

# Minutes –April 4, 2013

## SRC Performance Review Committee

SRC Performance Review Committee		
Thursday, April 4, 2013	10:00 am – 12:00 pm	VABVI, 60 Kimball Avenue, South Burlington, VT 05403
Meeting called by	Ellie Marshall (chair) at 10:06 am.	
Members Present	Laban Hill, John Alexander, Sam Liss, William Pendlebury	
Members Absent	Adam Leonard, John Spinney and Jennifer Whitmore	
SRC Liaison	James Smith, VR Budget and Policy Manager	
SRC Coordinator	Rebekah M. Stephens	
Interpreters	Cory Brunner and Barb Walker	
Speakers/Presenters	Susan Wells, Director MIG/Vermont Works VR and Clayton Clark, VR Senior Planning Coordinator	
Facilitator	-----	
Guests	Ellen Vaut, Michele Hubert and Anthony Williams	
<b>1. Today's Agenda</b>		
-----	-----	
<b>Discussion</b>	No discussion. John Alexander made motion to approve. Sam Liss 2nded.	
<b>Conclusions</b>	Approved.	
<b>2. Approval of Minutes – February 7, 2013 Committee Meeting</b>		
-----	Ellie Marshall	
<b>Discussion</b>	No discussion. No motion.	
<b>Conclusions</b>	Minutes approved unanimously.	
<b>Action Items</b>		<b>Person Responsible</b>
Upload approved minutes to <a href="http://www.VTSRC.org">www.VTSRC.org</a>		Rebekah Stephens
		4/17/2013
<b>3. Review of State Plan Targets/Goals for 2013</b>		
45 minutes	James Smith	
<b>Discussion</b>	James explained why PR committee reviews the State Plan Targets and Goals.	
There is a joint responsibility between VR and SRC to develop State Plan goals and priorities. The goals and priorities are quite broad. The measures are more specific and targets relate directly to the measures.		
Laban Hill wanted to know why time spent with a client by a counselor is not measured by VR. Susan Wells responded that successful outcomes can't really be measured by time spent with client. A counselor may spend a lot of time with a client and not have a successful outcome. Or a counselor may spend a lesser time with a client and achieve a successful outcome. William Pendlebury explained that a counselor needs to manage time between "client time" and paper work. William is hopeful that the new computer system will lessen the paperwork burden and allow more time with clients. James suggested also looking at amount of time counselors and employment staff spend in meetings with employers, as meetings with employers should be considered time spent for the benefit of clients. James can't commit to adding this measure to this year's state plan, however, he recommends that PR take a deeper dive into this topic. VR is currently looking into this measurement also. Ellie Marshall suggested PR start with the question, "How do we measure time spent with clients?" The meeting was redirected back to current State Plan.		
Goal 1. Consumer satisfaction with DVR services will increase – In 2011, 91% overall satisfaction. The target is to maintain the 91%. James explained that Brian Robinson, the 3 <sup>rd</sup> party which conducts the survey recommended that maintaining this number would be realistic. Ellie wanted to know why a target to increase by even one percent would not be achievable? James explained that Brian stated any large organization will find it difficult to increase from a 91% because of overall participation in survey by staff. Committee agrees maintaining target is reasonable. Goal 2. Consumer earnings will increase beyond the		

