

Minutes –February 7, 2013

SRC Performance Review Committee

SRC Performance Review Committee		
Thursday, February 7, 2013	10:00 am – 11:55 pm	Division of Vocational Rehabilitation 156 South Village Green, Middlebury, VT 05753
Meeting called by	Ellie Marshall, Chair at 10:00 am.	
Members Present	Sam Liss, John Alexander and Adam Leonard	
Members Absent	P. Neal Meier, William Pendlebury, John Spinney and Jennifer Whitmore (approved leave of absence)	
SRC Liaison	James Smith, VR Budget and Policy Manager	
SRC Coordinator	Rebekah M. Stephens	
Interpreters	n/a	
Speakers/Presenters	Renee Kievit-Kylar (VR Transition Projects and JOBS Program Coordinator) via phone and Clayton Clark, VR Senior Planning Coordinator	
Facilitator	-----	
Guests	Laban Hill, newly appointed SRC member	
1. Today's Agenda		
-----	-----	
Discussion	James suggested switching agenda items #3 and #4 as Renee Kievit-Kylar will be participating by phone and both items are content heavy.	
Conclusions	Members approved switching agenda items #3 and #4 on today's agenda.	
2. Approval of Minutes – October 4, 2012 Committee Meeting		
-----	-----	
Discussion	No discussion. Sam Liss made motion to approve. John Alexander 2nded.	
Conclusions	Approved unanimously.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Approved minutes to be uploaded to website www.VTSRC.org	Rebekah Stephens	2/28/2013
3. Discussion on Transition Counselors and Current Available Services		
-----	Renee Kievit-Kylar, VR Transition Projects and JOBS Program Coordinator) via phone	
Discussion	VR is required by statute to interact with high school IEP (Individualized Education Plan) students by the age of 16 years old. The intent of this interaction is to ease the transition between graduation and entering post secondary education or work environments. In order to facilitate interaction between VR and the schools; a good working relationship is needed. A joint effort is needed. However, it is difficult to get schools to focus on transitions. The VR Transition Project has been working diligently to provide all VT schools with access to transition counselors (TCs). Currently there are 16 TCs in the State. Each TC covers 4 or 5 schools. A lot of travel is required by each TC. The current case load for each TC is between 100 – 120 students. On occasion the case load amounts can jump to 170 students per TC. The majority of schools have been extremely cooperative with allowing a TC into their school. The question on the table today is: "Are these current services adequate to meet the needs of the transitioning students?" In order to adequately meet the needs of each transitioning student, every TC is equipped with a laptop and an iPhone. Each TC has access to an Employment Specialist. And protocols have been developed that clarify the role of each TC. The Transition Project has developed a 3-point plan that will allow for the hiring of Youth Employment Specialists (YESs) designated solely for the Transition Project. The YES's interaction starts when the student graduates from school. Currently the TCs are hosting meet and greets in each of their schools. This allows special educators, parents and students to become familiar with the services offered by the TC in their school. Unlike the YES position, which concentrates solely on employment; the role of the TC is to assist the school in developing the transition plan for each of the IEP students. The	

