

Minutes – October 4, 2012

SRC Performance Review Committee

SRC Performance Review Committee			
Thursday, October 4, 2012	10:00 am – 12:00 pm	Agency of Natural Resources, 100 Mineral Street, Suite 304, Springfield, VT 05156	
Meeting called by	Ellie Marshall (Chair) at 10:03 am.		
Members Present	William Pendlebury, Sam Liss, Jennifer Whitmore, P. Neal Meier, Adam Leonard		
Members Absent	John Alexander and John Spinney		
SRC Liaison	James Smith, VR Budget and Policy Manager		
SRC Coordinator	Rebekah M. Stephens		
Interpreters	Elizabeth Bjerke and Cory Brunner		
Speakers/Presenters	Clayton Clark		
Facilitator	-----		
Guests	-----		
1. Today's Agenda			
-----	-----		
Discussion	None.		
Conclusions	Today's agenda approved.		
2. Minutes of April 5, 2012 Committee Meeting & June 7, 2012 Cancelled Committee Meeting			
-----	-----		
Discussion	Sam Liss made motion to approve. Jennifer Whitmore 2nded.		
Conclusions	April 5, 2012 and June 7, 2012 minutes approved.		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Upload approved April 5, 2012 minutes to website www.VTSRC.org		Rebekah Stephens	10/22/2012
Upload approved June 7, 2012 minutes to website www.VTSRC.org		Rebekah Stephens	10/22/2012
3. Presentation and Continued Discussion of Unsuccessful Closures (28)			
-----	Clayton Clark		
Discussion	Clayton handed out packet. Clayton defined squishy..."it is soft, wet, and spongy."		
However, when it comes to data; sloppily sentimental is the appropriate definition. Data today focused on timeliness of process from application to IPE to closure for consumers with mental health disabilities.			
The data was compiled using employment closures. According to the data; individuals with mental health disabilities find employment sooner than those with other disabilities. The data query was done using diagnosis and therefore does not separate out CRT consumers from other mental health disability consumers. Committee members agreed that it will be prudent to separate the data out between CRT consumers and other mental health disability consumers. The data showed that consumers with TBI take the longest to go from application to IPE to closure. Based on data, James Smith made two observations:			
1. It appears that consumers with a mental health diagnosis are not being screened out and as a result are being served appropriately, and 2. Time from IPE to closure is not taking any longer for consumers with mental health diagnosis than those consumers with non-mental health diagnosis. The data did show, however, that the process for consumers with a mental health diagnosis is taking longer from the IPE to closure when the closure is unsuccessful (28 – no employment result). William Pendlebury hypothesized that due to the complicated nature of cases involving a mental health diagnosis, cases can be left in status 10 (after application & before IPE) longer in order to give the VR counselor and the consumer sufficient time to develop a Plan to meet the unique circumstances of a mental health consumer. James Smith explained the timeline set by the RSA for working a VR case. Once an individual applies for VR services, VR has 60 days to determine eligibility. Once eligibility is determined VR has 90 days to put the consumer on an			

Minutes – October 4, 2012

SRC Performance Review Committee

IPE. The data today, shows that consumers are being served well within the mandated time guidelines.		
Clayton explained that the data was also broken down by regional office. The Committee discussed the differences between offices and determined that it would be beneficial for Diane Dalmasse to speak to the regional managers about the differences in closures between offices. For example, Rutland and Morrisville have low levels of unsuccessful closures after an IPE, however, their closures without employment before an IPE are high. William Pendlebury offered that there could be many reasons for this; such as; a person gets employment before an IPE can be done and doesn't return to VR for services. A deeper dive into individual case files would be needed to determine the circumstances behind each closure. The Committee members agreed that a deeper look into this data is warranted. The data shows that over the past 5 years, 40% of consumers with a mental health diagnosis do not make it to an IPE. James Smith agreed with committee members. When 4 out of 10 mental health consumers never make it to an IPE, it raises a question. "This is the exact reason for having this Committee; these questions need to be asked." James and Diane will share this data with the managers at the next VR regional managers meeting. More information is needed before conclusions can be reached. Neal Meier requested that data showing the actual number of consumers be provided in addition to the percentages already shown on the data results. The Committee discussed the RAVR (Rural Agricultural Vocational Rehabilitation) program. This program primarily serves farmers. The primary disability seen in this population is physical injury related to farming. Coding for mental health disabilities for this population is generally secondary.		
Conclusions	The data shows that VR is timely handling the process from application to IPE to closure for consumers with mental health disabilities. The data also shows that closure data is different throughout the regional offices. A deeper dive into the data will be conducted before any conclusions are drawn.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Clayton Clark to separate data on mental health 28 closures between CRT and other mental health disability consumers to see if a difference in overall process timeliness. To be presented at next PR Committee meeting	Clayton Clark	12/6/2012
Diane Dalmasse and James Smith to present today's data on regional office closure differences at the next regional managers meeting and then provide Committee with a summary of information learned via email for review prior to next Committee meeting	James Smith and Diane Dalmasse	11/26/2012
Discussion of information learned at regional managers meeting to be put on December agenda	Rebekah Stephens	11/27/2012
James Smith will work with VR regional managers to develop some strategies on how to address the questions raised by today's data: Specifically, "Why 40% of mental health disability consumer cases close unsuccessfully prior to IPE?"	James Smith	TBD
Clayton Clark to compile data on actual number of consumers that generated percentages and email the results to PR members for review	Clayton Clark	11/27/2012
Clayton Clark to compile data for past 5 years using Department of Labor wage data to see if VR consumer cases (all disabilities) closed without employment actually became employed. Cases that closed prior to IPE and closed after IPE are to be included in data. To be presented at next PR Committee meeting	Clayton Clark	12/6/2012
4. Review and Discussion of Trend Data and Final Draft of FY 2012 State Plan Focus Elements		
-----	James Smith	
Discussion	In Spring of 2012, the Committee raised the question, " Are the targets for the	

