

Minutes

State Rehabilitation Council

November 4, 2009

Denver Metro Rehabilitation Office
2211 West Evans Avenue, Bldg. B
Denver, CO 80223

Columbine Conference Room
5:00 to 8:00 p.m.

Meeting called by:	Judi Stein Stutman, SRC Co-Chair	
Anticipated Attendees:	Todd Coffey, Jim Crowe, Joe Garrity, Rebecca Johnson, Lynne Neese, Todd Nielsen, Barbara Palmer, Debra Petersen, Geoff Peterson, Penny Ray, Sandy Pratt, Karen Rutledge, Joe Sims, Nancy Smith, Judi Stein Stutman, Larry Williams	
Guest(s):	Carol Feuerbacher, Jessica Smith, Stephanie Hydal, Brian Miller, Linda LaPointe	
	Recurring Agenda Items	
	Introduction Presentation of Agenda Ad hoc Agenda Items to be added Review/Approve minutes from previous meeting	
	Agenda Topics	
5:00	Dinner	
5:30	Roll Call	
5:30	Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA)	Brian Miller
6:30	Director's Report	Nancy Smith
7:00	DVR Policy Revision Review and Vote	Carol Feuerbacher
7:10	Public Comment/Recommendations	Kisha Mason
7:20	SRC Budget	Todd Coffey
7:30	Retreat Recap	ALL
7:40	OOS/DVR Budget Update	Sandy Pratt
7:45	Employment Committee Report	Dave DeLay
7:50	SILC Report	Debra Petersen
7:55	Open Q & A	All
8:00	Adjourn	

Minutes

SRC Mission

"The State Rehabilitation Council (SRC) is a partner with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR) in developing and evaluating the effectiveness of its vocational rehabilitation programs. The SRC advises DVR concerning activities under the Rehabilitation Act, assists in the development of the state plan, and helps determine the extent of consumer satisfaction with DVR's services that affect vocational client employment outcomes."

Meeting called by:

Judi Stein Stutman

Notes taken by:

Penny Ray

Agenda topics

Brian Miller: RSA administers the grants for all Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) agencies in the US and territories and has oversight responsibilities for the eighty programs. The RSA does a monitoring visit to each program every 4 years. Primary focus for the RSA monitoring visit is to look at the performance of the agency's VR and Independent Living (IL) Part B programs. The RSA looks across the range and scope of outcomes that they are seeing. During a monitoring visit the RSA looks at trends and areas of growth for the programs, areas for performance improvement, and they identify areas where need technical assistance is needed. They review data and reports that are largely generated by DVR and then sent to the RSA in Washington DC over the past five years. Brian described the members of the RSA monitoring team who were visiting during the week.

Brian noted that the SRC is an important conduit to RSA and that it can bring a variety of perspectives to the table.

Comments and Questions to Brian:

Barbara Palmer noted that there is an incredible partnership between the Department of Education (CDLE) and DVR. CDLE has proactive conversations with DVR/Field Management about people exiting schools and coming into DVR services. DVR and CDLE have been able to be partners for collaborative grants. Communication on all levels between CDLE and DVR is very open.

How do SRCs in other states work cooperatively with DVR?

Brian- There is a range of collaboration found nationally between SRCs and DVRs. The key is to figure out the balance between advocacy and being partners, which can be a challenge. What is the SRC's role, what are they supposed to do and what tools do they need to do it? Turnover is a challenge due to term limits. The training materials that RSA has produced should be useful. An interest group for state councils has been established. Representatives from this SRC can go to those meetings. That is the single best forum for talking to colleagues about what they are doing. Fred Isbister was responsible for developing the training for the SRC and he may have some other thoughts. There may be a list serve for SRCs to use in sharing their ideas.

Do other SRCs have more support staff that allow them to move forward?

Brian-No. No matter where I go there is always a perceived shortage, there never seems to be enough staff. If the SRC is interested in increasing the staff for the SRC, they should constantly be communicating the need to the agency and identifying gaps where there is not enough time in the day to get their activities done. The spending authority for additional support staff would be under what is known as Innovation and Expansion. This is not a separate pot of money but would need to be carved out of Title 1 DVR dollars. When the SRC looks at the 2011 state plan, there would be an opportunity to look at making a request for increasing support staff.