Minutes –February 7, 2013

SRC Performance Review Committee

<p>Transition plan is part of the formal IEP for the student and may include recommendations for on the job Supports or additional training. The TC sets up the plan that the YES will work from when the student graduates from high school. Because YESs are contracted through VABIR it is easier to bring on additional YES positions. Whereas, TCs are state employees and the process for hiring additional TCs is much more difficult. John Alexander suggested that TCs become involved with students much sooner than the senior year of high school. Renee responded that by statute schools are required to have a transition plan for all IEP students by the age of 16. Though TCs are involved in assisting the schools with writing a transition plan it is the responsibility of the school to develop the plan. The special educator is required to invite the TC to IEP meetings. The TC may attend in a solely advisory capacity only. John Alexander suggested VR provide education/training to special educators on the process of putting together a strong transition plan. The Department of Education just received a 5 year grant for developing a training program on transition planning for special educators. Renee and Diane Dalmasse meet with John Spinney, Department of Education, Special Education Consultant, Post Secondary Transition Specialist Integrated Support for Learning, on a regular basis in order to facilitate the joint efforts between VR and DOE. TCs encourage parents to be involved with the transition process. Parents and students are invited to meet with TCs outside of the school setting. In an ideal world, TCs would be involved as early as possible in the transition plan process, however, there are just not enough TCs to go around at this time. James Smith offered that he is not sure that earlier involvement by TCs would be beneficial. Ultimately it is the responsibility of the school to develop a strong transition plan. That is why the development of a training program for special educators is being developed. Schools also have the ability to contract directly with VABIR for YESs. Ellie Marshall suggested that VR could offer schools additional clarification on the role of TCs in schools and suggestions on how to develop a strong transition plan. The Transition Project has already provided schools with a written document detailing the role of a TC in a school and the steps the school can take to develop a strong transition plan. Renee will email the document to Ellie Marshall for distribution to the PR Committee members. Rebekah Stephens will post the document to the SRC website once received from Ellie. Renee feels that the document has helped the overall process, however, it is an ongoing discussion between TCs and special educators. One of the main issues is the high turnover of special educators in schools. The information is being lost from one hire to the next. James Smith asked the Committee members if this is a topic that they feel needs more in-depth follow up? The question of adequate services is being addressed by VR. VR has made massive strides in this area over the past decade and efforts to improve transition services are ongoing. Plans for additional resources are being developed. John Alexander suggested that in order to draw more families to the existing services, the focus should be on quality not quantity and success stories should be publicized. John also suggested using an Order Of Selection process in schools to determine who gets transition services. Adam Leonard wanted to know if the VR Consumer Surveys results for the age group of 16 – 25 years are available for review?</p>		
Conclusions	<p>Ellie Marshall requested a one page summary from Renee focusing on the areas of concern identified by the Transition Project and how VR is currently addressing each of these areas. Once this summary is received the Committee members will review and determine if a deeper dive into this topic is necessary.</p>	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
School - Transition Document to be emailed to Ellie Marshall	Renee Kievit-Kylar	2/28/2013
School – Transition Document to be emailed to Rebekah Stephens	Ellie Marshall	2/28/2013
School – Transition Document to be uploaded to www.VTSRC.org	Rebekah Stephens	3/5/2013

