

**February 4, 2011 – SRC Quarterly Meeting Minutes
Renaissance Inn – Noir Room
5188 Wittenberg Ln, Keizer OR 97303**

Members Present: Renata Beck, Anne Burns, Jackie Burr, Liz Fox, Victoria Haight, Scott Hatley, Jesse Kappel, Linda Keller, Gary Lanctot, Dodie McKenzie, Cynthia Owens, Sandy Reese, Becky Simpson, Sherry Stock, Patti Tom-Martin, Ted Wenk

Members Absent: Ann Balzell, Tony Marx, B.J. Rosenblad

OVRs Staff: Sandy Cooper, Martha Dodsworth, Peter Fox, Cheryl Furrer, Sheila Hoover, Rhoda Hunter, Kristina Kennedy, Susan Lincoln, Mark Masthoff, Joe Miller, Clayton Rees, Stephaine Taylor, Travis Wall

Guests: Elaine Bell, Anna Bergren, Glenn Bishop, Laurie Brooks, Cheryl Eby, Floyd Eby, Susan Hatley, Roxy Hills, Molly Holsapple, Tim Kral, Sonja McKenzie, Dina Muniz, Corissa Neufeldt, Derek O'Neill, Leslie Riggs, Naomi Shadwick, Dominick Spedale, Kadie Wellington, Scott Whetham

Welcome and Introductions – 8:39 a.m.

Liz Fox, SRC Co-Chair, introduced herself and welcomed all Council members, VR staff and guests, after which attendees introduced themselves.

Review of Process for 2012 State Plan Update

Travis Wall gave the Council a bit of background on what the state plan is and how it's developed. This plan is updated on an annual basis; some years require more work than others, depending on current needs assessments and RSA's requirements. This year there will be a workgroup including SRC members. Travis will bring a draft of the 2012 state plan to the council's May meeting for review, comments and questions.

Liz Fox and Cynthia Owens presented Clayton Rees with a plaque on behalf of the Council, thanking him for his many years of service with the OVRs Youth Transition Program (YTP).

Project ACCESS Update

Clayton Rees gave an overview of the status of Project ACCESS, designed to implement a coordinated transition service delivery model to promote positive post-school outcomes for youth with disabilities in Oregon. The project is designed to offer increased opportunities for VR counselors to interact with school

personnel and become exposed to a larger number of students to provide more coordinated and comprehensive transition-related services and supports. In Oregon the percentage of youth in K-12 with disabilities is about 8-9%; this comes out to about 75,000, some 22,000 of which are involved with special education programs at the high school level. Also in Oregon there are disconnected youth, many of whom have disabilities, who are not in school, have aged out of foster care, etc. There are two more years of funding left for this project and it is currently serving 433 students. Since its inception 20 years ago, the relationship between the VRC's and high school students has been one-on-one and the YTP process generally has begun in the student's junior or senior year. Project ACCESS puts the VRC's in the classroom beginning in the 9th grade with the VRC's having access to larger numbers of students and staying with those cohorts throughout much of the student's high school experience.

Project staff have been working to help young people to learn what things are important from a professional standpoint. The big question they are asking students is, "Do you know who you are?" The project has been helping counselors and teachers to see their role in this process. Helping students know who they are, give them a sense of self, is a central goal of the project in individual school programs. VR counselors have worked with special education teachers to develop a curriculum. It has been a discovery process on both sides, working with each other to more effectively collaborate to help young people.

The conclusion in a profile of disconnected youth from October 2010 was that the single-most important thing to rescue was their sense of self, so the project has been helping participants develop a positive view of themselves through a positive program. They are looking at how VR can be part of the process in accomplishing this. One of the goals of Project ACCESS is to help students with improving their sense of self, so they feel they have a measure of control in their lives. The 2007 grant is due to expire in September 2012. They are looking at ways to measure the success of the project in view of an application for continued funds.

Staff have been trying to include students' parents and family in the transition process, with limited success. Parents are not as involved in the process in the education system. They will be looking at ways to more actively engage parents in this process; the more involved the family is, the more successful the student will be.

ACCESS continues to have summer academies for the teachers and VR counselors working with the five Project ACCESS schools. Each school has its own culture, so the programs in each school are unique to the students of that particular school/culture.

This is a model demonstration program. There are five other sites around the country running their programs in ways best for their state.

The project continues to evaluate students on a semi-annual basis. The University of Oregon has been a help with collating data, etc. They have been looking at how Project ACCESS, teachers and VR counselors are helping students become self-aware, to recognize their own needs and who they are. Clayton has retired from his position as the OVRs YTP Coordinator, but will be working as the Project ACCESS Coordinator with VR on the last two years of this grant.

Linda Keller noted that, in the 20 years of experience she's had with YTP, lack of parental involvement has always been an issue. A lot of parents get lost and give up over time. She suggested there might be more success by catching them earlier in the education/transition process.