There was discussion that some members of the SRC did not agree there is a need for DVR to provide more support staff to the SRC. DVR gives additional support to the SRC by having someone take the minutes as well as people creating and giving reports during the SRC meetings.

The general SRC membership is composed of volunteers, many representing agencies. The work that has to be done sometimes is very time consuming. The important part of a successful SRC comes down to relationship with DVR and specifically with Nancy and DVR counselors. Members of the SRC can become critical of VR at times, but they need to also

consider the general experience with VR, and that relationships are important so differences can be worked out.

What is going to happen as a result of the RSA Monitoring visit? What can SRC do to support after?

Brian- The end product is the Monitoring report which will be issued toward the end of the fiscal year, probably the end of September. Between now and when the report is issued, RSA will do follow up teleconferences and request more documentation. The report will give observations, recommendations and bring up issues that may have an impact on the performance of the VR agency. The agency is able to take or leave recommendations.

The RSA may find compliance findings which could be legally based and are corrections that need to be made by the state.

The recommendations and findings will be shared with DVR and SRC in a draft form. There will be a chance to read draft, and then DVR will give their comments back to RSA.

The SRC could use the report to help in the development of goals and priorities in the state plan. The report could prompt a Customer Satisfaction Survey, or some of the recommendations could be built into the comprehensive needs assessment.

Will there be recommendations for SRC?

Not unless there are findings. Usually the RSA tries to couch findings in terms of collaboration with the VR program. Not typically, but could be a finding for example on the relationship, whatever would improve the performance of the program. The RSA welcomes input and comments.

Emails-

Brian.Miller@ed.gov

Jessica.Smith@ed.gov

Director's Report

Nancy Smith

Discussion: Handout

DVR Policy Revision Review and Vote		Carol Feuerbacher
Discussion: Handout.		
The SRC recommends that there be a separate signature, one for IPE and one for assigning the TTW. By having separate signatures, it makes it clear to the consumer that they are committing to two separate items. Making two separate documents for signature could also be a protection for VR, indicating there is intent.		
Action items:	Person responsible:	Deadline:
Carol will talk to the Field Management team to look at the forms to consider Larry's suggestion	Carol	
Public Comment/Recommendations		Kishia Mason (Public Comment)
Discussion: Person did not respond to email inviting to SRC meeting.		
SRC Budget		Todd
Discussion: Handout		
SRC will have funds remaining.		
Retreat Recap		All
Discussion: During the retreat there was a recommendation that a Partnership Committee be formed. The committee would provide recommendation on what ways the SRC could work with DVR in a better collaborative manner to implement specific activities. The intent was that the Partnership Committee would be ad hoc and short term. The SRC felt the committee would provide a mechanism for the SRC to integrate more with DVR.		
Comments: Karen did a great job with the retreat, it very well organized.		
SRC meetings-There was discussion during the retreat that the SRC should consider alternative schedules for meetings.		
Action items:	Person responsible:	Deadline:
Penny will go through the recording to see what Barb committed to regarding QC. Perhaps Gale can help.	Penny	
Will send recommendation for the Partnership Committee out to the SRC to solicit volunteers.	Judi	11/9
Suggestions on future meeting dates and times for SRC. Send an email to SRC with suggestions and have the SRC return their comments to Rebecca.	Judi	11/9
OOS/DVR Budget Update		Sandy Pratt
Discussion: Handout		
DVR is asking RSA for suggestions on how DVR balances fiscal and human resources once people are taken off the wait list.		

There was a question about funding for DVR on the Federal level. Appropriation bill that determines VR funding has not been signed yet. We have funding through February, but are waiting for the official appropriation amount.		
SILC Report		Debra Petersen
Discussion: Handout		
The SILC developed a reference card that gives phone numbers for all of the Independent Living Centers.		
The SILC is looking at how the ARRA funds should be used, and looking for advice from RSA.		
Employment Committee Report		Dave DeLay
Discussion: Dave was not in attendance.		
Open Q & A		Open
Discussion: No questions were raised.		
Member ship Committee		Jim Crowe
Discussion: A representative from Lowes is interested in joining the SRC.		
Action items:	Person responsible:	Deadline:
Jim will invite the representative to the next meeting.	Jim	