# Minutes –April 4, 2013

## SRC Performance Review Committee

rate of inflation. There has been a slight decline in this area from 62% to 61%. Per James, it may be due to the recession and its effect on wages during this period. The target is 64%. John Alexander wanted to know why VR consumers are being compared to overall DOL numbers? James explained that this is a federally mandated measure. James offered that it is most likely used because it provides a consistent year by year measurement of this goal. And it allows measurement state by state. It is a fairer standard because of the differences in wage levels across the country. James recommends setting this target at 63% because it is a tough area in which to move the needle. Committee agrees that 63% is realistic. Committee agrees that looking for a large increase when there has been a decline would be unrealistic. The second goal under this area is related to individuals who come to VR and their wages are not the sole source of their daily support. These individuals may have a family member or other source of income as their primary support. The target in this area is 47%. Committee agrees to 47%. Goal 3. More consumers will be employed and the rate that consumers maintain employment will increase. There has been a decline in this area from 62 to 58%. The PR committee has already invested a lot of time and resources into the review of closures. Because of the decline in this area, the Committee agrees to 62% as a target goal. Current data on retention – post 2 year closures is not available at this time. Goal 4. Vermont employers will increase their use of DVR as an employment agency through Creative Workforce Solutions. Data in this area is tracked through the Sales Force program. The proposed target was to record 1000 employers in Sales Force by 2012. VR recorded 5139 employers. There are approximately 30,000 VT employers that have at least 3 employees. James would like to see an increase to 7500 employers tracked via Sales Force by 2014. James feels that this will provide a decent penetration rate. Committee agrees with 7500 employers by 2014. Goal 5. DVR employees will be satisfied with their jobs. VR conducts a staff satisfaction survey every 2 years. Satisfaction rate increased to 93.1% in 2012. James suggests a maintenance target of 93.1%. Committee agrees. Goal 6. All DVR staff will have the skills and competencies to do their jobs. There was a decline of over 6 percentage points in this area. There has been a high turnover of staff in past 2 years. The decline in this goal may be reflective of new staff members requiring additional support and training. James feels that target needs to be above 90% in this area. VR is concerned with this decline and has been increasing training and support of all staff members. Committee agrees to a 93% target as reasonable. Goal 7. Continue to pursue funding opportunities for case management services to un-served or under-served populations; specifically: Individuals with measured IQs between 70 and 80, Individuals with TBI, Individuals with psychiatric disabilities, Individuals with other significant disabilities who require case management services, Individuals in the Autism Spectrum range of disorders, Individuals exiting the correctional system, Individuals with alcohol/ substance abuse dependence/abuse disorders (AODA), Individuals with disabilities who are veterans and individuals with disabilities who are not primary English speakers. There is good news and bad news in these areas. Tracking in these areas needs to be continued. James feels that veterans should be kept at 200. Committee agrees. Goal 8. DVR will work in collaboration with the DOL to ensure people with disabilities have access to services through the state workforce investment system. Hard data in this area is not available at this time. Goal 9. DVR will work to improve the outcomes of community supported employment providers serving individuals with developmental disabilities. The goal was 200 closures. Actual data shows 226 closures. James feels that this number reflects current program incentives. Funding incentives were added to grants for current providers. James recommends keeping target at 225. Achievement of current numbers was obtained by holding service provider organizations to standards. James doesn't believe numbers will increase much over this at this time. Committee agrees to 225 target. 2012 goal for total number of people working in supported employment was 1000. James suggests a modest 3% increase for 2013. The Committee agrees to an increase to 1140 people. Goal 10. DVR will work to improve the outcomes of community providers serving

# Minutes –April 4, 2013

## SRC Performance Review Committee

individuals with severe mental illness. This area shows some improvement with 137 successful closures in 2012. Total number of people employed in this area is not yet known as data is pending. However, James offered, that with known partial data available a very slight increase has been seen. VR is hopeful that a corner has been turned. Target of 900 people is probably unlikely. Work with supported employment is ongoing. Performance based grants may help. A 2014 goal of 700 is reasonable. Committee agrees. The CRT population is aging. Younger people are not getting involved with CRT programs. James feels that program needs to change to attract the younger consumers. Ellie feels it may take years for this shift to take place. James shared that he struggles with every year on how to address the state plan with the SRC. James is open to any ideas on how to address the state plan in the future. Ellie wanted to know if SRC input is helpful? James feels that it is. However, if there is a suggestion on the process of getting SRC input, a discussion can occur. Laban feels that consistent measurement over time is essential. John Alexander wanted to know if counselors have set hours for consumer appointments and how are walk-ins handled. William responded that the process depends on the particular office. Some offices have a counselor-of-the-day to handle walk-ins. John wanted to know if counselors are accessible to clients. William responded that counselors are supposed to call consumers back within 48 hours.		
<b>Conclusions</b>	Great work James and Susan. VR is on the right track. Performance Review Committee will look into taking a deeper dive into measuring counselor time with clients.	
<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Put discussion of deeper dive into counselor time with clients on June PR agenda	Rebekah Stephens	5/22/2013
<b>4. Continued Discussion from February 7, 2013 PR Committee Meeting RE: Transition Counseling Initiative Response and if a deeper dive into this topic is warranted at this time?</b>		
20 minutes	-----	
<b>Discussion</b>	James stated that he made a recommendation at the last meeting that this topic not be a focus for the SRC; as VR is definitely on top of this issue. Ellie Marshall agrees, that after reading response from Renee Kievit-Kylar, VR Transition Projects and JOBS Program Coordinator, a deeper dive is not necessary at this time. Committee members voiced their agreement with Ellie and James. Transition Counselor's response is available for review at <a href="http://www.VTSRC.org">www.VTSRC.org</a> .	
<b>Conclusions</b>	Committee agrees unanimously. A deeper dive is not warranted at this time.	
<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
None	n/a	n/a
<b>5. Continued Discussion on Unsuccessful Closures (28) – 33% All Other Closures Area</b>		
45 minutes	Clayton Clark	
<b>Discussion</b>	Clayton handed out packet of information – 3/22/2013 Review of SRC Data: Bottom Line Up Front (BLUF). Clayton explained that he is hesitant to allow this data to drive any decisions. Some of the populations in the data are very small and statistics can look dramatic. Also staff changes have impacted some of the statistics. This packet is available for review on the VT SRC website <a href="http://www.VTSRC.org">www.VTSRC.org</a> . Clayton explained the different closure statuses: 30-consumer is eligible for VR services but never makes it to an IEP; 26 - consumer is on an IEP and closes with employment; 28 - consumer is on an IEP and closes without employment. James Smith is concerned that 1 in 4 consumer cases close status 30. William Pendlebury shared that there are a variety of reasons that a case closes status 30. Some consumers just disappear off the radar and some individuals are eligible for VR services but their life circumstances do not support working at the time. Laban Hill is surprised the “30” closures are not higher. He is pleased that VR “26” closures are higher than “30” closures. He shared that it is difficult for people that need these services to stick to a plan and move forward. Sam Liss would like to see a survey of “30” closures. Some committee members agreed. Clayton asked James if a survey on this topic has already	