Minutes –February 7, 2013

SRC Performance Review Committee

One Page Summary on Areas of Concern Identified by Transition Project and how VR is currently addressing these areas to be emailed to Ellie Marshall	Renee Kievit-Kylar	2/28/2013
One Page Summary to be distributed to PR Committee members for review	Ellie Marshall /Rebekah Stephens	2/28/2013
Put discussion of One Page Summary and decision to conduct a deeper dive or not on April 2013 PR Committee agenda	Rebekah Stephens	3/20/2013
4. Review of State Plan Targets/Goals for 2013		
-----	James Smith, VR Budget and Policy Manager	
Discussion	James handed out 2 documents to Committee members: State Plan FFY Goals and Priorities and FFY Data Check In (updates data from first document). James suggests that Committee members move this agenda item to April 2013 and take the time to review the information in detail.	
	Members agreed with suggestion. Adam Leonard wanted to know if VT VR could compare the results of its Consumer Satisfaction Survey with other states survey results. Diane Dalmasse responded that most states conduct their surveys in house (internally), unlike VT, which hires an external 3 rd party. Diane is not sure that survey results from other states would be available from internal VR surveys. Sam Liss added that he recently received an email from Marlene Malloy of the Michigan State Rehabilitation Council and the National Coalition of State Rehabilitation Councils on the topic of “internal and external consumer surveys: Which is better?” Diane requested Sam forward the email to her.	
Conclusions	Committee members will review the information and be prepared to make recommendations and/or suggestions at April Committee meeting.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Put Review of State Plan Targets/Goals for 2013 on April PR agenda	Rebekah Stephens	3/20/2013
Email reminder to James Smith to send electronic version of State Plan Documents to Rebekah Stephens to forward out to all PR Committee members	Rebekah Stephens	2/19/2013
Email reminder to all Committee members to review State Plan documents 2 weeks prior to April PR meeting	Rebekah Stephens	3/20/2013
Email Marlene Malloy’s, MRC/NCSRC (Michigan Rehabilitation Council/National Coalition of State Rehabilitation Councils) email on internal or external consumer survey comparisons to Diane Dalmasse and Rebekah Stephens	Sam Liss	2/15/2013
5. Continued Discussion on Unsuccessful Closures (28) as related to Mental Health Disability Consumers, Total Number of Consumers with 28 Closures Used to Generate Percentages, and 5 year Trending of 28 Closures that Resulted in Employment Apart from VR Involvement		
-----	Clayton Clark, VR Senior Planning Coordinator	
Discussion	Clayton distributed “Mental Health Consumer Outcomes Data” memo to members. Clayton organized the data presented today into 3 categories: 1. Consumers with a Mental Health Disability by Office, 2. Comparison of Mental Health Outcomes with Supported Employment and 3. 28 Closures with Income. Category 1. is clearly defined and detailed in the memo. The memo broke down the information by office and showed the actual number of consumers used to determine the percentages. Under Category 2. “All Other Closures” was discussed by members. “All Other Closures” represents consumers that never make it to an IPE or drop out of the VR process for other reasons. A consumer may secure employment prior to making it to the IPE. Consumers that participate in Supported Employment have better employment outcomes then those that do not. Supported Employment services for consumers with mental health issues require more intensive services. These services are supplied by the mental health agency. VR contracts with the mental health agency for these services. Services can include but are not limited to on-the-job support or an occasional check in over a period of time. The CRT (Community Rehabilitation and Treatment)	

Minutes –February 7, 2013

SRC Performance Review Committee

program plays a large role in these on-going support services. Consumers that receive Supported		
Employment services are participating in the CRT program. However, not all consumers that participate in		
the CRT program receive Supported Employment services. Laban Hill wanted to know what VR can do to		
reduce the 33% number of consumers that never make it to an IPE. Clayton suggested peeling back the		
33% number and determining the reasons behind the closure. Clayton suggests pulling out all consumers		
who secure employment before reaching the IPE stage. James Smith agreed, that he too, is concerned with		
the 33% number and would like to see a deeper dive into the data. Clayton will provide this data for the next		
PR meeting in April. Adam Leonard wanted to know how these mental health numbers compare to the		
overall general VR consumer population. Category 3. Information was pulled from a comparison of the VR		
numbers and DOL (Department of Labor) numbers. Data is from in-state employment numbers only and		
does not include self-employed data. Clayton arbitrarily chose the income level of \$1500.00 per quarter or		
\$500.00 per month. He wanted to make sure the data had enough meat because DOL includes wages of		
\$1.00 in their data. The data shows that a “significant number of 28 clients have income during the		
quarter of closure and 12 months after closure.”		
Conclusions	Clayton will provide Rebekah Stephens with the electronic version of all previous	
	memos on this topic. Rebekah will forward out to PR Committee members for review prior to April 2013	
	committee meeting. The PR Committee will continue to dive deeper into this topic.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Provide electronic versions of all prior “28” memos to PR Committee	Clayton Clark /	3/5/2013
members for review prior to April meeting	Rebekah Stephens	
Put discussion of “33% All Other Closures” on April 2013 agenda	Rebekah Stephens	3/20/2013
6. Other Business		
Discussion	None.	
Conclusions	None.	
7. Adjournment		
-----	-----	
Discussion	Adam Leonard made motion to adjourn. Sam Liss 2nded.	
Conclusions	Meeting adjourned at 11:50 a.m.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Draft minutes respectfully submitted for approval	Rebekah Stephens	3/8/2013
Draft minutes emailed to all Committee members	Rebekah Stephens	3/8/2013
Minutes approved	Committee	4/4/2013
Approved minutes uploaded to website www.VTSRC.org	Rebekah Stephens	4/12/2013