



Washington State Rehabilitation Council  
PO Box 45343  
Olympia, WA 98504-5343  
1-866-252-2939  
[www.wastrehabcouncil.org](http://www.wastrehabcouncil.org)

## WSRC MEETING DAY 2 MINUTES

Friday, July 22, 2011  
9:00 am-4:00 pm

Courtyard Marriot  
1515 Commerce St.  
Tacoma, WA 98402

*In Attendance: JoAnne Lang, Bob Roberts, Vicki Foster, Sandra Carr, Rudy Hernandez, Susan Kautzman, Valerie Arnold, Jana Finkbonner, Mike Hudson, Joelle Brouner, Jim Larson, Jerry Johnsen, Martin McCallum, Don Brandon, Andres Aguirre, Bob Huven, Don Kay, and interpreters Roxie Andrews and Polly MacLean.*

**Approval of Agenda**—Don Brandon moves that the Council approve today’s agenda. Susan Kautzman seconds the motion.  
**Motion passes unanimously.**

**Approval of Minutes the April 2011 Quarterly Meeting**—Jim Larson moves that the council approve the minutes from the April Quarterly meeting. Jana Finkbonner seconds the motion.  
**Motion passes unanimously.**

**Remarks from Chair – Mike Hudson**— The WSRC has had a couple of opportunities to meet with Andres Aguirre, the DVR Director, and the Senior Leadership team. They have discussed the upcoming Customer Survey and received their input. After our meeting in Bellingham, Mr. Hudson was intrigued by the enthusiasm around the Motivational Interview training, and implementation that DVR is undertaking. Mr. Hudson has signed up for a 4 day Motivational Interviewing (MI) training, and he’s been through two of them so far. Having been through the training, he understands why they are enthusiastic and excited. In Mr. Hudson’s professional career, he’s been through a lot of change situations, where people try to change the culture of an organization, and he has never seen a situation where everyone who was involved was so enthusiastic about it, as people in DVR are about MI. At first Mr. Hudson was skeptical about MI and it being a good way to reduce caseloads and improve customer service. But now, having been through some of the training, he understands how that is possible. Amy Knizek is a former VRC for DVR and is now a learning design consultant for the Washington Institute for Mental Health and Training, and works as an MI Trainer. She talked about how it changed her way of approaching her job. The length of time from an initial meeting with a client to having a plan in place dropped from an average of

seven meetings down to an average of three meetings. Once Ms. Knizek embraced MI, and implemented it, she had zero fair hearing requests. Mr. Hudson looks forward to finishing his MI training. He's really enjoying it. Essentially it's a way of helping customers come to decisions about what they want to do. Teresa Moyers is conducting training in Motivational Interviewing in August for DVR staff and some partners.

Ms. Carr asks the chair if he thinks that this training is something that Community Rehabilitation Partner (CRP) staff should take as well. Mr. Hudson thinks that yes, CRP staff could benefit from this, as a tool to use with customers of VR.

Mr. Hudson would like to draw attention to the meeting mailing binder. We have made a few changes to its appearance. Having served on several boards and commissions, Mr. Hudson believes it to be one of the best and most comprehensive books of meeting materials, consistently. We have added to the agendas, a reference to what tab the information is under for each agenda item. The other helpful thing is that we have changed the evaluation form a little bit. It provides for a little more detail and quantitative information about how the Council feels about the content of the meeting.

Mr. Hudson would also like to thank Mr. Larson for conducting our forums so expertly.

**Remarks from Executive Director – Joelle Brouner**—Ms. Brouner thanks Don Kay and Andres Aguirre, for joining us. She also wanted to begin by thanking our members Don Brandon, Martin McCallum, and Jerry Johnsen. This quarter would have been difficult without Mr. McCallum's great help on analyzing the reauthorization of the Rehabilitation Act. 438 pages of analyzing legal language in the proposed Act, and Mr. McCallum was instrumental in helping Ms. Brouner to get through it. Mr. Brandon presented information yesterday on the Americans with Disabilities Act, (ADA). Mr. Brandon provided very useful information for the Council yesterday, and we thank him for that. Also, for having a good comment on the disability statistics that Ms. Brouner sent out to the Council last week. They were well sourced statistics about disabilities, and Mr. Brandon's comment suggested that the statistics excluded about 20-30 million people. On the US Census Bureau's questionnaire, there are only three questions regarding disability, which were added by the Social Security Administration, for the purposes of determining who cannot work, as a matter of forecasting. Ms. Brouner wanted to clarify for the Council that although these statistics are well sourced, the numbers are low. So, she thanks Mr. Brandon for pointing out that the statistics may be low. She would also like to thank Mr. Johnsen for checking in throughout the quarter, on the pulse and the temperature of the SRC and of VR. Mr. Johnsen has helped Council staff to recognize that there are many different things in VR to focus on, not just one thing. The Rehab Law Academy trainings that he provides are also very useful. Also Mr. Johnsen and Mr. Huven collected quarterly data in their work. Ms. Brouner appreciates all that work.

