monitor its plan for increasing cultural, geographical and disability diversity on its

Board of Directors and Advisory Councils.

Indicator is: Met

If “Met or Partially Met” was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed.

VOPA’s Board’s membership composition is defined in the Virginia Code and is intended to reflect the diverse disability communities. Appointed by the Governor and legislators, Board nominees recommended by statewide advocacy groups are to be considered. VOPA is to coordinate and provide the appointing authorities the nominations. The Executive Director Reviews the composition of the Board and advises the advocacy groups of the statute membership requirements as well as the need for the Board to be reflective of the cultural diversity of Virginia residents.

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

The requirement for VOPA to coordinate the nominees has afforded VOPA the opportunity to collaborate with other advocacy entities. This collaboration has also provided a forum to clarify and promote VOPA’s mission.

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

Each of the following indicators allowed VOPA to reach underserved and unserved pockets of Virginians related to disability rights information. Because this information is critical to the promotion of self advocacy and true community integration, VOPA has incorporated outreach and education into each of the other 6 priorities for FY08 and tied it more tightly to the other advocacy work of the Office. Collaborating with these other entities has provided a forum to clarify and promote VOPA’s mission.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars, how much of this year’s grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?

\$2,035

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?

Yes

1. Priority #7- - People with Disabilities in the Commonwealth of Virginia are Aware of VOPA’s Services

2. Indicator #2

VOPA will continue its office hours at CILS and will provide information and assistance on alternative decision making supports.

Indicator is: Met

If “Met or Partially Met” was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example

case(s) should be successfully closed.

VOPA works with CILs across the State to address issues and recommendations that resulted from the Office Hours program review VOPA conducted last year. VOPA is currently in the process of identifying remaining issues and recommendations in order to plan for the new fiscal year. This was done with other funding streams.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars, how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?

\$00

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?

No

1. Priority #7- - People with Disabilities in the Commonwealth of Virginia are Aware of VOPA's Services

2. Indicator #3

VOPA will continue its outreach efforts to the Eastern Shore via a mailing of publications and 3 trainings on fair housing.

Indicator is: Met

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed.

VOPA mailed our new assistive technology publication to 3 community-based providers. Fair Housing training was provided and included specific examples of reasonable accommodations for people with disabilities. This was done with other funding sources.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars, how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?

\$00

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?

No

1. Priority #7- - People with Disabilities in the Commonwealth of Virginia are Aware of VOPA's Services

2. Indicator #4

VOPA will continue its outreach efforts to the Spanish speaking community by distributing translated VOPA publications and running a PSA on a Spanish-speaking radio station.

Indicator is: Met

If “Met or Partially Met” was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed.

VOPA continued its participation with 2 local Spanish speaking Coalitions and supported efforts related to people with disabilities. VOPA contracted with a local non-profit entity to provide on-going translation of VOPA publications into Spanish. The VOPA brochure and another publication have been translated and we are distributing them.

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

A collegial working relationship has been developed with the non-profit. VOPA has sought their advice about outreach strategies and better avenues to reach the Spanish speaking population in Virginia.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars, how much of this year’s grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?

Priority #7, Indicator #1

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?

No

1. Priority #7- - People with Disabilities in the Commonwealth of Virginia are Aware of VOPA’s Services

2. Indicator #5

VOPA will increase disability awareness of law enforcement agencies through 2 trainings or meetings and developing a fact sheet.

Indicator is: Met

If “Met or Partially Met” was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed.

VOPA developed a fact sheet on the rights of people with disabilities for law enforcement and sent it to 3 law enforcement agencies. We completed 1 training with a police academy; it generated a high level of interest and participation.

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

VOPA developed a “tip Sheet” that may help law enforcement officers assisting people with disabilities. This tip sheet focused on people with disabilities who use assistive technology devices and services.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars, how much of this year’s grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?

This was done with other funding

10. **Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?**
No
-

1. **Priority #7- - People with Disabilities in the Commonwealth of Virginia are Aware of VOPA's Services**

2. **Indicator #6**

VOPA will increase awareness of the special education needs for foster care children via a training program and consulting with the VOPA Disabilities Advisory Council.

Indicator is: Partially Met

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed.

The Disabilities Advisory Council provided VOPA staff with resources about foster care and ideas about linkages to community partners that may be helpful in learning about foster care in Virginia. The training program was delayed due to staffing issues.

9. **Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars, how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?**

See Priority #7, Indicator #1

10. **Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?**
No
-

1. **Priority #7- - People with Disabilities in the Commonwealth of Virginia are Aware of VOPA's Services**

2. **Indicator #7**

VOPA will increase awareness of discharge rights by forwarding a fact sheet to 25 nursing homes.

Indicator is: Partially Met/Continuing

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed.

VOPA prepared a fact sheet on disability rights related to discharge and distributed it to 25 nursing homes. However, based on feedback we received we will re-draft the publication and re-distribute it.

