

Minutes SRC Performance Review Committee - December 3, 2015

SRC Performance Review Committee			
Thursday, December 3, 2015	10:00 am – 12:00 pm	Video Conference – Rutland VR and Williston VR	
Meeting called by	Adam Leonard, Chair at 10:00 a.m.		
Members Present	Samantha Brennan, Julia Burakian, Leslie Walker Mitchell, Alaina Clements and Spencer Lemons		
Members Absent	Ben Wimett		
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		
Discussion	Spencer Lemons moved to accept. Leslie Walker Mitchell 2 nd . No discussion.		
Conclusions	Today's agenda accepted.		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
None		n/a	n/a
2. Approval of Minutes – October 30, 2015 Committee Meeting			
-----	Adam Leonard		
Discussion	No discussion. Leslie Walker Mitchell moved to approve. Spencer Lemons 2 nd .		
Conclusions	Minutes approved.		
Action Items		Person Responsible	Deadline
Upload approved minutes to www.VTSRC.org		Rebekah Stephens	12/11/2015
3. Report and Discussion – Where the 15% for PETS is being spent this year			
-----	James Smith		
Discussion	15% of federal award must be spent on Pre-Employment Transition Services. The funding is done on a fiscal year starting in October and ending in September. In federal fiscal year (FFY) 2015 the 15% equaled \$1,343,079.45. For FFY 2016 the 15% equals \$2,213,079.45. If VR does not spend the full 15% during the FFY then VR has the option of rolling over the underspent money to the next FFY. This rollover must be spent within a one-year time period. VR does not actually get the funds upfront. VR must show the federal authorities where the monies are going before VR can draw the money down into the state. The spending for PETS during FFY 2015 was \$1,107,022.82. The proposed spending for FFY 2016 is \$2,621,806.09. This amount includes the rollover from FFY 2015. The 15% budget is spread over – JOBS in school, Developmental Services (DS) in school, VABIR PETS, in school VR Counselors, Young Adult Counselors, VR Transition Program Coordinator, VR Transition Project Director, Benefits Counselors, State BAM's (Business Account Managers), VABIR 110 BAM's, Summer Youth, VCIL (Vermont Center for Independent Living), VFN (Vermont Family Network), Project Search Burlington, Project Search Rutland and Project Search LSI (Lincoln Street Incorporated). Initially during the implementation of PETS, RSA's definition of what services could be included in the PETS calculation was very rigid; only direct service time with consumers could be counted towards the percentage calculation. But as guidance from RSA (Rehabilitation Services Administration) has been received and it was found out what other states are doing it was determined that counselors working 100% with students can include their travel time and their training time in the total percentage. The time percentages estimated by VR are as accurate as possible. RSA's legal team announced that RSA could not provide guidance to local VRs around this percentage calculation, so local VRs are doing their best to develop policy that aligns itself with the spirit of the law.		

Minutes SRC Performance Review Committee - December 3, 2015

VR's FFY 2016 budget numbers are based on the assumption that FFY 2017 grants will remain the same as FFY 2016. The FFY 2016 budget is about \$100,000 over the actual 15% amount required to be spent on PETS. There is no penalty for spending over the 15%. Samantha Brennan asked if case service expenses, like driver training and assistive technology is included in this budget. James responded that these costs are not reflected in these budget numbers. This is an oversight. These costs for general VR Counselors can total approximately \$100,000 during a FFY. James explained that any money spent on students will be identified by VR's reporting system and will get picked up in the budget. So any oversights should be caught and expensed correctly. Adam Leonard asked if there is any area of the budgeted expenses that may cause concern for RSA during a future audit. James responded that RSA may question VR's definition of time spent by BAM's for PETS and Director's time spent on authorized services only after providing access to PETS to all VT students. It will probably be a good thing that VR's budget is a few hundred thousand over budget because if RSA comes back and says that certain costs cannot be counted under the 15%, VT VR will still be at 15% and won't need to pay money back to RSA. RSA is supposed to audit VT VR on a 3-year cycle. No audits are being done right now because of WIOA (Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act).

Conclusions Excellent explanation of breakdown of PETS spending budget. Thank you, James. The committee would like to see a mid FFY spending update. These numbers will be available in mid-April 2016. Allison Carmichael should be invited to June 2016 PR meeting to provide an update of PETS spending for FFY 2016.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Include "Update on PETS Spending for FFY 2016" on June 2016 PR meeting agenda	Rebekah Stephens	5/20/2016
Invite Alison Carmichael (Alison.carmichael@vermont.gov) to PR meeting to June 2016 PR meeting to conduct "Update on PETS Spending for FFY 2016" cc-James Smith on email invitation	Rebekah Stephens	5/2/2016