Please give us action items out of your committee work from yesterday, if you need staff support on any items.

We have no info about the council budget in the meeting mailing, because DVR has asked us if we could negotiate that in September. The Executive Committee will discuss this quarter about our allocation and the shape of what we will do in the following year. She would also like to know from the Council, what went well this year. The October meeting will be when we vote on meeting dates/locations for 2012. Think about a theme and what we are going to be working on next year. The WSRC Annual report is due December 31. We have decided not to publish a hard

copy because of cost effectiveness. We are thinking of producing a full annual report only on the internet, and in addition, an 8x10 brochure, with one fold for each quarter of the year to highlight and showcase our work, and teasing the report a little.

When Ms. Brouner looked at our council mandates, the only one that we don't seem to be really doing our absolute best on, is delving into partnerships with the Division of Services for the Blind, (DSB), the Governor's Committee on Disability and Employment (GCDE), The Developmental Disabilities Council (DDC), and Mental Health. Ms. Brouner tried to get updates from a few of these groups, to try to solidify those partnerships a little bit. There is a new Independent Living Center opening in Bellingham. Washington State has lost 2 centers, recently, and the shrink is not helpful for people in our state. In DSB the Director, Don Alveshere just accepted a position and is moving to Idaho Vocational Rehabilitation to be the Director. So Mr. Alveshere is leaving DSB. In the DDC, three things are happening. First, they have been conducting quality assurance surveys of people moving out of institutions in the past few months. This is important to Medicaid and Medicare services. Secondly, the DDC may be losing two of their nine staff. And third, they will be electing a new Chair soon. Their last Chair has been in place for over 20 years.

In the meeting notebook, under Tab 7 is the 2011 Case Review. This can be useful for October's agenda. If you have not read it, please read that case review before October's meeting, because we don't get to often look at this kind of data.

Last quarter we met Teesha Kirschbaum, of the Mount Vernon office, who presented us with information about Motivational Interviewing. She is ill. Also, Grace Webb, a long time VRC of the North Seattle office, lost her husband. Ms. Brouner sent them both cards, to let them know that the council keeps them in our thoughts.

On July 1, Ms. Lang completed her third year of state service with our Council, and we'd like to thank her for her good work. And lastly, Andres Aguirre shared with Ms. Brouner recently that he thinks the WSRC is the most effective SRC that he has seen in his time in DVR. Ms. Brouner thanks Mr. Aguirre for that, and appreciates his work.

Mr. McCallum comments on his appreciation for encouragement on thinking about the coming year, and how we will conduct our business, and keeping that in mind for budget purposes. He also suggests that when the new Chair of the DDC is in place, and has had a chance to get settled in the new position, that we invite him or her to a WSRC meeting to present and discuss how our councils relate to one another. Mr. Larson suggests DDD collaborations as well.

Ms. Brouner also notes that our member, Leandro Razo, is not joining us today because he is completing his last term of service with the DDC, and today is his last meeting.

#### **Remarks from Interim DVR Director—Andres Aguirre—**

Budget situation is that there will be a slight decrease in State General Funds that DVR was allotted, but it does not impact Maintenance of Effort. It will not impact our resources. Changes with hiring freeze, in a month or two away we're going to try to open that up.

Out of state travel freeze is lifted, but we do need approval from the Secretary if state funds are involved for traveling out of state, and from the Assistant Secretary if there are no state funds involved.

Equipment freeze is lifted. We are using all-in-one printers only now, for faxing, printing, scanning, copiers.