9. **Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars, how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority?**

See Priority #7, Indicator #1

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year?
No

Section VII Development Disabilities Network Collaboration

- A. Provide information related to only those issues/barriers affecting individuals with developmental disabilities and their families in your State that the DDC, P&A, and UAP(s) (the DD network) have jointly identified as critical State issues/barriers.**

Using short titles, list 5-10 areas that the DDC, P&A, and UAP(s) have identified as critical State issues/barriers. Then, by checking the circle(s) to the left of the short titles(s), identify any issues/barriers selected by your State DD Network for joint collaboration.

1. Policy Maker Education
2. Increase in ICF/MRs and plan for rebuilding of state institutions
3. Reduction in Medicaid Waivers Waiting lists
4. Lack of integrated developmental disabilities service delivery system
5. Abuse and Neglect
6. Outreach
7. Funding opportunities
8. Children in nursing homes and institutional settings
9. Advances and Opportunities for Self Advocacy

- B. Provide the following information for at least one of the issues/barriers selected for DD Network collaboration. Repeat this section for reporting each issue/barrier selected for DD Network collaboration.**

- 1. Issue/Barrier # (from above): 1**
- 2. Provide a brief description of the collaborative issue/barrier and expected outcome(s).**

The DD Council and the P&A frequently collaborate during Virginia's General Assembly session about proposed legislation that may impact people with disabilities. VOPA sought the advice of UAP. This collaboration helps to facilitate educating the policy-makers (legislators and state agency representatives) about opportunities to advance the rights of people with disabilities as well as to identify risks of violating the rights of people with disabilities.

- 3. Reference applicable SGP Goals: 2,4**
- 4. Describe the P&A's specific roles and responsibilities in this collaborative effort.**

VOPA and the DD Council collaborated to educate policy makers regarding proposed legislation that would lessen protections for people with disabilities Statewide. This particular legislation would have significantly changed the Virginian's with Disabilities Act.

- 5. Briefly identify problems, if any, encountered as a result of this collaboration. Not applicable**

6. Describe unexpected benefits, if any, of this collaborative effort:
The collaboration seemed to advance both entities' reputations with policy makers as being seen as trusted fact providers.

7. If your P&A can provide technical assistance expertise in this area to other States, please describe.
Not applicable

8. If any, describe the technical assistance needs the P&A/DD Network have in this area.
Not applicable

1. Issue/Barrier # (from above): 2

2. Provide a brief description of the collaborative issue/barrier and expected outcome(s).

In FY07 the DD Network partners frequently collaborated during Virginia's General Assembly session about proposed legislation, budget language and administrative policies that may impact people with disabilities. This collaboration helped to facilitate educating the policy-makers (legislators and state agency representatives) about how their proposals to address the staggering poor conditions of the mental retardation institutions violated the rights of people with disabilities.

3. Reference applicable SGP Goals: 2,4

4. Describe the P&A's specific roles and responsibilities in this collaborative effort:

VOPA and the DD Council collaborated to educate policy makers regarding proposals that fostered putting more funding and planning efforts into re-building and ultimately re-storing the institutions instead of moving the service delivery system toward community based services. The UCEDD coordinated an information session for policy makers to demonstrate how other states had accomplished this.

5. Briefly identify problems, if any, encountered as a result of this collaboration. Not applicable

6. Describe unexpected benefits, if any, of this collaborative effort.
The collaboration convinced policy makers that the proposals being considered bordered on violating the Olmstead decision.

7. If your P&A can provide technical assistance expertise in this area to other States, please describe. Not applicable

8. If any, describe the technical assistance needs the P&A/DD Network have in this area.
Not applicable

Section VIII. Coordination

Check if the following programs are housed in the same organization as the P&A program:

- ✓ **Client Assistance Program (CAP)**
Long Term Care Ombudsman (Older Americans Act)
- ✓ **Other:**

If other, please list:

Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness, Protection and Advocacy for Individual Rights, Protection and Advocacy for Beneficiaries of Social Security, Protection and Advocacy for Assistive Technology, Protection and Advocacy for Traumatic Brain Injuries, funding to support Virginians with Disabilities Act activities and Help America Vote Act.

If the Client Assistance Program (CAP) and the Long Term Care Ombudsman (Older Americans Act) are not part of the P&A System (PADD, PAIMI, PAIR AND PAAT programs) describe coordination between the PADD program and the CAP and the Long Term Care Ombudsman (Older Americans Act.)

Coordination with the State Long-Term Care Program (Virginia Department of Aging) occurs on an as needed basis. However, VOPA does attend and participate in their Virginia Public Guardian and Conservator Advisory Board. VOPA staff had discussions with representatives from the Long Term Care Ombudsman Program in Virginia during individual case work. VOPA received referrals and reports of incidents from the Long Term Care Ombudsman staff.

The Department of Medical Assistance Services (DMAS) is the primary source of funding for the long-term care system in Virginia. Again, VOPA coordinates with them on an as needed basis.

Describe your system's relations with agencies other than above and any inter-agency agreements or joint projects you may have, other than mentioned above. VOPA collaborates with other state-wide advocacy entities and disabilities service providers as needed.

Section IX. Services Provided Using Non-Part C Funding

Are services and activities benefiting persons with developmental disabilities and their families supported by funding other than that provided by Part C of the DD Act or its program income.

No

Please describe the projects funded with non-part C funding or its program income.

Not applicable.