Clayton replied that they have tried to identify what motivates some of these parents in order to serve them better but so far they have not had a lot of success. There is an idea out of Michigan that transition services should start in kindergarten. There needs to be policy development to start YTP earlier in the education process. Currently it starts in 9th grade. The individualized education plan (IEP) process can be intimidating and disempowering for parents. Those involved in the process need to stop long enough to listen to parents instead of overwhelming them, to engage parents and help them feel invested in the process.

At-risk kids don't necessarily have a disability, but may have significant impediments to employment. These individuals may have disabilities which may not have been identified yet. The project will need to identify the larger population and have VR counselors in classrooms.

Cynthia Owens spoke about Project Employ, where family is involved from the very beginning of the process. The focus is on a person-centered plan working with students the school districts have identified as being ready for a VR plan. They have had good buy-in from families.

Joe Miller informed the council that there was a family component to Project Access when the grant was built. Roz Slovic was working on this before she retired. Different school settings have different levels of parental involvement. Project staff conferred with the U of Oregon for a number of hours; they want to keep looking at models that might be best practices, such as Project Employ.

Jackie Burr explained it has taken a long time to build partnerships, relationships, and trust between VR and special education teachers looking to protect the confidentiality of their students. One of the goals has been to work on smooth transitions from an educational setting to the next settings in students' lives. The 22,000 students Clayton identified get services from schools as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA); it's not a matter of 22,000 kids out there without any services at all.

Cynthia noted that investing in kids at the front end can help allay VR expenses later.

Secretary of State Audit Status Report

Gary Lanctot informed the Council of the recent follow-up on the OVRs Secretary of State audit. The SRC had hoped to be more involved in making improvements to the program. The Executive Committee looked at the program's recent needs assessment in addition to the audit. There were concerns expressed within the disability community regarding VR's new contract process and how much time this is/was taking. The Executive Committee is looking at what the Council can do in order to help improve services and the program with consumers in mind. This is potentially a discussion of what could be the major portion of Council work for the next year. Gary opened the discussion to the Council for conversation.

There have been requests for data from the SRC to OVRs which have not been followed up on as cleanly as they might have been. The Council has received pieces of information, but would like to see a better alignment of program improvement. Both OVRs staff and Council members have the obligation to be engaged in program improvements.

Cynthia expressed concern that, when the Council first received the audit report and had an initial conversation with Stephaine, the SRC asked to be able to work closely with the person following up on process improvement. However, they were informed later that there was a DHS employee following up on the report but the SRC was not contacted to be part of the process as they had requested, and haven't been actively involved in it. There are some issues in the audit report that should be crossed over into policies. **The request of the SRC is to be sure that the policies and the audit cross over and they want to be involved in this process.** Some of the policies currently being worked on touch on these concerns, but not all do.

Linda noted that having a matrix is a start, but it seems like there should be a meeting of the SRC, OVRs and any other involved parties. She encouraged being more thoughtful in this process, even though we are on a timeline.

Travis suggested continuing this conversation after Stephaine arrived later in the day or after this meeting to make sure everyone's on the same page.

Joe explained that Stephaine was at the legislature this morning, but he anticipated her being at the meeting this afternoon to continue this conversation. He noted there were still many opportunities for input in this process. Additionally, even if the policies are under a tight deadline, it doesn't mean these can't be modified later.

Cynthia added that the Council had requested specific data from OVRs as to whether VR is seeing any improvements from counselors and job developers using the Allen Anderson model, but still hasn't received this data.

Two of the Council's concerns include the requirement for vendors/job developers working with OVRs to undergo the Allen Anderson job training program and problems with the contracts and procurement process. At issue are vendor and potential vendor complaints, including the difficulty and complexity of the paperwork; lack of responsiveness from OVRs/DHS; lost materials submitted with, or as part of, the application process; and the amount of time spent waiting for a response from OVRs.

Sandy noted that Stephaine may be planning to share this data with the Council later today.

Cynthia said that it would be nice if the Council's Executive Committee could be introduced to Steve Hastings, (DHS project manager on the audit report), at their next committee meeting.

Sandy Reese brought out information sent to the Council the day before this meeting or that morning regarding these issues and Joe believes Stephaine will be addressing this with the Council later today.

BREAK (Stephaine joined the meeting at this time.)

Autism Transition Report

Corissa Neufeldt, a manager for Developmental Disability (DD) services within the DHS Seniors and People with Disabilities Division (SPD), shared a collaboration work update for an interagency subcommittee for the Autism Commission. This committee has been meeting for a year to address interagency collaboration around transition issues. The committee's focus has been on 16-26 year olds with autism spectrum disorders. There are a variety of interagency agreements that

already exist but not one that speaks specifically to transition goals for youth with autism spectrum disorders. While their focus has been on autism spectrum disorders, they believe their suggestions would work for youth with other types of disabilities going through transition services as well.

Their goal is to develop interagency agreements between DHS, the Department of Education and OHA – including OVRS and SPD - to establish roles and feedback with common points of data collection, including reviewing practices in other states to see if they have more comprehensive performance reviews looking at housing, work, independent living, and assistance needs.