Minutes – October 4, 2012

SRC Performance Review Committee

<p>State plan reasonable?” James and Committee reviewed the trend data and final draft. #1 – Consumer satisfaction with DVR services will increase. The Consumer Satisfaction Survey is done by an external company. 700 VR consumers from around the State were surveyed. Currently 91% of the consumers surveyed are satisfied with DVR services. James feels that maintaining this percentage, with the best scenario of increasing success, is a reasonable goal. The Committee agrees. #2 – Consumer earnings will increase beyond the rate of inflation. The measurement used for this goal is the average hourly wage of VR consumers compared to average VT wages for non-VR consumers. Currently 62% is the average. #3 – More consumers will be employed and the rate that consumers maintain employment will increase. There has been a drop in this category. Goal is to increase from 60% - 65%. VR is not on track for this goal. However, on the bright side, the national rate for this goal is 54%. VT is doing better than the national average. It is still troubling that 4 out of 10 consumers never get to employment. VR is continuing to work on this goal. #4 – Vermont employers will increase their use of DVR as an employment agency. VR is using the computer program, “Sales Force”, to develop and maintain a database of VT employers. “Sales Force” is an account management program developed in the private sector and modified to fit VR needs. The software was populated with 3000 VT employer contacts. All CWS team members have the capability to view and add additional employers to the system. This software has alleviated a lot of the double work for VR counselors and excess contacts with employers. “Sales Force” provides detailed information on each employer. It is helping VR employment employees to have effective contacts with employers. It is a great tool for maintaining employer information for VR. #5 – DVR employees will be satisfied with their jobs. Survey results for 2012 show 94% of VR employees are satisfied with their jobs. #6 – All DVR staff will have the competencies to do their jobs. There has been a slight drop in this goal. Committee members speculated as to why there has been a drop: layoffs and new computer software. #7 – Increase capacity to serve un-served or underserved populations. #8 – DVR will work in collaboration with DOL to ensure people with disabilities have access to services through the state workforce investment system. #9 – DVR will work to improve the outcomes of community supported employment providers serving individuals with developmental disabilities and cross disabilities. #10 – DVR will work to improve the outcomes of community providers serving individuals with severe mental illness. Numbers have dropped in this area. An increase of 30% for the State fiscal year 2012 has been seen in this area. The increase in success is being attributed to the introduction of incentives and penalties for employments goals into grant awards. Support agencies receive more money for better results. The Supportive Employment and CRT programs have seen increases in successful outcomes since the introduction of grant incentives and penalties. James referenced the “Hawthorne Effect”; just paying attention to an area can cause an increase in outcome. James has done an amazing job of marketing these incentives and penalties to the program providers. All grants and contracts are performance based. VT has been the test area for these incentives and penalties for the nation. CWS and Progressive Employment have also had an impact on the increased successful outcomes. What is not known at this time if the increased rates in CRT will result in an increase of sustainable employment for these consumers.</p>		
Conclusions	<p>In order to allow sufficient time to review State Plan targets, the Performance Review Committee will begin review of next year’s targets at February 2013 committee meeting. The Committee wants to review data on VR consumers who have retained employment for more than 2 years.</p>	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Review of data on VR consumers who have retained employment for more than 2 years. To be presented at next PR Committee meeting	Clayton Clark	12/6/2012
“Sales Force” presentation to SRC	Hugh Bradshaw	TBD
Present Staff Satisfaction Survey results to PR committee for review	James Smith	12/6/2012

Minutes – October 4, 2012

SRC Performance Review Committee

Review of State Plan targets to be put on February 7, 2013 PR Committee meeting agenda	Rebekah Stephens	1/24/2013
5. Review of PR Response to Policy & Procedures Committee Question, “Is the Division living up to the intent of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (as amended) regarding the mandate to provide adequate services to people with the most severe disabilities?”		
-----	-----	
Discussion	Committee members reviewed response. The question of who defines severe disability was put on the table. Diane Dalmasse responded that federal law defines severe disability. The PR Committee does not need to define it. Relying on the federal definition, the Committee surmised that individuals receiving SSDI have already been determined to meet the requirements for severe disability. The Committee charged Clayton Clark with the task of gathering data on case closures for VR consumers receiving SSDI. Clayton is to also look at the Consumer Satisfaction results and do a comparison between VR consumers with severe disability and those with a lesser categorization.	
Conclusions	Add additional action items above to PR response to P&P Committee.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Action items to Clayton Clark to be added to PR Response	Rebekah Stephens	10/31/2012
Presentation of data to PR Committee on case closures for VR consumers receiving SSDI	Clayton Clark	TBD
Presentation of data to PR Committee on comparison of satisfaction with VR services for consumers with severe disability categorization and for those with a lesser categorization	Clayton Clark	TBD
6. Other Business		
Discussion	None.	
Conclusions	None.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
None.	n/a	n/a
7. Adjournment		
Discussion	Sam Liss made motion to adjourn. William Pendlebury 2nded.	
Conclusions	Committee members voted unanimously. Meeting adjourned at 11:51 pm.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Draft minutes respectfully submitted for approval	Rebekah Stephens	11/2/2012
Draft minutes uploaded to website www.VTSRC.org	Rebekah Stephens	11/9/2012
Minutes approved	PR Committee Members	2/7/2013
Approved minutes uploaded to website www.VTSRC.org	Rebekah Stephens	3/1/2013