

Minutes –April 5, 2012

SRC Performance Review Committee

SRC Performance Review Committee		
Thursday, April 5, 2012	10:00 am – 12:00 pm	RRMC/CVPS/Leahy Community Health Education Center 160 Allen Street, Rutland, VT 05701
Meeting called by	Ellie Marshall (chair) at 10:09 a.m.	
Members Present	Don Parrish, Jennifer Whitmore, William Pendlebury and Adam Leonard	
Members Absent	John Spinney, John Alexander and Christine McCarthy	
SRC Liaison	James Smith, VR Budget and Policy Manager	
SRC Coordinator	Rebekah M. Stephens	
Interpreters	Cory Brunner and Janice Wightman	
Speakers/Presenters	Susan Wells, VR	
Facilitator	-----	
Guests	None.	
1. Today's Agenda		
-----	-----	
Discussion	No changes to today's agenda.	
Conclusions	Agenda accepted.	
2. Approval of Minutes – February 2, 2012 Committee Meeting		
-----	[Presenter] Ellie Marshall	
Discussion	Don Parrish moved to accept minutes. Jennifer Whitmore 2nded.	
Conclusions	Passed unanimously.	
Action Items		Person Responsible
Put approved minutes on web site, VTSRC.org		Rebekah M. Stephens
		Deadline
		4/25/2012
3. Discussion on Policy and Procedure 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	There was supposed to be money set aside for a pilot program to meet the needs of people with the most severe disabilities. The pilot program never got off the ground because the funding was lost. Can we do anything to better serve these clients? Vermont VR works under "Order of Selection". Everyone who is medically eligible will not necessarily receive VR services. OOS is used to categorize individuals into 1, 2, and 3 categories based on severity of disability. Currently VT VR is servicing categories 1 and 2. Once an individual qualifies for VR services they receive all services available to get them employed. The pilot program was meant to provide case management for long term services needed by consumers with the most severe disabilities. VR is prohibited from providing long term case management on a regular basis. Currently VR works with available service partners to provide consumers with the long term wrap around services they need. Long term funding is outside VR control. At this time, evidence does not show that individuals with the most severe disabilities are not being served by VR. VR is able to take a look at how consumers with the most severe disabilities are being served by VR currently. Don Parrish wants to know not just if they are being served but if the services are adequate. The question is "Is there a way to do things so that those with the most severe disabilities get the funding for services to adequately obtain and maintain employment?" The first step is to define "severely disabled." Currently about 90% of VR consumers fall under category 1 disabilities which is defined as "most severe disabilities." Currently there is no stratification of funding based on what category of disability a consumer qualifies under. Whether a category 1 or 2, a consumer has all VR services available to them. James Smith believes that looking at consumers, who typically need long term wrap around services, such as, those with borderline IQs and mental health issues would be a good starting point for answering this question. He doesn't agree that the OOS is the issue at this time. Continuing to look at 28 closures is also a good idea. James Smith suggested VR do a facilitated focus group to take a deeper look into this issue.	
Conclusions	Ellie Marshall summed up the discussion. Performance Review will continue to look at 28 closures. Clayton Clark will be asked to pull out information from the 28 closures that includes type of disability and reason for closure.	

Minutes –April 5, 2012

SRC Performance Review Committee

28 Closures will be put on June 2012 agenda.		
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Contact Clayton Clark to request information on disability type and reason for closure for 28's.	Rebekah M. Stephens	4/25/2012
Invite Clayton Clark to June 7, 2012 Performance Review Committee meeting	Rebekah M. Stephens	4/25/2012
Put 28 closures on June 7, 2012 Performance Review Committee meeting agenda	Rebekah M. Stephens	5/22/2012
4. Planning for the FY 2012 State Plan – Review and Input on 8 Focus Elements		
-----	Susan Wells and James Smith	
Discussion	Per the feds, if there are no major changes to a section then the section does not need to be updated.	
Susan Wells, VR, has been charged with writing the State Plan this year. Attachment 4.2©: Input of State Rehabilitation Council - Ellie Marshall proposes that James writes the section and the Full SRC will review it. Attachment 4.11©(1): State Goals and Priorities - Susan explained that all 2010 information in this draft is correct. This is the most accurate information that VR has at this time. Don Parrish requested a summary of trend data to be put in a spreadsheet for easier reference and review. Susan and James will put together a spreadsheet of the last 5 years of trend data for easy reference and review by committee members. The committee discussed 4.11©(1), #7 - "Increase capacity to serve un-served or underserved populations; specifically:" of the FFY2012 Goal and Priorities in depth. The first 5 populations were the focus of the discussion. 1. Individuals with measured lqs between 70 and 80. Per James, currently there is no targeted strategy and no current data source for this population. The target will be to develop a measurable data source by which to measure the success rate for this population. 2. Individuals with TBI (traumatic brain injury). VR currently has employment data on this population. However, the issue at this time is how to set a target for this population when there is no current strategy on how to achieve the target. James wants to make sure that targets set are obtainable. Populations 3 (Individuals with psychiatric disabilities), 4 (Individuals in the Autism Spectrum), and 5 (Individuals with other significant disabilities who require case management services) were also included in the discussion. VR will continue to pursue case management services and where available collect baseline data for these 5 populations. VR's intent is to continue to pursue grants and other money sources that would enable VR to create and/or expand services to these target populations. James and Susan briefly went through the remainder of the focus elements with the committee. Generally, other than some wording regarding current status of progress, all good.		
Conclusions	Great work Susan and James. Thank you. Susan and James will continue to work on developing a finer draft of the focus elements for review by the committee. The committee will review the last five years of trend data and final draft of the focus elements at the June 7, 2012 Performance Review Committee meeting.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Draft of Section 4.2©: Input of State Rehabilitation Council for review by Full SRC	James Smith	5/29/2012
Distribute final draft of focus elements for review by PR Committee	James Smith/Susan Wells/ Rebekah Stephens	5/24/2012
Distribute trend data –past 5 years spreadsheet to PR Committee for review	James Smith/Susan Wells/ Rebekah Stephens	5/24/2012
Put trend data and final draft of focus elements on June 7, 2012 PR agenda	Rebekah M. Stephens	5/22/2012
5. Other Business		
-----	-----	
Discussion	None.	
Conclusions	None.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
None.	n/a	n/a
6. Adjournment		
-----	-----	
Discussion	Don Parrish moved to adjourn. William Pendlebury 2nded.	
Conclusions	Meeting adjourned at 12:05 pm. Unanimously.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Draft minutes respectfully submitted to committee for approval	Rebekah M. Stephens	5/4/2012
To be approved by committee on June 7, 2012	PR Committee	6/7/2012
Upload approved minutes to website	Rebekah M. Stephens	6/15/2012