One barrier has been overcoming the fact that people from different agencies don't really know what others do. The hope is that interagency agreements will:

- More clearly establish supports, resulting in consistent packets of information outlining the responsibilities of agencies, families and individuals;
- Speak to consistent collaboration on trainings;
- Support the nature of a statewide collaborative advisory committee and local advisory committees;
- Encourage cross representation on policy committees;
- Allow for quality assurance with their bi-annual agreement updates/reviews;
- Address how these agencies can incorporate and collaborate on policy and rule development;
- Encourage these agencies to work together to develop an interagency collaborative guide to be used as a tool for the field and for students regarding rules and responsibilities; and
- Reflect various agency policies and procedures, with each partner being responsible to inform their field staff about changes, etc.

The committee has been getting feedback that professionals are confused in their own agencies. They can only imagine how students and families feel. Committee members have even been struggling with the idea of how to collaborate with one another and whether they need to get a basic understanding of what each agency does first.

They don't want to create new tools people won't use but want to identify tools currently being used and improve these if possible, adding additional agencies' services to what exists. They are looking at a transition portfolio documenting key areas specific to the student, including IEP highlights and medication needs.

Oregon has a requirement through IDEA for each student to have summary of performance. They would like to see this fleshed out more and are looking at how other states are doing this for ideas.

The committee is looking to have a document to present to the full commission with their recommendations by the end of June.

Becky Simpson asked whether some of what is being developed through this group will be incorporated into VR policy and not watered down through the years. This is an excellent way to make sure this information gets to field staff.

Stephaine replied that policy has been used to outline practice per the Federal Regulations. Generally interagency agreements have been incorporated into the OVRs training plan or otherwise into its management plan to share with staff.

Review of Draft Policy Manual/Draft Rules

Travis Wall and Peter Fox reported to the Council on OVRs' draft policy manual and solicited input from them regarding any concerns they might have in the hopes that the Council would give its approval for the process to move forward. At this point the manual is 85-90% complete. As they have gone through this material, they have looked for ways to better align OVRs policies and rules with federal rules.

VR hopes to issue emergency/temporary rules by mid-February, to take effect by March, after which they would become permanent rules. The rulemaking process involves public hearings and OVRs will keep the SRC apprised on these hearings since the Council is interested in these.

There will be training for all OVRs staff on the new manual, in person and online sessions.

Gary noted that there may be value in reviewing policies completed prior to the Secretary of State audit, just to make sure that those concerns have been addressed. Travis replied that his has been done informally, but VR can look at this more closely. Most of auditor concerns were things VR was already aware of or working on.

Dodie McKenzie reported that there are now five 121 programs in Oregon. She had information for the policies and gave it to Peter.

The policies, rules and technical assistance guide (TAG) are all loaded into ORCA to be readily accessible by staff at any time. The policy manual will be available to the public on the OVRs website.

Joe informed the SRC that, when the group was working on the TAG for vehicle modification, it recorded that VR would only do a vehicle modification if it's the last alternative when public transport is not available; the new policy doesn't allow for when public transport not available /or feasible/. VR feels that there needs to be the option of counselor and manager discretion in this matter. This policy has already been approved by the SRC, but there needs to be some mechanism for flexibility in this case. The SRC will send language to Travis and Peter for review to be added to policy, who will then send the modified policy to the SRC for final approval.

Gary Lanctot made a motion for the Council to approve the policy manual as it stands and Becky Simpson seconded this motion. The motion was approved unanimously by the Council.

Stephaine extended her thanks to the SRC for the tremendous amount of work they put into this process.

Stephaine announced the hire of Keith Ozols as the new OVRs YTP coordinator.

OVRs has received the first two Ticket payments on Partnership Plus and have been able to distribute funds on a community-based program. They have the first evaluations of WIN in draft; the findings are quite positive. She was able to share this with the legislature this morning. Representative Gilliam has been very supportive and Representative Gurlick has been very supportive around the issues of autism and brain injury population.

Sherry Stock informed the group that Representative Gurlick will be speaking at the BIAOR conference on March 4 and 5 at the Portland Sheraton.

Stephaine has learned that VR will only take a 10% cut this coming year, which is still a big cut but impressive considering the cuts others are taking.

Anne Burns shared brochures on the National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI). NAMI has gotten a grant, moved offices, and produced these new brochures. She noted that one in four adults in the U.S. is affected by mental illness, but less than a 1/3 of such individuals receive any services for mental illness.

Linda Keller encouraged OVRs to look into the transition of youth with mental illness as it is exploring grant opportunities. This population is huge, especially in Oregon.

LUNCH

Public Input (3 minutes allowed per person)

Liz Fox called the meeting back to order. She invited public comment and reviewed the rules for public input. The following individuals shared input with the Council:

Elaine Bell: She worked for more than 20 years in medical facilities nursing and then hurt her hip. She's now a full-time student. VR has been very helpful to her. She is very grateful for what they're doing for her.