Hiring freeze has been lifted, though DSHS chose to continue the need for approval in hiring. One position approved for hiring is the Mercer Office Supervisor. A state office staffer has been covering the vacant supervisor position in the Mercer DVR office, the Employment Relations Manager, John Evans. Now Mr. Evans can return to his main job, which includes helping DVR staff and partners understand the ADA.

A team will be convened to look at the results of DVR's annual case review. There is improvement regarding staff determining eligibility. DVR is still struggling with connecting eligibilities and barriers to employment to plan development, or making a comprehensive vocational assessment. Comparable Services and Benefits was an interesting part to read. One can tell the differences between how those are determined between seasoned counselors and counselors who are newer to the job, so there are some training opportunities. Some trainings in the future will be Best Practices along fiscal issues, resource, benefits planning, comparable services and benefits and actual provision of services. DVR will continue to focus on the items they believe they need to improve on. There has been an emphasis on production, and DVR wants to balance that with the quality of the IEPs and Rehabs that are produced. This is also the intent of the Motivational Interviewing trainings.

DVR has been very open and working closely with the WSRC this quarter. There is a lot of information in our meeting mailing that DVR has provided. Mr. Aguirre wants to emphasize based on yesterday's conversation that DVR is not headed toward Order of Selection. DVR will continue to hire staff and will be meeting on the 25<sup>th</sup> with the Senior Leadership Team and Area Managers, to develop a comprehensive hiring plan to really look at what DVR's needs are and what future staffing needs will be.

Mr. Brandon comments that it seems DVR is concerned about rumors of Order of Selection, and it might be a good idea for Mr. Aguirre in his monthly reports to reiterate that Order of Selection is not impending. Mr. Aguirre thanks Mr. Brandon for the suggestion.

Mr. Johnsen asks about the Annual Case Review Report, and practices needing improvement, like the proper use of trial work experience pre eligibility determination. Does this mean that it isn't being done properly or needs to be done more frequently? Mr. Aguirre believes it needs to be done more. There have been a lot of customers who have high recidivism rates, who end up with no positive outcomes, and no employment. Staff does eligibility and then determines whether the customer will benefit from VR services. If there is doubt about whether a person is going to benefit from services, then Counselors need to act on that doubt and provide the customer an opportunity to demonstrate their ability to benefit, and providing that clear and convincing evidence as to why they would be able to benefit from vocational rehabilitation services. Mr. Johnson argues that trial work is designed to prove someone ineligible. Congress designed the law with the belief that everyone can work. Trial work experience was included to say "If you can prove to us that this person can't benefit, then we'll believe you." Clear and convincing evidence is needed to prove that a person is unable to benefit from voc rehab services. There are better ways to reach the same conclusion because the Trial Work Experience process takes many steps and assessments. You can make someone eligible and do community based assessments. There are very few people who really understand how to use Trial Work Experience. Mr. Aguirre agrees

with Mr. Johnsen, except that with Community Based Assessments, DVR isn't capturing all the information they need to capture, and that's where they should be using Trial Work Experience.

#### **CAP Report—Jerry Johnsen & Bob Huven**

- Highlighting how CAP processes referrals
- Some general observations and quantitative information about the quarter

Due to time conflicts, Valerie Arnold has to leave, so we're moving her agency report up to now.

**Valerie Arnold- OSPI**—Focusing on collaboration between OSPI at the state and local levels will be important in the coming year. OSPI is reviewing and renewing interagency agreements with partners. This has been productive with DVR. There's also a joint resolution with Secretary Dreyfus and DSHS. Ms. Dreyfus has signed it, but Superintendent Dorn has not yet, he is still reviewing it. Every year, there is an annual Special Education Administrators conference. This time it's in Tacoma at the Hotel Murano. This brings all special education administrators in our state together to provide support, training, professional development, sharing new guidance, monitoring priority areas. This is processed through the Washington (see [www.WASA.org](http://www.WASA.org) for more information). Some coordinators and teachers attend, but Mostly administration.

Mr. Kay asks, DVR area managers or supervisors could attend, would that help? Avreayl Jacobson is attending, to build relationships. Mr. Kay means, should we send more than just Ms. Jacobsen? Ms. Arnold thinks yes, that would be helpful. State OSPI is presenting 70% of the agenda, but there are outside presenters regarding best practices. It would be beneficial. The event occurs August 4 & 5, with registration available on [www.WASA.org](http://www.WASA.org). There will be a session on secondary transition, with the Center for Change in Transition Services.

