

# Minutes –June 4, 2015

## SRC Performance Review Committee

SRC Performance Review Committee		
Thursday, June 4, 2015	10:00 am – 12:00 pm	VR Office 27 Federal Street, Suite 200 St. Albans, VT 05478
Meeting called by	Adam Leonard, Chair at 10:04 a.m.	
Members Present	Spencer Lemons, Samantha Brennan, Ben Wimett (via Scopia), Anthony Williams and Whitney Nichols (via phone)	
Members Absent	Alaina Clements and Leslie Walker Mitchell	
SRC Liaison	James Smith, VR Budget and Policy Manager	
SRC Coordinator	Rebekah M. Stephens	
Interpreters	n/a	
Speakers/Presenters	Lisa Young, VR Quality Assurance Manager	
Facilitator	-----	
Guests	n/a	
<b>1. Today's Agenda</b>		
-----	-----	
<b>Discussion</b>	James Smith requested that additional time be given to the AWARE discussion as Lisa Young is with the PR Committee today. Spencer Lemons moved to approve. Samantha Brennan 2 <sup>nd</sup> .	
<b>Conclusions</b>	Today's agenda, as amended, is accepted.	
<b>2. Approval of Minutes – February 5, 2015 and April 2, 2015 Committee Meeting</b>		
-----	Adam Leonard	
<b>Discussion</b>	No discussion. Samantha Brennan moved to approve. Spencer Lemons 2 <sup>nd</sup> .	
<b>Conclusions</b>	Minutes approved.	
<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Upload approved minutes to <a href="http://www.VTSRC.org">www.VTSRC.org</a>	Rebekah Stephens	6/12/2015
<b>3. Discussion – SRC Data Request re Cases Served from OOS, FFY 2012 to Present</b>		
-----	James Smith	
<b>Discussion</b>	Adam Leonard provided a brief summary on how this topic has progressed for new members. James provided a brief summary of federal and Vermont OOS guidelines for new members. Each state can choose how to do OOS and Vermont's process is based on the process developed by the State of CT. James had asked Alice Porter to provide some additional data on this topic. James handed out the document "Order of Selection Case Outcomes Review for the SRC". The PR Committee had asked several questions and this document addresses each of these questions. James explained the data shows that 91.5% of those served fall under Category 1 for Significant Disabled and have 2 or more areas of functional loss. The data also shows that "very few cases (.4%) are deemed "Not Significantly Disabled and put into the OOS waiting list." In 2008/2009 VR changed the definition of disabilities for the categories. This change allowed additional individuals to move into Category 2 from Category 3. While doing this review of the OOS data, VR found that some staff had not been waiting to start the plan development for a Category 3 individual until the SRC approved the opening of the case from the waiting list. VR realizes some refresher training is needed and specific language addressing this has been added to the VR Policy & Procedures manual. Adam Leonard asked James if he was surprised by any of the data. James shared that he was a bit surprised that VR was spending the same amount of funds on Category 3 as Category 1 and 2. An explanation is that the presenting disability that put an individual in Category 3 was not the only disability that individual had and additional barriers to employment may surface during the plan process. Adam wanted to know why is VR using OOS? The purpose of the OOS is to give some framework to the services offered by VR. It would also be beneficial if services were reduced in the future. It also gives a framework to	

# Minutes –June 4, 2015

## SRC Performance Review Committee

determine who is eligible for services. There are some states that do not use OOS. Adam wanted to know if there was a way for the SRC to make a more informed vote on OOS? Should information on the actual services needed be included when the vote is requested – more than just there are 2 individuals under Category 3 that have requested services? Should a 4 <sup>th</sup> tier (category) be added to OOS? Should definitions of each tier (category) be redone? Should there be a conversation with other states that are not using OOS? How do other states handle reduction in funding? What are the implications behind getting rid of OOS in VT?		
<b>Conclusions</b>	James will reach out to other states that do not use OOS. Put continuing discussion of OOS on October 15, 2015 PR meeting agenda.	
<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Provide electronic form of “Order of Selection Case Outcomes Review for the SRC” document to Rebekah Stephens	James Smith	6/5/2015
Email “Order of Selection Case Outcomes Review for the SRC” document to Whitney Nichols and Ben Wimett	Rebekah Stephens	6/15/2015
Include this continuing discussion on the October 15, 2015 PR Committee meeting agenda	Rebekah Stephens	10/2/2015
<b>4. Update – AWARE System</b>		
-----	Lisa Young, VR Quality Assurance Manager	
<b>Discussion</b>	Lisa presented a power point presentation to the Committee members. AWARE is the acronym for “Accessible Web-based Activity & Reporting Environment; a comprehensive case management software system designed for public VR agencies.” This is a universal design that will bring consistency to case management. It is a secure system to ensure confidentiality. Alliance, the development company, will provide 2 updates per year to ensure that the system stays current with all federal regulations. AWARE is currently being used by 10,000 “VR professional nationwide.” AWARE “consists of 17 modules” - for example “case management modules and summary reports.” Because the AWARE system is standardized it will allow for simplified training and sharing of information across VR. This is a system that is “tried and true.” It will be very helpful to have a universal environment for VR, VABIR and the consumers. The hope is that there will be a reduction in “reporting errors and eliminate redundancy.” AWARE will also streamline the billing process by being interfaced directly to the State business office. It will eliminate a lot of paper. Alliance has a “proven track record – they have 100% completion rate & 20+ years working with the social service industry.” VR is currently conducting an independent review of the product and they hope to have a contract by the end of July 2015. VR “hopes to be using the system in early 2017.” The software will be configured and adapted during the period between July 2015 and the beginning of 2017. Data migration will also need to occur during this period. One or two offices will do a test period before the system goes statewide to make sure the system is working correctly. Training of staff will also be done during this time.	
<b>Conclusions</b>	Excellent presentation!	
<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Update on AWARE milestones to PR Committee	Lisa Young/James Smith	ongoing
<b>5. Other Business</b>		
-----	-----	
<b>Discussion</b>	The State Plan will be due by the end of March 2016. A Needs Assessment for students and youth may be required.	
<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Include “Discussion – Plan and Outline for State Plan and Needs Assessment” on October 15, 2015 PR meeting agenda	Rebekah Stephens	10/2/2015

# Minutes –June 4, 2015

## SRC Performance Review Committee

6. Adjournment		
<b>Discussion</b>	Spencer Lemons made motion to adjourn. Samantha Brennan 2 <sup>nd</sup> .	
<b>Conclusions</b>	Meeting adjourned at 11:45 a.m.	
<b>Action Items</b>	<b>Person Responsible</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
Draft minutes respectfully submitted for approval	Rebekah Stephens	7/3/2015
Emailed draft minutes to Committee members	Rebekah Stephens	7/3/2015
Draft minutes uploaded to website <a href="http://www.VTSRC.org">www.VTSRC.org</a>	Rebekah Stephens	7/3/2015
Minutes approved	Committee Members	10/15/2015
Approved minutes uploaded to website <a href="http://www.VTSRC.org">www.VTSRC.org</a>	Rebekah Stephens	10/23/2015