Floyd Eby: He spoke on behalf of his son Tristan. The family had contacted VR in November of 2009 and was told not to expect much and whatever results came from the process would take a long time. He explained that Tristan is severely autistic and was assigned to three job developers: the first one worked to place Tristan in a job where he was not wanted, the second one didn't work out, and the third one left him sitting there alone when the job developer did not show up. Tristan feels like he has wasted a year of his life.

Cheryl Eby: Tristan's mother expressed that to say the family is disgusted with VR would be an understatement. They have never experienced anything like this at all; it has been a horrible experience. Their son has been treated like dirt and jerked around. If she had her way the agency would be de-funded.

Dina Muniz: This is the second time she has been through VR. The first time the counselor made her believe she could do it. If it wasn't for VR believing in her, she doesn't think she could do the things she has been doing while living with depression, fibromyalgia, bipolar disorder, and ADHD. Currently she is going through a three-month CNA course. She felt encouraged by the people in the program and has had a great experience with VR.

Dominick Spedale: As a job developer he noted that there are no easy rehabilitations. Times have changed; the economy's not what we'd want. With the limited budget VR has, everybody is doing best they can but it is difficult to do things on such a short timeline – 60 days is not a lot of time. Clients deserve more time than we're able to give them.

Glenn Bishop, M.S., CRC: Glenn works with Dirkse Counseling and Consulting, is a PSU educator and an active job developer. It's difficult work. He expressed the need to make sure we are looking at a workable model for all clients. The Allen Anderson stuff is a great tool in the toolbox of a job developer, but it's just one tool. As future policies are made he encouraged OVRS to take vendors into account as partners; in the past the relationship between the two has seemed adversarial. It would be nice to have job developers' input listened to in order to achieve the outcomes our clients deserve.

Tim Kral: Tim is the executive director of the Oregon Rehabilitation Association (ORA), an organization with about 7,000 members. He has been in the field, working with and for individuals with disabilities for about 35 years. He noted that he had rarely seen such a united opinion against a training being used for the developmentally disabled (DD) population, because it doesn't work with their population. Several job developers were uncomfortable to come before the Council today because they were worried about their relationship with OVRS. He added that "motivated," "dependable," and "ready" are not necessarily automatic qualities for the DD population. The DD system has been working on customized employment opportunities. While ORA fully supports the idea that job developers should have qualifications, it doesn't believe the Allen Anderson model is the only way to go; it has not been effective with the DD population. He would like the Council to support suspending this requirement for DD providers.

Anna Bergren: Anna works as a lead personal agent with Full Access Brokerage in Bend. Currently they have 25 clients enrolled in VR. In the last year and a half only three clients have been placed in community positions. They have seen carving to be most successful to place their clients, unfortunately this is not happening now.

Sonja McKenzie: As project coordinator and field liaison for the Americorps program with OHSU's Center on Self-Determination, Sonja wanted to make the Council aware of the CSD's new statewide program called ABLECORPS. Their goal is to provide ten to fifteen members to serve the disability community by fostering independent living and creating partnerships with the disability community. She made ABLECORPS information brochures available to those interested and noted she was asking for assistance in getting information out about their program.

Roxy Hills: She stated she had worked for fifteen years as a job developer and was hesitant to come forward to give her public input, fearing her contract with OVRS might not be renewed in April as a result. She feels the Allen Anderson model has hampered services to clients. She would like the SRC to remove its

support of the model. She brought along written statements from clients, which were given to Rhoda Hunter to share with the group.

Susan Lincoln and Rhoda Hunter read public input sent to the Council via email, and comments delivered by Roxy Hills on behalf of 3 clients. **(Please see attached items, including:**

1. Emails from Pam Furrer, mother of VR client Jeremy Hammitt – Lane County;
2. An anonymous letter for public input;
3. A letter from Marjorie Hamlin, job developer - Bend;
4. A memo from Melissa Miller, United Cerebral Palsy Employment Specialist - Portland;
5. An email from Molly McCallum, Macrieb Consultants owner and job developer - Eugene;
6. Three letters from clients of Roxy Hills:
 - a. An anonymous letter from a former recipient of job development services through DHS;
 - b. A letter from Meghan Caughey, former VR client and owner of Meghan Caughey Consulting – Monroe;
 - c. Correspondence notes from interactions with VR client Elva Maria Rosa Delgado Hernandez.
7. A letter from Tim Kral, executive director of the Oregon Rehabilitation Association – Salem.
8. A memo from the Oregon Developmental Disabilities Commission.

Administrator's Report

Stephaine Taylor, OVRS Administrator, began her report by speaking about the Secretary of State audit, the plan and a status report, which she passed around to Council members.