#### **Highlights and Conversation about the Discussion Draft of Title V for Reauthorization of the Workforce Investment Act in the Senate**

Mr. McCallum presents on the WIA passed in 1998. Federal funds were dedicated to serving vulnerable populations, for employment training. This includes services for low income youth, unemployed adults, dislocated workers, those who calculate at less than an 8<sup>th</sup> grade level in adult basic education, supporting the nation's labor exchange system, through the Wagner Peyser Act amendments, and amendments to the Rehabilitation Act. The Act sunsetted in 2004. They kept it alive through annual appropriations and extension, anticipating that it will be reauthorized. There have been 2 failed attempts at reauthorizing it. Ms. Murray, our senator has been championing it in the Health Education Labor and Pensions Committee (HELP) to work on a bipartisan bill with improvements, and bring it up to the needs of our current time. Over a decade or more, the senator has had a chance to hear from the field, ways to improve delivery, infrastructure and governance of the Act. It is important to Senator Murray because in our communities, there are low income youth who are wasting their summer because they do not have chances to get work experience. Out-of-school youth from 16-24 years of age who are not making a connection to the work place, they will go until 30 before significantly contributing to their savings and their futures. Veterans need special help to think about how skills can be transferrable from the service back into civilian life. Tribal members have resources through WIA, as well as migrant seasonal farm workers, and youth who could benefit from Job Corps training, with apprenticeship programs with Journeyman instructors. For those who are not English

proficient, or have low levels of reading, writing, and math there have been public funds through WIA. Individuals with disabilities needing vocational rehabilitation receive funds from WIA.

Youth, adult, dislocated worker, Wagner Peyser, adult basic education, Title V Vocational Rehabilitation, proposed legislation partners would share common performance measures. This reauthorization results in a unified plan for working on common goals to benefit these populations.

The state plan that DVR creates each 3 years and updates every year would change due to this reauthorization. DVR would have one piece of the plan, and would coordinate with all the other participants under the act, and complete one piece of it. Federal education Perkins plan, Secretaries of Labor, and Education review and approve the unified plan collectively, to allow the funds to flow.

This works toward systems integration. For the youth program of WIA, there would be an expectation that 60% of funds would go to out of school youth, which is debated because in-school youth have needs too. For the adult program: adults who come into a local one-stop like WorkSource would not have to go through a determination and assessment services, and move straight into training. Dislocated workers would continue critical funding for people who are laid off, they would continue to have, even before they are laid off, a chance to have a business management team to help them transition plan, and they can get retraining and skills upgrading to reenter the workforce. For Wagner Peyser, employment security, they would collocate with the one stop, (like Worksource, which is common in Washington State, but not in all states,) also they would begin to assist customers to make applications to other parts of the system, including youth, adult, and dislocated worker programs. For Adult basic education, working independently with state community & technical colleges, there would be the expectation of unified planning and sharing performance measures, but the local applicants for federal funds would submit plans to local Workforce Development Council for approval, to be certain that planning is done locally and in an integrated manner. Also, there is a greater emphasis on IBEST, having academics offered in instruction in *context* with work, with a chance to have it tied to technical skills. The ability to springboard into employment or post secondary education would be more likely to stay engaged to make necessary advancements. Ms. Arnold talks about OSPI how they're tying increasing their skills to their transition goals, and getting academics to link with employment or post secondary education. OSPI is pushing for career pathways, as is Workforce board. This piece of legislation ties that all together with emphasis on career pathways.

Back to this unified planning group, there are six common adult performance measures, and five for youth. All the different units will contribute to the cost of the one stop doing business. This becomes a public one-stop. There's a choice for local Workforce Development Councils. The formula would be wired into the act itself, and the partners would agree via a local memo of understanding how those costs will be borne by each. And, those funds dedicated to the WorkSource would be drawn from administrative costs of each program. Right now the memo of understanding is required, but they are not required to provide moneys, only resources, like staffing on certain days, which helps, but does not pay for costs of doing business. Money does not change hands at the federal level.

Governors and business members and local councils want the money to stretch further than it does, one group left out are incumbent workers. People who are employed but are stuck in dead end jobs, need to advance, cannot afford tuition for further training, healthcare, and congress is

considering 15% of Adult and dislocated workers for those who are currently employed, those who are low wage workers for skill development while on the job.

