## Entitlement Determination & Rehabilitation Planning Accuracy (EDRPA) Instrument

	Question	Compliance		
Applic	ation, Initial Evaluation, and Entitlement Determination	ion		
1.	Was data entered correctly and consistently in the VR&E record?	Yes	No	NA
	<ul> <li>Case status dates were not consistent with documentation in the record</li> </ul>			
	B. SEH indicator was not consistent.			
	C. Pre-Chapter 31 salary was not consistent.			
	D. Occupational code was not consistent.			
	E. Service type and service detail type were not consistent.			
	F. Selected track was not consistent			
	G. Employment Tab was not completed when a combination IWRP/IEAP plan was developed.			1
2.	Was EP status opened when the individual reported	Yes	No	NA
	to the initial evaluation appointment?			
3.	Was VR&E Program Orientation (VAF 28-0800)	Yes	No	NA
	signed?	N	NLa	NIA
4.	Was VAF 28-1902w, Rehabilitation Needs Inventory	Yes	No	NA
	and Protection of Privacy Information Statement,			
5	signed? Did the 28-1902b contain all required elements to	Yes	No	NA
5.	document the entitlement determination?	res	INO	INA
	A. 28-1902b was not present in the record.			
	B. 28-1902b was not signed by the VRC.			
-	C. 28-1902b did not document the entitlement decision.			
-	D. Automatic entitlement under NDAA was not			
	documented for the Servicemember.			
	<ul> <li>E. Existence of a vocational impairment was not documented, justified, and/or consistent with evidence.</li> </ul>			
	F. Contribution of the SCD to the vocational impairment was not documented, justified, and/or consistent with evidence.			
	<ul> <li>G. Overcoming the effects of the impairment was not documented, justified, and/or consistent with evidence.</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>H. EH determination was not documented, justified, and/or consistent with evidence.</li> </ul>			
	<ol> <li>SEH determination (including how SCD contributes in substantial part) was not documented, justified, and/or consistent with evidence.</li> </ol>			
6.	Was the feasibility of achieving a vocational goal documented?	Yes	No	NA
7.	Was the removal of reason(s) for prior case closure documented, justified, and consistent with evidence in the record, and, if required, was concurrence documented?	Yes	No	NA

<ul> <li>Removal of reason(s) for prior discontinuance was not documented, justified, and/or consistent with evidence</li> </ul>			
in the record.			
B. Reason(s) to overturn prior rehabilitation decision was			
not documented, justified, and/or consistent with			
evidence in the record.			
C. Concurrence was not documented when the Veteran			
reapplied within one year of rehabilitation or MRG.	Yes	No	NA
8. Was the Veteran's overall pattern of interests, aptitudes and abilities assessed and documented?	res	INO	INA
9. Was an assessment for basic IL needs documented?	Yes	No	NA
10. Was the entitlement decision correct, based on the	Yes	No	NA
documented evidence?	163	NO	
11. Was the Veteran provided written notification of entitlement determination?	Yes	No	NA
Evaluation and Planning			
12. Were vocational exploration activities documented?	Yes	No	NA
A. Labor market information was not documented			
B. The suitability of the selected vocational goal was not			
documented.			
C. Justification for the type of rehabilitation plan to be			
developed was not documented.			
D. Description of how vocational goal will be achieved and			
Planned services were not documented. E. Consideration for retroactive induction and related			
information were not documented.			
F. Estimated program charges and costs were not			
documented.			
G. Justification for exceeding the VRC's level of approval			
was not documented. H. Level of Case Management was not documented or			
justified.			
Image: Plan Development			
13. Did the rehabilitation plan include individualized	Yes	No	NA
services to addresses the identified needs?	100		
14. Were the objectives observable, measurable, and	Yes	No	NA
designed to meet the overall goal of the rehabilitation			
plan?			
15. Was required concurrence documented?	Yes	No	NA
A. Program cost concurrence was not documented.			
<ul> <li>B. Retroactive Induction concurrence was not documented.</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>Retroactive Reimbursement concurrence was not documented.</li> </ul>			
D. Firearm purchase concurrence was not documented.			
16. Was VAF 28-0957, Vocational Rehabilitation	Yes	No	NA
Guidelines and Debt Prevention, signed?			
17. Was the rehabilitation plan documented and signed by the Veteran and VRC?	Yes	No	NA
A. Rehabilitation plan was not included in the record.			
B. Rehabilitation plan was not signed by the VRC.			
C. Rehabilitation plan was not signed by the Veteran.			

Exact Track			
18. Were the criteria for provision of services under a Fast Track plan met?	Yes	No	NA
<ul> <li>A. Training was not limited to the completion of remedial and/or general education coursework.</li> </ul>			1
B. The Fast Track IWRP was not limited to 12 months or three consecutive terms, or there was no VREO approved extension up to 6 months or two consecutive			
<ul> <li>terms.</li> <li>C. The Fast Track IEEP was not limited to 12 months, exceeds one term of training, or there was no VREO approved extension up to 6 months or one additional term.</li> </ul>			
<u>Extended Evaluation</u>			
19. Were services outlined in the IEEP designed to resolve the question of feasibility?	Yes	No	NA
20. Was the duration of the IEEP appropriate?	Yes	No	NA
A. The duration of the IEEP was less than two weeks.			
B. The duration of the IEEP exceeded 12 months.			
C. VREO concurrence was not obtained for an IEEP in excess of 12 months.			
21. Did the IEEP consist of no more than one academic term?	Yes	No	NA
Independent Living			
22. Was a Preliminary IL Assessment complete and documented?	Yes	No	NA
23. Was a Comprehensive IL assessment complete and documented?	Yes	No	NA
24. Was service coordination with other VA programs/grants or community-based resources documented?	Yes	No	NA
25. Was assistance with applying for VA housing grants documented when home modifications are an identified need and it appears the individual may qualify?	Yes	No	NA
26. Did avocational services included on the plan meet criteria?	Yes	No	NA
<ul> <li>A. The record did not document that the disability condition(s) limits or prevents participation in the avocational activity previously performed.</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>B. Documentation did not explain how the avocational interest will improve independence.</li> </ul>			
C. The plan included more than one avocational activity.			
<ul> <li>D. The services were provided to update or replace existing equipment.</li> </ul>			
27. Was appropriate Independent Living plan concurrence documented?	Yes	No	NA
<u>Self-Employment</u>			
28. Was self-employment orientation completed and documented?	Yes	No	NA

29. Was the Preliminary Evaluation Self-Employment	Yes	No	NA
Checklist completed and documented?			
30. Was self-employment plan concurrence documented?	Yes	No	NA
31. Was assignment to Category I or II documented along	Yes	No	NA
with appropriate concurrence?			
32. Was a proposed business plan documented?	Yes	No	NA
33. Was a summation of business plan analysis	Yes	No	NA
documented?			

□ <b>Reviews</b> (For tracking only. Not included in score. Answering No <u>does not</u> result in an error.)			
34. Was the requested Higher-Level Review completed in	Yes	No	N/A
an accurate and timely manner?			
A. The requested review was not completed accurately.			
B. The review was not completed in a timely manner (90			
days or less from date of request).			
C. The review was not completed by a more experienced			
VRC than the individual who made the decision.			
D. The review indicated a Duty to Assist error, but a			
Supplemental Claim Review was not initiated.			
E. The requested informal conference was not provided.			
35. Was the requested Supplemental Review completed	Yes	No	N/A
in an accurate and timely manner?			
A. The requested review was not completed accurately.			
B. The review was not completed in a timely manner (125			
days or less from date of request or identification of a			
Duty to Assist error).			

## General Comments