Stephaine noted that OVRS had gone into this audit with the expectation that it would be an ordinary audit where OVRS has an opportunity to look over the auditors' findings, state where VR might have disagreements and then the auditors issue a report. Historically, OVRS has written a narrative response to each of the auditors' findings and then explained what its course of action on that finding would be. In the midst of this last audit, the state decided to employ a new strategy in response to audits; they are looking for strategic improvement plans, which are more dynamic than the static narrative responses given in the past. In order to achieve this end, OVRS needed to quickly acquire skill sets they hadn't previously used including using Microsoft Project management tool. There was also talk about adding a staff person to work with VR to implement this plan. This has changed; Steve Hastings, the person who was identified to help OVRS, has taken another job. He did, however, work with them to get them up to speed on

the tools on project management and tools to facilitate discussion and prioritizing. He was able to facilitate some OVRs executive team meetings and work with branch managers on examining and prioritizing their job duties. He will be back with the branch managers at their February meeting for two days.

OVRs has started a plan that is in response to audit findings. It is really not a strategic plan; it doesn't cover the numerous initiatives that OVRs has underway. Stephaine would very much like, as OVRs has the capacity, to expand this plan to include things OVRs is involved in that aren't reflected here and any additional items with the goal of making a parallel to the state plan – so that they may be two different documents but not two sets of content or work being considered.

The most extensive part of the plan was regarding policy because OVRs was already well into their efforts in this area when the audit document was drafted and it continues to be updated as OVRs makes progress against specific activities.

Included in the materials Stephaine had for Council members was a shorter document that was an example of the bi-weekly status update report OVRs puts together to share with Erinn Kelley-Siel. This report includes the milestones, what the status currently is – green, yellow or red – and the percentage reflecting how close to completion each goal is. When they have work product to add to the report, they attach this as well.

Stephaine also referred to a more narrative handout on policy considerations including 6 bulleted points and reviewed this with the Council. OVRs has developed a system that ties to ORCA that issues a report to let the counselor and branch manager know when milestones haven't been met. There is an expectation that branch managers will be reviewing these reports and addressing them. Another goal is the use of EBT cards such as Food Stamps uses that would let counselors load specific parameters onto the card for clients, allowing them to only purchase the type and price range of items as outlined by the counselor; this system is about 16 months out and would increase efficiency, accountability and eliminate time and money wasted by processing purchase orders.

At the moment OVRs is basically implementing the plan of improvement and managing other initiatives after working with Steve Hastings. He is currently working with other offices/agencies in a similar capacity as he did with OVRs. VR will consult with him as they move forward.

Cynthia asked if SRC could be kept up to date as this process moves forward. She asked if the SRC Exec Committee could get a copy of the bi-weekly report produced for Erinn Kelley-Siel. One of the things the SRC has asked for, in order

to be more involved in the plan for improvement was to be given the opportunity to make sure that the items in the audit are followed up on and to work with the person who was hired into Steve Hastings position, so being able to have progress reports would be helpful.

Gary noted that, in reviewing the materials, it looks like the Council had a mistaken impression of what Steve Hastings had been hired to do. The materials Stephaine shared with the Council indicated more project management direction for OVRs staff than coordinating the activities outlined in the audit results plan. Stephaine confirmed she is the main point of contact for information about this process.

Stephaine expressed her belief that the goal of the leadership of DHS will be moving forward as an organization with this as standard operating procedure for our work. She reviewed other areas of the plan with the Council.

On behalf of the Exec Committee, Cynthia asked whether there was a way OVRs is collecting data from counselors to identify whether or not they are using the Allen Anderson model when talking to a client? Stephaine indicated that VR does not track or have a data box for this information. Cynthia asked how OVRs is gauging how effective the Allen Anderson model is?

Stephaine replied that one of the pieces of data being looked at is the survival rate from application to plan and part of the process is figuring out what to look at to get to this information. One of the criteria Stephaine has suggested using is whether there are fewer people who go into plan and then drop out. Are people dropping out before or after going into plan and having VR spend money on them? The issue has been having people come into VR who weren't motivated. VR would create a plan with these individuals and throw money at them, trying to achieve movement and progress when, in fact, they weren't yet ready to enter employment and ended up dropping out of their plan. This money was wasted on individuals who were not motivated to go to work when it could have been used to assist individuals ready to go to work. Being able to identify early whether a client is committed to go to work and discern whether there are barriers to their readiness before they enter plan has been of benefit.

Cynthia asked if other methods have been made available to counselors meeting with clients who are non-verbal or for whom it is difficult to articulate and show their motivation. Stephaine replied that OVRs recognizes that the Allen Anderson model is not necessarily appropriate for everyone who walks in the door.

In line with today's public testimony, OVRS has been examining the data and cost effectiveness of what has been paid to job developers and the results from that investment. Stephaine referred to the packet given to Council members during lunch.

The green handout outlines that OVRS spent \$2,737,000.25 for job developer services in FY 2008 with a resulting 602 rehab outcomes (out of 2776 clients), which did not look like a good return on investment. After further examination, OVRS found that they were only getting about 22% of their rehabs from job developers.

Linda Keller asked what the ratio is of OVRS clients who don't receive services from job developers. Stephaine said that she didn't have this information on hand but would get it to the Council.

The yellow handout in the packet outlines information from 2008-2010. Of 4265 VR clients, about 1300 were working with job developers and about 3000 were not working with job developers. Overall, there were 2602 individuals rehabilitated. There were 1263 job placements made, but these individuals were not necessarily closed out as successful rehabs yet because they haven't been in their placement for 90 days.