4. Update - Progress towards the 2015 State Plan Goals

-----	James Smith
Discussion	James provided a summary of FFY 2014 and 2015 DVR Performance Indicators. VR increased their number of rehabs from 1873 in FFY 2014 to 1922 in FFY 2015. The percentage "achieving an employment outcome" actually dropped from FFY 2014 57.9% to 51.7% in FFY 2015. This percentage is under the federal minimum. VR has been able to identify this drop as attributable to the moving of cases among staff as a result of the movement of resources required by PETS. VR identified this issue early and addressed this as an opportunity for counselors to take a good look at older cases to determine if closure was appropriate. As a result, the unsuccessful closure percentages increased during this period. If a case was not actively engaged in the pursuit of employment then a decision had to be made to close cases. Some of the consumers involved in these closures have actually reengaged with VR and a new case has been opened. Julia Burakian shared that a few consumers just didn't want to work with a new counselor so they chose to leave VR instead of engaging with a new counselor. Samantha Brennan shared that the relationship piece of VR work is so important and a change can impact how a consumer chooses to engage with VR. Julia shared that all consumers were offered the opportunity to meet with the new counselor but some did not follow through in the end. James asked if it is fair to say that the case transfer process had an impact on consumers that would not have necessarily closed their cases except for not wanting to work with a new counselor? Julia responded that a small percentage of consumers would fall under this statement and the transition was difficult for them. The majority of case closures were simply because it was time to close the case. James feels that keeping a close eye on how many students do not make it through the transition process from school to general VR services would be a good idea. Julia shared that there is always a percentage of students that do not make the change from school based services to post school services. Measurement 1.6 - "Own income as primary source of support at intake and closure" is a tricky measurement. In FFY 2014 the net percentage for this measurement

Minutes SRC Performance Review Committee - December 3, 2015

was 51.512% and in FFY 2015 the net percentage dropped to 46.166%. VR thinks that the increase in unsuccessful closures also effected this number. This is an educated guess and the exact reason has not been determined. These consumers applied for services prior to FFY 2015. It may be a data glitch but one or two individual entries shouldn't throw off the numbers significantly. James provided a summary of "Evaluation and Reports of Progress: VR and Supported Employment Goals and Priorities". The overall impression is that last year for targets was not a great year. Goal and Priority 1: "Consumer satisfaction with DVR services will increase". The Consumer Satisfaction Survey is scheduled for early Spring 2016. Results of this survey should be available for June 2016 PR meeting. PR Committee should take a look at the actual survey prior to looking at the results. PR Committee will just be looking at the survey not making any changes. Goal and Priority 2: "Consumer earnings will increase beyond the rate of inflation". VR set a target of 62%. The actual was only 57%. This was a disappointment. Goal and Priority 3: "More consumers will be employed and the rate at which consumers maintain employment will increase." This measurement stayed the same at 65%. Goal and Priority 4: "Vermont employers will increase their use of DVR as an employment agency through Creative Workforce Solutions". "CWS had active ongoing relationships with 2283 employers statewide". Goal and Priority 5: "DVR employees will be satisfied with their jobs". "With the implementation of WIOA and PETS DVR decided to delay the staff satisfaction survey to the Spring of 2016". Goal and Priority 6: "All DVR staff will have the skills and competencies to do their jobs". "With the implementation of WIOA and PETS DVR decided to delay the staff satisfaction survey to the Spring of 2016". Goal and Priority 7 - "Increase capacity to serve un-served or underserved populations..." Numbers in under this goal decreased. Which may be a result of the overall increase in unsuccessful closures. Goal and Priority 8: "DVR will work to improve the outcomes of community-supported employment providers serving individuals with developmental disabilities". VR was able to serve 1112 individuals in FFY 2015, up from 1088 individuals in FFY 2013. Goal and Priority 9: "DVR will work to improve the outcomes of community providers serving individuals with severe mental illness." VR was unable to capture this data at the time of this report.

Conclusions Clear and concise overview. This was not a banner year. It was a year of growing pains. This next year will be better. Thank you, James.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Include topic "Review of Consumer Satisfaction Survey" on February 4, 2016	Rebekah Stephens	1/21/2016

5. Other Business

Discussion None.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
None	n/a	n/a

6. Adjournment

Discussion Spencer Lemons moved to adjourn. Leslie Walker Mitchell 2nd.

Conclusions Meeting adjourned at 11:52 a.m.

Action Items	Person Responsible	Deadline
Draft minutes respectfully submitted for approval	Rebekah Stephens	1/1/2016
Draft minutes uploaded to website www.VTSRC.org	Rebekah Stephens	1/1/2016
Draft minutes emailed to Committee members	Rebekah Stephens	1/1/2016
Minutes approved	Committee members	2/4/2016
Approved minutes uploaded to website www.VTSRC.org	Rebekah Stephens	2/12/2016