

Policy Academy Meeting Minutes  
Oct. 20, 2009

**Present:** Deb Henderson-Guenther, Linda Vegoe, Sue Munger, Patti Johnson, Beth Ulrich, Linda Raap, Allison Gordon, Katherine Massa, Tom Draghi, Suzanne Walter, Kris Martin, Tammi Cassidy-Neal, Brock Hansen, Jennifer Hunn, Charlene Dwyer, Manuel Lugo, Jean Rogers, Mike Greco

**Review of September Meeting Minutes**

**All**

**Updates from Management**

**Manuel, Mike, Jean**

Manuel:

- Discussed ARRA & also what we are doing/planning to do to prepare for RSA visit. Plans are to do a trial run through and use that process to do a self evaluation prior to RSA's visit.
- 44 vacancies currently plus an additional 15 people on medical leave. WRC has sent a letter to DOA supporting the need for DVR to fill vacancies.
- IRIS design update: Team continues to work well together. Anticipate a much better RapWeb system & IRIS becoming much easier to navigate.
- Training Academy: Will be asking PA members to participate in the Academy to train new staff and create refresher courses. We want to provide "just in time training."

Jean:

- Jean discussed how the recently sent out instructions to teams on developing strategic plans to address our required performance indicators will also help us meet our Federal Requirements and help with the RSA review.
  - Jean asked PA members to keep time open during RSA's visit because members will be the first approached. We want to be upfront, helpful, and transparent.

Mike:

- Had 2683 successful closures for FY 09 which is 74% of our closure goal. About 14,000 IPEs currently.
- OJTs: Now have 5 state departments signed up for OJTs. Currently have 141 OJTs. Ultimate goal is 900 OJTs, so we want to increase marketing. Recent letters to consumers about the OJT program have generated numerous calls and questions.
- GAR review process – deadline is completion before Thanksgiving.

Charlene:

- Focusing on monitoring visit at this time. In Nov. teleconference scheduled with RSA which should give us some early insights as to what issues they are seeing in the states they have already reviewed. If we have similar issues, we start working on correcting them. We feel as long as we try to identify issues and correct them, we should be okay. The Policy Academy's approach where issues are identified on an ongoing basis and then the teams work on improvements is a good model to follow.
- We are in a good position as far as funding because ARRA funding is allowing us to take people off the wait list and also to focus on creating OJTs. The challenge in the next 18 month is the human resource side. However, just had 4 VRC positions approved for Milwaukee.

Discussion continued on work load issues:

- Linda V. shared that they are encouraging Independent Living Centers to look at general information sessions (sessions that lend themselves to having an ILC provide) they might be able to provide to DVR consumers to help with the DVR workload.
- Discussed hiring consumers as LTEs. DVR currently has no LTE line so we would have to use case service money & there are pros and cons related to this.

### **OOS Feedback**

- Pros and cons gathered from WDAs were shared and discussed.
- Group recommended doing a dummy run to evaluate the impact on category placement and the ease of use.
- Manuel added that a system counting only limitations would align with ADA because we would not be considering accommodations when determining limitations.
- Next Step: Manuel will create a test instrument. WDA directors would manage the selection of cases and gather feedback from teams. Each team will use the test instrument on 6 existing cases.
- Timeline: Test instrument completed in next couple of weeks. Have process completed and feedback compiled by Jan. 15. Information to Policy Academy by the end of Jan. & follow-up discussion at February meeting. If we decide to implement process, will have to give public notice by the end of February.

### **RSA 911 Feedback**

- No additional input from the field.
- Linda R. will forward our recommendations to Manuel for review by SLT and then to send to RSA.

### **Working towards competitive employment**

- WI will not accept as successful closures individuals working at sub-minimum. This information will be shared/discussed at the directors' meeting, added to the Knowledgebase, and included in the TAG.

### **Exception Request**

#### **Deb**

- Shared areas where there are problems with the exception request and the following was discussed:
  - Car purchases: As part of exception process, asking that detailed information on the car, price, etc. be included in the request. By the time approved, the car has been sold. Can the purchase price for a vehicle be approved as a "price range"? Give the consumer a price range that can be used as a guideline when looking for a car & then DVR staff and consumer work together to finalize purchase.
  - Business Plans: Concern with the length of time it takes for approval and the amount of detail required often resulting in rolling requirements.
    - Will include a discussion on this topic at the managers' meeting.
    - If purchasing approval needs to go to the director's level for approval, then mechanism needs to be in place to have director sit in on committee process.

- After review and approval of business plan by the business committee, should be able to approve purchases in its entirety without having to go through the exception process & provide additional details and quotes. Would follow standard delegated spending authority process.
    - Could VRC approve exception request/purchases up to the delegated amount and document that this is above our fee schedule and the reason why?
    - What did we intend to do when we created fee schedules? Is our current system meeting our needs?
  - TG Unmet Need: When exception requests are used to fund the DVR unmet need, asking for very detailed list of needs. Financial aids has already determined an unmet need, and DVR has agreed to accept their determination.
    - Can process be simplified? Recommendation that consumer would be informed of his/her DVR unmet that is not covered by TG or financial aids, and consumer could choose to request additional funding to cover the unmet need without use of the exception process.
    - Additional funding beyond the DVR unmet need would require the use of the exception process.
    - SLT could determine what process to use for out of state/private schools.
- **Recommendations regarding exception process:**
  - Discuss at Managers' Meeting what are the appropriate review processes for the above services?
  - Reiterate the importance of the 10-day turn around time.

### **Customized Self Employment Toolkit**

**Jean, Deb, Allison**

- Suggested having the toolkit put on a disc.
- Include in IRIS check lists specifically related to self employment, customized self employment, etc. as reminder of what needs to be addressed in IRIS in these areas.
- Suggested giving examples of who does what in each step, include estimated times for task, and identify who is the leader of the process. Remove self employment coordinator wording because it causes confusion.
- Include underlined information from Pg. 19 in earlier processes so the information is shared early in the planning. Include the information also in the self employment toolkit.
- Deb will check with ERI to find out what is offered through the TTW. Could also add TTW reference to appendix 8 & 11 and reference pg. 67.
- **Email additional feedback to Deb by the end of the month.**
- Statewide training will be provided on the toolkit. Have submitted a proposal for panel presentation at Rehab Conference in March.