There is a fairly significant difference in performance between those who are working with job developers and those who are not. OVRS is paying a fair amount of money for this. In terms of individuals rehabilitated, there is more of a parity between the two groups; job developers are doing better by 3% than non-job developers at this point. OVRS feels there are a number of factors playing into this: VR is getting more people who are ready to engage in job development and OVRS believes job developers have benefited from the Allen Anderson training.

Stephaine encouraged the Council to look over the pale yellow sheet in the packet, where performance information is split out by branch; this sheet splits out the outcomes achieved by job developers who have been through the Allen Anderson training and those who have not. VR gave all job developers a year to go through the training and continued to use services from both groups during that time. The orchid sheet in the packet also has information about outcomes for clients with developmental disabilities.

OVRS will continue to track this data. The next step will be looking at customer satisfaction with the process. This will be a challenge because of staff capacity issues. But Stephaine believes they have seen benefit from this process and have gotten better outcomes from it for people with some more serious challenges.

They are looking at the Allen Anderson model as a foundation, not the only way to do things, but it does afford strategies that can be used across populations that can increase outcomes.

The hot pink sheet in the packet outlines the qualifications OVRS has set out for job developers. There are an awful lot of people who have had training around customized employment. Stephaine acknowledged that there is still work to be done on this and expressed her concern that internal work documents, that were not final, have been circulated leading to misinformation being shared with the Council and others. The payment schedule discussed earlier, during public input, is not the schedule VR is going to go with; this issue is currently under discussion.

Cynthia noted that she recalled seeing a letter about a job development advisory committee being formed and that previously the SRC has asked OVRS to appoint Liz Fox as an SRC representative to this committee. Is this something the SRC can still request? Stephaine apologized, saying it was an oversight on her part in getting that information to Kris Kennedy, who staffs that workgroup.

Cynthia stated, in this upcoming year, with the rollout of the Employment First policy and the activities that are going on, it will be crucial to continue to build the capacity of job developers who are able to work with individuals with developmental disabilities. She asked what VR's intentions are in going forward and having a component somewhere that addresses working with individuals with developmental disabilities and to assure that job developers have the tools or training, whatever it is they need to work with this population and be able to be VR vendors. She understands that people don't necessarily need to go through the Allen Anderson training in order to be VR vendors, but can be certified VR counselors, rehab counseling, etc.

Stephaine shared with the Council what OVRS has been discussing regarding the next year. They would like to bring Allen Anderson back and have talked with Molly Holsapple and Mike Maley about this. VR is also interested in doing a pilot partnership plus and look at that pilot group as the target audience for Allen. They would like to have a meeting so that Allen could talk to people directly to address the concerns being brought up. There have been no final decisions made with Molly Holsapple beyond what has already been agreed between SPD and the MIG. One of the results of the separation of DHS and OHA is that VR has been asked to work more collaboratively with SPD. Mike Maley is developing a charter for this cross-division workgroup focusing on employment. There will be talk there and activities in the future that grow out of these efforts.

Molly Holsapple, policy analyst with the Office of Developmental Disabilities Services within SPD, has been charged with the implementation of the Employment First policy and is at this meeting representing Mike Maley. Her office has been partnering with OVRs and working with the Competitive Employment Project to help implement Employment First. Together the two offices are committed to improving their services, processes, and outcomes for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. They have been discussing different strategies to address the concerns brought up in the public testimony today. They are still discussing what a good strategy would be in having Allen Anderson back in this process and to help people better understand those things about motivation and other kinds of criteria and how these can and should relate to customized employment, timelines and all of those kinds of issues.

VR has just recently heard there might be additional resources available through the Medicaid Infrastructure Grant/Competitive Employment Project (MIG/CEP). The uncertainty of whether or not there would be funds available had been one of the factors holding up the movement forward on these issues. Two strategies that will be a part of this process will be that of provider capacity building in terms of having consistent training about the expectations for providers as it relates to supported and customized employment; this will be a joint effort between SPD and OVRs. They will be conducting more interagency training as SPD oversees long-term supports for these populations, and can also do groundwork in helping their clients with a path to employment and preparation for VR services in order to avoid wasting VR dollars. Molly's office will also be working to develop a set of expectations around job development, job coaching and providing ongoing support, looking at those from a national perspective. This is not something that SPD has done before and is working to get in step with VR in this process. These are some of the strategies that will be worked on in the 11 months remaining to the MIG/CEP funding.

Stephaine noted that she was sorry Tim Kral had left the meeting. She had talked with him about VR's plans, realizing there were going to be changes for some of his members and actually had offered to put some money on the table to help his membership with these changes. Unfortunately, he has not taken advantage of that offer. She encouraged any ORA members present to encourage Tim to reconsider this offer.