Joelle Brouner will cover details on how the Rehabilitation Act is further amended through the proposed Senate bill; there are things in Titles 1 & 2 that improve benefits to individuals with disabilities. The new bill would have the workforce board to “establish objective criteria and processes to assess effectiveness of physical and programmatic accessibility and continuous improvement of one-stop centers”. This is a chance to get experts to weigh in on physical and programmatic accessibility.

Some funds stay with sec of labor federally for research and tech assist grants. One is heavy, for workforce innovation and replication grants. The Secretary of Labor and her Assistant Secretary are releasing an opportunity for state and local partners to compete for innovation grants in the fall. The workforce board meets next week, and how can we do youth unemployment with policy and practice and we may make a grant proposal to apply for the innovation money, when the instructions come out.

VR community very active getting word to Murray and staff, and there is much innovation in the reauthorized document.

**Ms. Brouner on Title V**—Thanks Mr. McCallum. She will focus on the senate bill. The McKeon’s house bill will not be covered.

So Title V of the Rehabilitation Act has two 2 purposes; 1. Integrity of the VR program; 2. What does it mean in our most local micro way? Observations about the Senate bill, Titles 1, 2 and 5:

- Emphasizes collaboration: slogan would be individualized employment plans for every American.
- Leveraging expertise to help each other be better programs,
- To make it easier for people, but harder for systems, and customers moving freely.

Workforce development and rehab, entry point is wide and path is more narrow. For rehab, the entry is narrow, and the path is wider, because it’s more individualized. Entry should be wide for everyone, and path wide too.

Particular observations: increased recognition of the role of assistive technology. Sometimes people with disabilities come up with low tech solutions that do not cost much, and that they work out themselves. Or sometimes they have higher tech options. A critique of the national VR constituency is that tech changes so fast, that we need to use it more. Locally we would add a member to our board from the Washington Access Foundation which used to be WATA, now renamed WATF. They do a lot of low interest loans to assist people in buying assistive technology. Title V emphasizes VR’s obligation to communication and employability. Another key is we don’t want people to wait to find work. No long gaps in employment records. An effort to make sure younger people or lower education attainment or skill gaps, don’t miss the first ten years of their earning potential and for people with disabilities as well. Another emphasis is transition. Yesterday about DVR’s obligation to provide prompt and equitable services, the requirement in the new bill is that VR would have statewide coordinator for transition students, and focuses regionally, and in every local office a dedicated staff solely for transition. Will that come at the cost of older equally motivated people with disabilities? Younger people have more access to support, may be inequitable. Senate staff did not agree. CSAVR responded with comments about transition. DVR responded with comments about transition. SRC comments responded on transition.

People don't like waiting for VR services. There's some recognition in this draft that DVR would seize the moment. There were notable changes to timelines. DVR presently has 60 days to determine eligibility. In the draft, the window is reduced to 45 days. DVR has a guideline of 120 in which to create an IPE, in the draft, it is 90 days. In terms of benefits, they have two months to figure out if they can get into a program. For customers there is a certain benefit to not waiting to be eligible. If that reduced time increases pressure to make hasty eligibility decisions, this could add time pressure to staff. When staff are pressured, where is the requisite emphasis on fundamental rehabilitation? Is it more important to get a plan timely, or quality? There may be a balance. In this draft, that's a change. Advocacy based argument: go in with confidence and understanding the system and their role in it and that could be included in plan development. Everyone pays into the one-stop. You can find SRC feedback in your notebook. We suggested that if we have to invest money into the rest of the system, you should amend the language to specify that people with disabilities and other underrepresented populations should expressly benefit from that investment. Suggested about own council, there are 10-12 other states that do provide staffing for SRCs. But only 3SRCs have staff who are solely dedicated only to serving the SRC. Many SRC's don't realize they can negotiate for a resource plan. A lot of VR administrators are not like Andres who don't want to have SRCs be active, because they don't see it as a partnership as much as a threat. We suggested that we want every DSU to have to show how they did the negotiation. If you have to report on it, you're more likely to do it. Supported employment in Title V is more customized. A recognition of the things we've done in our state for many years but not national practice. On page 30 of the Title V, strengthening authority of DSU in relationship to DSA, we applauded that in our comments, because if we strengthen the DSU, money shortages cannot cause too many consolidations or shifting of funds. Section 511 aligns nicely with a letter this SRC drafted, in support of the NDRN report. It puts severe limits on circumstances in which people with disabilities could be paid less than minimum wage, or in a segregated setting.