# Minutes –April 4, 2013

## SRC Performance Review Committee

been done. James responded that Alice Porter would be the one to ask. Clayton will follow up with Alice.		
suggested he send out the results from the last survey of recent consumer closures from Brian Robinson.		
However, a new survey is due to be done soon. Committee members agree to wait for the new survey results. John Alexander wanted to know what is done at the regional supervisor’s meetings to address the regional differences in the data. James stated that there is a bit of a debate between counselors when opening a new case for services. Some counselors hold to the belief of “moving to a plan as quickly as possible even if plan is not perfect or complete, while other counselors prefer to do a fuller discovery process before developing a plan. Putting people on plans quickly can result in more 28 closures. It all depends on the philosophy of the office. Clayton informed the Committee members that he purposefully left holes in the data to draw attention to those areas. The holes are due to small sample sizes.		
<b>Conclusions</b>	Great work, Clayton. Good data.	
<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Forward results from newest consumer closure survey to Rebekah Stephens	James Smith	TBD
Follow up with Alice Porter concerning survey of “30” closure consumers	Clayton Clark	4/30/2013
<b>6. Overview of Current Status of RSA Audit</b>		
5 minutes	James Smith	
<b>Discussion</b>	VR has received the preliminary findings from RSA. The majority of findings were pretty simple fixes. However, one finding was quite disturbing. Per the RSA, VT VR is out of compliance in area of transition counselors (TCs). Currently TC’s are building up their presence in the schools. In order to facilitate this process, TCs have been getting to know students, parents and staff through a gradual engagement process; meeting and talking with students, parents and staff in order to build relationships that will assist with working with students in the future. Right now this is being done without opening up a formal case on each student. Per the RSA, in order for VR to be in compliance in this area, TCs are not allowed to consult directly with students or parents without opening a formal case. TCs are only to work through the educational staff. The educational staff will work with the students and then make a referral to the TC for services. The TC will then open a case and be allowed to speak directly with a student and parents. If VR complies with this RSA recommendation, every time a TC speaks with a student an application for services will have to be completed. This could potentially damage the relationship building with students and parents and result in the opening of many, many unnecessary case files. VR is pushing back on this finding. VR is going to contact other states to determine how they are doing things. Michele Hubert, a special educator, shared that compliance with this finding could be very damaging to the process. Anthony Williams added that TCs are the first step to opening the door to VR services later in life. The TC program is very important. James has drafted a response to the RSA findings. Diane Dalmasse will review it next week.	
<b>Conclusions</b>	James will keep the SRC updated as the process continues.	
<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
None	n/a	n/a
<b>7. Other Business</b>		
<b>Discussion</b>	None.	
<b>Conclusions</b>	None.	
<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
None	n/a	n/a

# Minutes –April 4, 2013

## SRC Performance Review Committee

6. Adjournment		
<b>Discussion</b>	No discussion.	
<b>Conclusions</b>	Committee members voted unanimously to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 12:10 pm.	
<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Draft minutes respectfully submitted for approval	Rebekah Stephens	5/3/2013
Draft minutes emailed to Committee members	Rebekah Stephens	5/3/2013
Minutes approved	Committee Members	6/6/2013
Approved minutes uploaded to website <a href="http://www.VTSRC.org">www.VTSRC.org</a>	Rebekah Stephens	6/14/2013