Gary referred to a few comments from the public input. The first was that job developers aren't just vendors, but can be partners also. The fact that there is a contract between the two parties doesn't negate the ability for them to be partners. There is an extremely common practice in corporate America now to build partners from vendors, which creates a whole different dynamic in terms of how

you work with one another. He said he was struck by the idea that people had to 'buy in' to the training and didn't hear an explanation of why potential vendors paid to get training they were required to get in order to be a vendor with VR.

Stephaine replied that OVRs has subsidized the cost of the Allen Anderson training; the only cost to job developers is \$200 for materials. OVRs feels this is a matter of professional development for job developers, which is a standard cost of doing business. OVRs doesn't feel it is responsible to take on the cost of job developers' professional development; as professionals, we have an obligation to increase our skill sets. Since they are moving toward performance-based expectations in the way they are doing business, OVRs felt that offering the training to job developers would help with this transition and knowing what OVRs' expectations would be of them. OVRs has offered scholarships to those who said they could not afford the \$200 and have gone on site to train groups of people for whom travel was problematic.

Anne Burns asked if there was the possibility of job developers who had been working with OVRs for five years or more to get the training for free, since it would be mostly a refresher.

Stephaine replied that the first part of the contract allowed for individuals to demonstrate their competency and have the option of not taking the training. However, in reviewing the data, there is an obvious issue with lack of effectiveness or VR would have better numbers. When the contract is re-issued, individuals will have the option of saying 'we don't think you should do this,' but they will need to find a way to work with OVRs, since it's not likely that VR's expectations are going to change. One of the things VR found was that job developers were not knocking on employer doors. Familiarity with employers is a very important part of creating customized employment; if job developers are touching base with employers frequently, they are more able to understand employer needs and make suggestions of individuals who can fulfill those needs.

Cynthia replied that she didn't disagree with what Stephaine was saying but one of the things the Council has heard through the letters and public testimony has been that job developers don't feel they're getting enough time to learn about the person they are representing to employers. She liked the comment that was made about the VR counselor sharing some information about the client with the job developer working with them. She expressed that she felt strongly that those working with her son would not have been able to succeed in finding him a position if they had not had the opportunity to get to know him and his abilities; this was key to selling his capabilities to an employer.

Stephaine noted that OVRS has heard this feedback along the way and has made changes to address that concern.

Cynthia also had concerns from the audit report and the needs assessment about the cost of the Allen Anderson model - \$647,000 and more spent before that. Stephaine said she has reviewed how much training Allen provided to OVRS and it turned out to be less than \$100 an hour. Kris Kennedy noted that this hourly cost was fairly accurate and comparable to other trainers of the caliber of Allen Anderson and Liz Fabiano. (The \$647,000 included expenses for Liz Fabiano as well.)

Liz Fox asked whether, with Allen not currently being under contract with VR, would mean additional expense to bring him back? Stephaine replied that it may be.

Cynthia said the SRC would recommend the use of trainers within Oregon who are very capable of offering training to job developers on working with individuals with disabilities. It would make sense to pull from the amount of expertise that exists within the state; it would be way more cost-effective and such individuals know our community. It doesn't seem like an economical option to have Allen Anderson back here, particularly when OVRS has just taken a 10% budget cut. Stephaine noted it is possible that Allen might return at his own expense.

Ted Wenk expressed that he understood that individuals with their CRCC are considered qualified on that basis and are exempted from having to take the Employment Outcomes Professional (EOP) II training. He asked whether OVRS had looked at other types of exceptions for other types of training.

Stephaine replied that it's true that individuals with their CRCC do not have to take the EOP II training, but ultimately it's about outcomes: if a job developer is not producing outcomes, they won't get a contract with OVRS. There will be an annual review to look at job developer outcomes. An individual who has spent \$19,000 and achieved one placement over the year is not likely to get their contract renewed. An emphasis on accountability and the wise use of state dollars as well as finding outcomes at a reasonable cost is driving decision making in state government at this point. The Allen Anderson model is a foundation being offered to potential vendors/job developers, on top of which they can add whatever training they like. Requiring this foundation has set up expectations and, quite frankly, consequences around performance.

Ted asked whether there were exceptions being made for people who have significant challenges and whose placement might take more money and or time?

Will there be alternate payment systems for individuals who might, for instance, take up to a year to place?

Stephaine replied that VR has been discussing this issue and whether there should be two levels. VR has paid for a lot of hours of services and said, "Well these are people who have significant challenges, so it's going to take more money/time." But after research, this has not necessarily been the case in other states using performance-based standards. This is something they can continue to look at over time.

OQRS going into an order of selection impacted the use of job developers; nobody was being referred to job developers for a very long time. This affected the percentages and numbers quite a bit. Another outcome of the Allen Anderson model was recognizing that there are people who can job develop on their own and to use counselors to support these individuals along with community-based resources that they are otherwise entitled to.

Cynthia noted that she has heard from some brokerages that they are no longer working with VR because of the confrontational atmosphere, but are going to job developers directly. The difference in the numbers between '09 and '10 could be due, in part, to the order of selection and many people were being served by brokerages because of that. There was an agreement that the brokerages could pay for job development up front until that population was taken off the list of those not yet being served. Another factor is that some brokerages have chosen not to have a relationship with VR because of the problems with getting clients served. Stephaine said that the number of clients working with VR through brokerages is so small that these factors likely wouldn't make a dent in VR's numbers. Molly Holsapple agreed stating that the number of DD referrals to VR was less than 3% of total referrals and between 3-5% at best.