Challenges if this version passed, reorient the way we do transition, and the relationship between VR and OSPI and schools would be a big level of collaboration required doesn't match the current funding levels. The level of expertise on tech issues, that VR will have to have will be higher, and good at INI plans might be weighed and measured.

Mr. Hudson, informed people with this state's workforce development system, and K-12 system and community tech college system and VR system, recognize a lot in this draft as having originated in WA or flourished in WA. This is a compliment to us in the SRC and VR and our state and partners. Regardless of your political orientation, Senator Murray has achieved a level of seniority in the senate and she has been a tremendous advocate, and she is paying attention to what we are doing. This draft reflects that, and makes it a foot in the door. We cannot discount the influence that Ms. Rutledge has had since moving to RSA as commissioner.

Joelle appreciates the Workforce Board, who were given the task of being collector and compiler of stakeholder feedback for every title of this draft. They did a masterful job on a huge deadline of putting something meaningful together with a strict protocol for that feedback.

Mr. McCallum: titles came out in installments, and Senator Murray has a good workforce investment board. We do more than just oversee Title 1.b. statute established in our state, makes Workforce board to do more, to be a coordinating body. Murray's suggestion to have workforce board coordinate that feedback, Lenny Papadakis took it seriously. Employment Security

commented, as did the State Board of Community and Technical Colleges. They got it in by 5pm pacific.

It communicates the things the system needs imagined by many great minds. We can reflect on what we can do with what we have to make the system better.

12:00p—1:00p      **L U N C H**

**Customer Forum Debrief**—Mr. Larson definitely takes the tension off. There were less attendees than expected. Not getting enough content with counselors is as usual a thing we heard about. The woman from PAVE came and had asked that DVR staff had worked with her more on a workable placement for her daughter. Parents can be heavily biased. When can a parent be a smart advocate? Where do you draw the line as using the parents as a resource or decision making processes? Some parents come in and dominate the process. Counselors look for independence from the client. Can't bar parents from the process, some of them are guardians. But, the counselor should be looking to see what the client can do. The parent has a lot to offer, but in the end it's going to be about the customer. Mr. Aguirre points out that counselors may forget that if the customer is over 18, it's the customers' choice if they want the parents' involvement. Counselors need to be cognizant of the individuals' choice. Parents are people too, and there is always a chance that what they know about the system is not very informed. At the Bellingham forum, one parent spoke about why there wouldn't be a sheltered workshop. She was not aware that this isn't something DVR does anymore. They also come from schools where parents are heavily involved in developing IPEs. The mom isn't going to be at work with you. Mr. Larson appreciated the positive comments. Ms. Kautzman noticed they were customers encouraging each other, and a sharing of information. Ms. Brouner noticed three comments about communications between CRPs and DVR and customers. CRPs in Pierce County and their relationships with DVR might be a good place to look at. Mr. Huven thinks that there's a lot that wasn't there. He expected a larger crowd, with more serious complaints, because of his caseload right now containing negative opinions on performance and wait times. Mr. Hudson has heard this from a few people, that Tacoma forum might have been difficult. Ms. Foster noted that two people had to pay for parking. Perhaps in the future we could work on. Don Brandon was concerned about the quasi threatening tone, from the "how dare you," woman. It was curious that she was so caustic when she spoke but playful and friendly otherwise, when not public speaking. Mr. Hernandez asks when we met in Olympia, we invited Tacoma customers. Ms. Carr, one public forum where we were sitting in front, they thought that SRC members were paid, but we changed how we opened the meeting to give people a better idea who we're about. Ms. Foster very much enjoys the forums and thinks that the people that let it be known that they're felons, they self selected to tell that information. He was proud of where he had come from and what he was working toward. He was giving courage to other people that seemed to be frustrated. One woman said that her counselor helped her to learn to read, there's a wide variety of people, and how you look at the feeling of the whole. Mr. Hernandez sees more and more felons coming to DVR in the last few years. DVR has been doing a lot of trainings on that.

