

# Minutes –October 30, 2015

## SRC Performance Review Committee

SRC Performance Review Committee		
Friday, October 30, 2015	1:00 PM – 3:00 PM	Video Conference – Williston VR, Rutland VR and White River Junction VR
Meeting called by	Adam Leonard, Chair at 1:00 pm	
Members Present	Leslie Walker Mitchell and Samantha Brennan	
Members Absent	Spencer Lemons and Julia Burakian	
SRC Liaison	James Smith, VR Budget and Policy Manager	
SRC Coordinator	Rebekah M. Stephens	
Interpreters	n/a	
Speakers/Presenters	n/a	
Facilitator	-----	
Guests	n/a	
1. Today's Agenda		
-----	Adam Leonard	
<b>Discussion</b>	No discussion. Samantha Brennan moved to accept. Leslie Walker Mitchell 2 <sup>nd</sup> .	
<b>Conclusions</b>	Today's agenda accepted.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
None	n/a	n/a
2. Approval of Minutes - June 4, 2015 Committee Meeting		
-----	Adam Leonard	
<b>Discussion</b>	No discussion. Leslie Walker Mitchell moved to approve. Samantha Brennan 2 <sup>nd</sup> .	
<b>Conclusions</b>	June 4, 2015 Committee Meeting minutes approved.	
Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Upload approved minutes to <a href="http://www.VTSRC.org">www.VTSRC.org</a>	Rebekah Stephens	11/6/2015
3. Continuing Discussion – Order of Selection (OOS): Proposal to change OOS in the FFY 16 State Plan (needs full SRC vote) & Proposal to open the current OOS (needs full SRC vote)		
-----	James Smith	
<b>Discussion</b>	<p>VR's section of the Unified State Plan is due March 3, 2016. In order to submit by March 3<sup>rd</sup>, the draft has to be finished by January 2016 to allow for a 30 day open comment period. James is hoping for a recommendation today from the PR Committee to take the OOS new language proposal to the full SRC for a vote of approval. James reviewed what VR is currently doing with OOS – Category 1 (2 or more areas of functional loss), Category 2 (1 area of functional loss) and Category 3 (non-significant disabilities not requiring “multiple services over a period of 6 months or more”). Currently the majority of VR consumers are being served under Category 1. In the event of potential budgetary restrictions there could potentially be Category 1 individuals that may not be able to receive VR services. In an effort to minimize this potentially situation, VR is proposing new language for OOS. James presented the new OOS proposal to the Committee members. A change in definition of the Categories is included in the new OOS proposal. The new Category 1 definition states that Category 1 services will be limited to folks who receive Supplemental Security Income (SSI) or Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) as determined by the Social Security Administration and “the applicant must intend to achieve an employment outcome...” The definition for the new Category 2 is a combination of the current Category 1 and 2 definitions. Adam Leonard asked if a sentence around Category 2 individuals “must not be eligible for SSI or SSDI” to differentiate from Category 1 would be appropriate or redundant? It is not redundant, James agreed that a sentence around this would be a good idea. The definition for the new Category 3 definition will remain the same as the current definition. Based on the new definitions approximately 30% of consumers served by VR would fall under Category 1 and 70% would fall under Category 2 with a handful falling under Category 3. Adam asked</p>	