Cynthia asked about whether the money to pay for Allen Anderson came out of MIG funds. Stephaine replied that it had not.

Cynthia inquired how this training avoided the RFP process if it didn't come out of MIG funding. Stephaine replied that it hadn't avoided the RFP process; OQRS did put out an RFP for these services. Any bids over \$5000 need to go through this process. Liz Fox asked that the Council be informed when an RFP goes out for any future training sessions of this type and Stephaine agreed stating that OQRS had been very mindful of the cost and careful to follow all the rules in putting out their RFP.

Stephaine noted another source of contention for job developers. DAS changed the way vendors are able to be added to the system. Potential vendors have to go through the “ORPIN” system now – a system that is hard to manipulate. This has resulted in the loss of vendors who couldn’t navigate the system. This is totally out of OVRs’ control. It has created a workload for VR but it doesn’t look like it’s going to be changed anytime soon.

BREAK

Budget Update

Stephaine Taylor informed the Council that OVRs would like Allen Anderson to come back for training with Molly Holsapple and the MIG grant staff to address the concerns put forward by the DD community. OVRs will put out an RFP for this.

The governor’s budget includes 10% cuts for OVRs; there will be some cut to administration costs. The agency budget is on track for our expenditures. The big issue will come in 2013-15. Because of general funds received last biennium, the state will have to come up with more general funds, but in this economy that’s not likely. OVRs will have a big maintenance of effort (MOE) issue then. There are talks of a 5% cut to RSA funding.

There are changes happening in DHS; staff from CAF, SPD and Long-Term Care are being moved to the new Oregon Health Authority (OHA) – this doesn’t leave much left. The governor is proposing a new agency that would focus on early childhood issues; there is \$93 million tied up in that.

OHA now has an organizational chart but there is still none for DHS. DHS staff don’t know who their new director will be.

Cynthia requested a copy of the OVRs budget be presented at each SRC quarterly meeting. It’s important that the Council be aware of the progress of the maintenance of effort situation, amongst other things. Judy Barker has been assisting the members of the Program Strategies and Budget Committee to understand these numbers. It would be great to have her explain things to the full Council.

Jackie Burr reported that the Department of Education is in the same situation with its maintenance of effort. They have asked for waiver from the federal government and if they don’t get it, the school districts will suffer.

The next RSA Monitoring Review of OVRs will be in 2014.

Committee Reports

Executive Committee Report:

Cynthia Owens informed the Council this committee will meet on March 9.

Business/Employment Committee Report:

No report available.

Legislative Advocacy Committee Report:

Sherry Stock reported on legislation the Brain Injury Association of Oregon (BIAOR) has been involved with, such as the 2009 SB381 - a mandate to insurance companies to cover cognitive rehab costs. Previously, insurance companies had been labeling various supports for brain injury, such as seeing a neural optometrist for special glasses, attending a day program, occupational therapy, and physical therapy as “experimental” and so OVRS would have to pick up the costs for these support services. Right now the bill has been modified and is currently before the legislature as LC1617 because insurance companies are working around the mandate and VR is still paying the bills for these services. Texas had similar problems and has been tutoring Oregon on how to reword the legislation to help this situation.

Membership Committee Report:

No report available.

Policy Committee Report:

No report available.

Program Effectiveness Committee Report:

Ted Wenk reported that this committee is continuing its work on future OVRS site visits.

Program Strategies and Budget Committee Report:

Gary Lanctot said this committee met last night and the issues discussed were covered by today’s meeting discussions. The committee will continue to look into the contracting process.

Consent Agenda

The membership application for Laurie Brooks was approved with yes votes from Anne Burns, Jackie Burr, Liz Fox, Victoria Haight, Scott Hatley, Linda Keller, Gary Lanctot, Patti Martin, Dodie McKenzie, Cynthia Owens, Sandy Reese, Becky Simpson, Sherry Stock and Ted Wenk and abstentions from Ann Balzell, Tony Marx and B.J. Rosenblad.

The Council noted an amendment to the draft minutes from November 2010 quarterly meeting. Sherry Stock made a motion to approve the minutes as amended. Jackie Burr seconded the motion. The consent agenda was approved with yes votes for Laurie Brooks membership from: Anne Burns, Jackie Burr, Liz Fox, Victoria Haight, Scott Hatley, Linda Keller, Gary Lanctot, Patti Martin, Dodie McKenzie, Cynthia Owens, Sandy Reese, Becky Simpson, Sherry Stock and Ted Wenk and abstentions from Ann Balzell, Tony Marx and B.J. Rosenblad.

Housekeeping: The next SRC Quarterly Meeting is scheduled for May 6, 2011 at the Mill Creek Inn in Salem.

The meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m.