**Review work of Customer Satisfaction Committee**—There is no one conduit for assessing how people feel about the services provided by DVR. The council is expected to measure customer satisfaction, by the rehab act. We have not done a survey in a long time. 2006 was the last one. We have an active Customer Satisfaction Committee who have worked two quarters to devise a survey questionnaire. They have gotten positive input from DVR's senior leadership team. They have concluded that they should survey current participants who have been in plan for 358-597

days; another sample will be those in plan for 114-200 days; former participants of DVR who were rehabilitated, and a fourth survey for those who exited for other reasons. Two surveys are almost identical, one in present tense, one in past tense. Ms. Brouner and Mr. McCallum have a meeting scheduled for Aug 15<sup>th</sup> for DSHS surveying staff, to determine whether they can fit our survey into their workload and have it done in-house. Mr. Larson met with them when he was chair, and it was a positive meeting. They will perhaps assist us with conducting the surveys and analyzing the data. They do not have a hard and fast due date for completion. We will be trying to set a date for that, perhaps when we meet in Spokane we will have another update. DVR reviewed the questions, and found them good.

## **Agency Reports**

*Sandra Carr—State Independent Living Council (SILC)—Ms. Carr thanks Ms. Finkbonner for reporting in April on her behalf. Ms. Carr is on DRW, who sent her to Baltimore for the National Disability Rights Conference, and that was very valuable. Lots of good information on Ticket to Work, Independent Living, and a lot of it is on CD and we can make copies, and send it to people. She also went to Gallaudet University. Independent Living Center in Vancouver closed. Mr. Johnsen asks why it happened. Ms. Brouner said that she doesn't know why except that it may have been a sensitive personnel issue.*

**Training on Serving Customers who are Deaf, Hard of hearing, Late deafened, and deaf-blind**—Dona Fuerst and Steve Roldan are here to share information about their recent training. This training has been due for a long time. It hasn't been done in over ten years. Both of them are former RCDs. They started talking about it, and an interpreter really thought it was a great idea. They have a fabulous dynamic training team. In Tab 6 of the meeting mailing, there is an outline of what was covered in the training. The training is three days long, which is a long time to be out of the office. They invited vendors, they coordinated with CCER to invite all the vendors, and class turnout has been 50/50 vendors/staff. People thought it was only for staff who serve deaf customers. But DVR does not have RCDs in every office, and counselors there serve those. It also became a cultural sensitivity training. Mostly they go over the fundamentals of hearing loss: the different types, then deafness/deaf culture. They do a day on deafness. Then one deaf blind specialist comes in and talks about that. Dr. Jamie Wilson is a psychologist who is deaf. He does a half day on the importance of providing culturally relevant rehab for deaf people. There is a panel of three staff who work in three different offices, they are culturally deaf, use ASL and were born in deaf families. They talk about how this does and doesn't impact their lives. They talk about their experience with working in DVR. DVR tries to hold themselves to a high accessibility standard. Deaf staff feel isolated. They feel frustrated with technology. It has been a powerful presentation. There are some evaluations in the notebook from people who attended the training. They just did the training in Spokane, and the supervisor in Spokane covered the office phones while everyone in the office, including IT and HR staff went to this training. They've done 4 sessions so far. They have four more this year. They are going to keep this going a few times a year over five years. Most of the trainings like this require Supervisor approval. Training requests need to be submitted. There is no prioritization, but there is an encouragement to engage. This isn't specifically for RCDs. It's for everyone. This has gone beyond with deaf customers. It is how we work with deaf coworkers. How we supervise deaf employees. How we integrate this into our agency culture. Is this adaptable to private sector employers? Dona believes, certainly. This would be something AWB would be interested in. They are doing one at the Criminal Justice Training Center, outside of SeaTac. This is Aug 23, 24 & 25. Ms. Brouner asks about language

competency, and English/ASL/tactile. What about people who are eligible for DVR services, but not English speakers, or people with no language? The role of the deaf interpreter is a person good with minimal language skills. So far the trainings have been in Lynnwood, Yakima, Spokane and Lacey. Future sessions will be in Burien, Moses Lake, Mount Vernon, and Vancouver. They want to do Lynnwood in the spring.

