

Policy Academy
July 10, 2012 Meeting Minutes

ATTENDANCE: ANGIE DEJONG, LUCY HILGENDORF, DEBRA SHAW, CRAIG WEHNER, JENNIFER MIKALOWSKI, JAMES MAZZETTI, JACQUELINE MEYER, RANDY SOMMERFELD (FOR MEGAN SCHUELLER), KATHY HOLLEN, ANDREA SIMON, DEB HENDERSON-GUENTHER, LINDA VEGOE, JOHN HAUGH, LINDA RAAP

ABSENT: DEEPA PAL, MIKE GRECO, JOANNA RICHARD, ALLISON GORDON

May Meeting Report Outs

All

- Coding manual has been updated with more detailed coding
- Workers Comp training has been completed
- The Consumer Responsibilities form has been updated
- A Q & A has been added to the knowledgebase about including insurance when renting a vehicle for consumers

Living FAR – Draft Document

Jennifer

- Jennifer explained the potential function of the document, populating into eligibility and OOS, but only the first time. Also explained how the Great 8 was included but only as a single field. Functional limitations have a drop box with yes or no, to make clear whether limitation is disability related or not. Also there is space to discuss whether limitations are in place or not. If a disability was accommodated then the disability would not populate into OOS.
 - Discussion:
 - Did we grab the information we were looking for?
 - Will the form be mandatory or not?
 - The group was split about whether the form should be mandatory with staff being busy already.
 - There were questions about whether it is just another form to fill out
 - There was a caution about being too process oriented, so be careful with making things mandatory
 - Form was considered to be a great tool overall with comments about it being a great tool to share with consumers and services providers
 - This topic also brought up the changes to OOS and how disabilities are counted, limitations will no longer take whether accommodated into consideration, this would change some of the form, whether the fields would be necessary or not.
 - There was discussion about committee member going before IRIS committee to talk about potential addition of this item. Jennifer offered to go before IRIS committee. There were a lot of questions about how long this addition of this form would take, taking into consideration the IRIS changes are prioritized and the 1st priority now is the OOS changes scheduled for 10/1/12.
 - There was a question about whether to implement the GST or Amended FAR prior to the IRIS addition, and do we make it mandatory?
 - There was discussion of changes to the form such as getting rid of the non disability related or yes/no due to this information can go in to the other section of the form.

- There was discussion about the reason this form is being considered it was for difficult cases, transfer of cases and when a disability can change over time or a new disability/limitation is acquired and possibly for service provider referral.
- Next Steps:
 - Go before IRIS
 - Discuss at future meeting
 - Jennifer to make adjustments discussed and go before IRIS committee.

Continuing Support for Subsequent Post-Secondary Training After a Failed Semester Linda V

- Linda started the conversation with stating that in a review of other states, those states do not pull funding for schooling after a failed semester, that they will wait 2 semesters, Linda from reading case notes is under the impression that there is little flexibility about the failing one semester and then cutting payments.
 - Discussion: Many spoke up that there are exceptions to this. Linda R was going to check policy about the language. It was asked that this question be taken back to teams. Possible urban myth?

Training Grant Training

Linda R

- Linda R is wondering what needs to be included in the training. She will be developing short webcasts on the TG process that will be saved so that staff can view at any time. She suggested that the previous discussion could be one topic.
 - There is a need to look at private college policy, the necessary and appropriate, what services are being provided to the attendee – childcare, travel, etc
 - When does the exception request need to be completed?
 - It was felt counselors need to be reminded that the counselor needs to agree with the goal, especially when the counselor is getting the case once school has started
 - There was a reminder that training grants can't be authorized until after 7/1 due the to state fiscal year
 - There was a question about semesters starting at odd times
 - Next Steps:
 - Ask for input on Training grant training from teams
 - Issues addressed
 - Policy
 - The whole process
 - **Get back to Linda R feedback by 7/27 COB via e-mail**

- Background: A consumer had worked at Goodwill Industries and when their experience was done they thought they could collect unemployment. That is not the case because Goodwill is exempt from UI. The suggestion was made that counselors need to make consumers aware of this.
 - Question about whether DVR should be doing business with entities that do not pay into UI.
 - It was stated that UI is not paid for staff either
 - It was stated that a thought was that the admin fee covered the UI
 - What is DVR's part? To make sure that a TWE doesn't last long enough to be eligible for UI? To be sure that we discuss this with consumers when setting of TWE's?
 - DVR should consult with legal or UI? Potential training opportunity?
 - The preferred method of payment of TWE wages is to ask the employer to do the payroll, counselors should be talking with the employers
 - Next steps: Linda R will do some digging to get more information on the UI issue. For now, academy members should take back to their WDAs that we should be advising consumers who participate in TWE, that they may or may not be eligible for UI. They should not assume they will be eligible for UI once they complete a TWE. UI is determined based on each individual's work history.

Category 1 OOS Letters**All**

- Examples of letters were distributed for all of the WDA's. There was a wide range of what the letters looked like. Discussion took place as to whether there should be a consistent form letter, to include a welcoming and positive tone.

The following was discussed:

- Some of the language that could be removed: OOS (means nothing or confusing to consumers), talking about waitlist (as there is no wait list for cat1), the 3 bullet points (why are they there?)
- Some letters had professional counselor information, some letters had CAP info, some letters had bullet points about what is expected to work with DVR, other letters had IPE planning worksheets or some combination of the above. The consensus was to simplify the letter to include the date of application, and any other necessary language.
- Next steps: Linda R to check policy about CAP and OOS language, come up with a standardized letter based on necessary components and put to a vote, possibly get letter generated through IRIS