# Minutes –October 30, 2015

## SRC Performance Review Committee

“barring any budgetary changes will this change in definitions have any impact on the services currently offered by VR or is this just in preparation for potential future budgetary constraints?” James responded the new definitions are meant as a safeguard for potential future budgetary issues and will not affect services currently offered.		
James will make the suggested change to the language, along with some grammar and sentence structure changes.		
<b>Conclusions</b>	The PR Committee members agree to send the proposal to the full SRC for a vote. Include “Vote on the Proposed new Language for Order of Selection (OOS)” on December 3, 2015 SRC meeting agenda.	
<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Include “Vote on the Proposed new Language - 4.11 c (3) Order of Selection” on December 3, 2015 SRC meeting agenda	Rebekah Stephens	11/20/2015
<b>4. Discussion – Plan and Outline for State Plan : Review of Proposed Goals and Priorities for FFY 16 (actually for FFY 2017) State Plan</b>		
-----	James Smith	
<b>Discussion</b>	The current goals have been the same for about 5 years. The goals don’t really change but the strategies on how to reach the goals change. The proposed “goals and priorities” are updated to align with WIOA. The state plans for FFY 2016 have been waived by the feds. So what we are looking at is FFY 2017. There are nine “ <b>FFY 2017 Goals and Priorities</b> ”. The “ <b>FFY 2017 Goals and Priorities</b> ” are based on the April 2014 Needs Assessment and WIOA. <b>1. DVR will implement highly effective Pre-Employment Transition Services (PETS) for students statewide</b> – Discussion: Committee members suggested that an additional goal, for example, enrolling at least one student in each high school be added under Goal/Priority 1 in order to determine/measure if PETS is having successful outcomes. <b>2. DVR align services to support consumers achieve the WIOA Common Performance Outcomes Measures</b> – Discussion: Currently VR is waiting on employment data from the Department of Labor (DOL) on out of state employment. Once this data is received, VR will be able to negotiate with the Governor and the Federal Government to determine if the goals are appropriate. Adam Leonard asked if a mention of increasing outcomes as a goal would be appropriate for this goal? James will be happy to add this to the proposal. <b>3. DVR will effectively serve employers through Creative Workforce Solutions (CWS)</b> – Discussion: James felt CWS deserved its own goal in the plan. James will change the wording under the Target “statewide” to “annual”. <b>4. Consumer satisfaction with DVR services will be maintained or increase</b> – Discussion: This goal has not changed from last year – the next Consumer Satisfaction Survey will take place in the late Winter or Spring of 2016. Going forward a 2 year cycle will be used unless needed more frequently. The Consumer Satisfaction survey was skipped last year due to the changes in case loads and staffing in response to WIOA. Adam asked if the goal of 91% from 2015 would be the goal for 2017 or if VR is just going to try and improve on the last rating of 83%? James is not sure. James is willing to put some language in around the aspiration to return to 91%, however, achieving a rating between 83% - 91% would be o.k. and anything less than 83% would not be o.k. <b>5. DVR will implement the Alliance Enterprises AWARE electronic case management system to support staff provide high quality VR services</b> – Discussion: The only way to measure this is through staff satisfaction. The next DVR Employee Satisfaction Survey is scheduled for Spring of 2016. James feels that an Employee Satisfaction Survey just for satisfaction with AWARE would be appropriate; maybe 6 months post implementation. An 80% satisfaction rate may be reasonable to strive for around employee satisfaction with the AWARE system. Samantha Brennan recommended not setting an 80% satisfaction rate right off the bat, but instead do a 6 month post implementation survey , get staff feedback, make any changes and then do another survey after 3 additional months to see if there has been an improvement in satisfaction between months 6 and 9. This implementation process is going to be a large focus of DVR over the next 2 years. <b>6. DVR will be satisfied with their jobs and have the training, tools and support they need to be effective</b> – Discussion: If DVR achieves 90% they will be happy. Satisfaction numbers in the past have been 88% and 79%. An employee survey has not been done since 2012. <b>7. DVR will continue to seek funding for services for underserved populations in the state</b> – Discussion: It is not realistic to set goals under this goal because VR does not have a source for long-term supports for these populations. This is an area that VR will continue to pay attention to and keep their eyes open for funding opportunities to meet some of these needs. The question was asked, “Is there a reasonable way to measure efforts in these areas?” There is the	

# Minutes –October 30, 2015

## SRC Performance Review Committee

possibility to report out on what initiatives have been tried by VR to address the needs of these populations.		
Sometimes it is not about money but about making a contact or setting up partnerships with other agencies to provide support. James will add language to broaden what is considered successful under this goal. <b>8. DVR will improve the outcomes for supported employment programs serving adults with developmental disabilities. This includes students served under Pre-Employment Transition Services</b> – Discussion: The goal under this is to have 250 successful outcomes. This will be an approximate 10% -15% increase from 2015. Samantha Brennan asked if it would be prudent to include a measurement that looks at the increase in wages for an individual? James thanked Samantha for mentioning this and will add it. <b>9. DVR will improve the outcomes for students and youth with emotional/behavioral disabilities served through the JOBS Supported Employment Programs</b> – Discussion: The prior #9 Goal/Priority was the Community Rehabilitation Treatment (CRT) program which has been defunded. On one hand VR does not want to ignore this population, however, the majority of funding is now going towards PETS. VR could add a #10 or could add the CRT population under CWS or under the JOBS program.		
<b>Conclusions</b>	James is going to rework the proposal with the suggested recommendations from today's meeting. James will resend the updated proposal of Goals and Priorities to the PR Committee members. A review of the FFY 2017 Goals and Priorities needs to be included on the December 3, 2015 SRC meeting agenda.	
<b>Action Items</b>		
	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Send updated Goals and Priorities proposal to PR Committee members	James Smith & Rebekah Stephens	11/20/2015
Include review/discussion of FFY 2017 Goals and Priorities on December 3, 2015 SRC meeting agenda	Rebekah Stephens	11/20/2015
<b>6. 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
<b>7. Adjournment</b>		
<b>Discussion</b>	Leslie Walker Mitchell made motion to adjourn. Samantha Brennan 2 <sup>nd</sup> .	
<b>Conclusions</b>	Meeting adjourned at 2:56 pm	
<b>Action Items</b>		
	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Draft minutes respectfully submitted for approval	Rebekah Stephens	11/28/2015
Draft minutes emailed to Committee members	Rebekah Stephens	11/28/2015
Draft minutes uploaded to website <a href="http://www.VTSRC.org">www.VTSRC.org</a>	Rebekah Stephens	11/28/2015
Minutes approved	Committee Members	12/3/2015
Approved minutes uploaded to website <a href="http://www.VTSRC.org">www.VTSRC.org</a>	Rebekah Stephens	12/11/2015