In conjunction, Mr. Roldan looked at what we haven't done that needs to be done soon? The federal region 10 meets, where professionals get together and have a training conference. This hasn't happened in 8 years or so. CCER/TACE lots of autism blindness mental health, but TACE thinks yes good idea. DVR is working in conjunction with TACE to do a conference in Portland in September. In house training, they do ASL/deaf trainings, but the conference in Portland September 13-15 will be 201 or 301, Breakout sessions (25 of them) relating to different aspects of deafness and hearing loss, each with a different presenter. It's called Building Bridges for Employment for the deaf and hard of hearing. It's \$125 for three days. ARRA funds have been dedicated to that, to try to keep the registration fee low. It will be held at the Sheraton at Portland Airport.

**Martin McCallum – Workforce Board**—Downturn in economy ... workforce board is to healthcare shortage taskforce. Unmet needs for healthcare workers in hospitals and advance planning for changing demands in healthcare occupations. Teaming with OSPI with small amount of funds helping career path services for at risk youth to avoid them dropping out of school. There are some small state funds for community and technical colleges, for internships for adults attending college and state financial aid. Please see the newsletter put out by Tim Sweeny, you can read all about workforce activities. The Workforce Board has a new member, postsecondary opportunities Sonja Hallum.

**Janna Finkbonner – Section 121 Tribal VR**— Not much has happened in 3 months. Most programs are gearing up for the end of the year and trying to get those successful closures. July lately has been slow for Tribal VR. The Canoe Journey ends in Swinomish soon. Yakama had a 2 day disability conference. They are hosting CANAR next year, here in Seattle. The annual used to happen in Seattle every year, but it has been four years since it's been in Seattle. Samish has a new director. They are talking about mentoring new directors and working with TACE to do that for a transfer of knowledge. Common measures are a thing that the tribes are working on. A Memorandum of Understanding might be able to capture some data for that. Mr. Larson says DVR uses STARS, does the tribe have one too? Alliance worked with DVR and the tribes to build STARS and a similar database for tribal partners. Is there a CRP mod for that? Mr. Aguirre answers that they can capture data about RFPs for CRPs. That's available on the public facing site. They do not capture qualitative data, working with CRPs.

## **Committee Reports**

**Executive Committee**—Mike Hudson—Action Items for upcoming quarter: They met telephonically to approve agenda. Minutes will be in the next notebook. Upcoming activities include a meeting for budget planning and resource plans.

**Employer & Rehabilitation Partnerships**—Jim Larson—Action Items: Ms. Franklin is in charge of business relations in DVR, so we will be meeting with her soon this coming quarter. To get a good idea of what DVR does to engage with employers. They also talked in their subcommittee meeting yesterday about OSPI and their Memorandum of Understanding with DVR, DDD, and OSPI. There are the ARRA projects listing, but we weren't clear what we wanted. We want to know what the impacts of numbers of people working, how many hours and dollars per outcome. Mr. Aguirre can give that information on Project Hire, but other projects are relationship building and training. They also request quarterly reports on ARRA.

**Member Recruitment & Participation**—Rudy Hernandez—Action Items: We have one member terming off, the SILC representative, Sandra Carr in September or October. She will need to be replaced. She was part of the first meetings of this incarnation of the council. She has served for a long time. We are going to talk about strategies for replacing her and getting someone else from the SILC. We hope to find someone as devoted and dedicated as Ms. Carr. We will give Ms. Carr a proper sendoff in October, in Spokane.

**Planning Policy & Advocacy**— Susan Kautzman—Action Items: Input to State Plan, what's next? Mr. McCallum suggests relationships/partnerships, work across agencies. Mr. McCallum offered to talk to Teresa Kutsch and someone at Worksource Spokane about their relationship. They will also be looking at the 2011 case review. Mr. Aguirre has DVR planning to convene a team to review the case review too, 2 people from the state office, one area manager, one supervisor and one Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor, at the very least.

Mr. Hudson reminds us that we were well represented at the State Plan Forums. Ms. Brouner facilitated all those meetings, and members attended each one. Mr. McCallum says one other source of info on performance: workforce board prepares a report called workforce training results, which looks at the major workforce developers in our state, and will have by October data on all our workforce partners. This can be a comparative view across programs, and to contrast because different populations are served, but it is a helpful source to look at our workforce development statewide.

Ms. Brouner reminds us that July is the best month in disability history. This is a special thing. Justin Dart links us to the ADA and the Rehab Act. He was the first Commissioner of RSA. He was outspoken and outgrew the system.

3:40p—3:50p      **Member Surveys & Travel Forms**

3: 50 p — 4:00 p      **Recapping Action Items**

4:00p      **A D J O U R N**