

## **Governor's State Rehabilitation Council (SRC)**

### **Full Council Meeting Minutes**

February 15, 2018

#### **Members Present**

Dan Martinez, Chair  
Danita Applewhite  
Ana Nunez  
Sheri Carparelli  
Jill Pleasant\*  
Melissa Wotjak  
Scott Lindbloom\*  
David Cheeseman  
Judith Castro\*

#### **Members Absent**

John Gutierrez  
Carol Carr  
Paula Seanez  
Joshua Auer  
Kathy McDonald  
Brandon Dale

#### **Staff Present**

Lindsey Powers, Council Staff Liaison  
Teleconferenced\*

#### **Guests Present**

Amy Porterfield\*  
Adam Robson  
Brandi Coffland\*

---

### **Call to Order and Introductions**

Dan Martinez, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:10 pm in the RSA Videoconference Room, 515 N. 51st Avenue, Phoenix, and in the RSA Video Conference Rooms located in Tucson, Flagstaff, and Yuma, AZ.

### **Approval of September 14, 2017 Meeting Minutes**

Jill Pleasant moved to approve the minutes of the September 14, 2017 SRC Full Council meeting. Danita Applewhite seconded the motion. The council approved the meeting minutes by unanimous voice vote.

### **SRC Chairperson's Report**

Dan Martinez stated that members of the Executive Committee would provide feedback to Federal staff during RSA's Federal monitoring visit, which would focus on compliance with the Workforce and Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA). Dan Martinez noted that one of the SRC's responsibilities was to evaluate RSA's services. Mr. Martinez stated the Program Review Committee was responsible for evaluating services, programs, and policies and providing feedback to RSA. Dan Martinez stated the committee would do the work and report back to the SRC Full Council. Dan Martinez inquired whether any council members would be interested in serving on that committee. Ana Nunez, Melissa Wotjak, David Cheeseman, Scott Lindbloom, Sheri Carparelli, and Brandi Coffland expressed interest in serving on that committee. Melissa Wotjak stated she had questions regarding Transition policies and inquired whether

RSA's policies were available to the public. Brandi Coffland, Policy and Support Unit Manager, stated that RSA's policies were available on the Department of Economic Security (DES) website under RSA and the Resource Tab. Ms. Coffland noted the Transition Program was a unique program and encouraged Ms. Wojtak to contact Abel Young, Statewide Transition Coordinator, who could provide more detailed information regarding Transition policies.

## **RSA Administrator's Report**

This item was tabled.

## **New Business**

### ***Report from the Governor's Council on Blindness and Visual Impairment***

Amy Porterfield, Chair of the Governor's Council on Blindness and Visual Impairment (GCBVI) stated the GCBVI was established in 1992 by Executive Order to preserve and protect specialized services for blind and visually impaired individuals. Amy Porterfield noted that rehabilitation for blind and visually impaired individuals was not typically covered in the medical field. Ms. Porterfield stated an individual that loses sight must learn how to perform all duties to live independently such as how to travel, read, and use assistive technology. Amy Porterfield stated the GCBVI collaborated with the Services for the Blind Visually Impaired and Deaf (SBVID) program within Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) as well as with the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) to review and recommend accessible testing standards for students. Amy Porterfield stated the GCBVI included members from different blindness consumer groups. She explained that blindness consumer groups were titled "of the blind" such as the National Federation of the Blind (NFB), which formed in 1940 by blind individuals whom advocated for themselves and for changes in policy. Amy Porterfield stated at that time, blind or visually impaired individuals were only eligible for social security if the individual could prove they did not have a caretaker to take care of the blind or visually impaired individual. Amy Porterfield stated the GCBVI had members from consumer groups, which included the NFB or the National Federation of the Blind of Arizona (NFBA), the American Foundation for the Blind (ACB) or the Arizona Council of the Blind (AzCB) and the Blinded Veterans Association (BVA). She added the council also included a parent of a blind or visually impaired child, community members, Ex-Oficio members from the Arizona Braille and Talking Book Library, the SBVID Program Manager, the Director of the Arizona Center for the Blind and Visually Impaired (ACBVI), and the Superintendent from the Arizona State Schools for the Deaf and Blind (ASDB). Ms. Porterfield stated the GCBVI would evaluate policies and Legislature effecting blind individuals and could provide recommendations on Legislature if the Governor was in support of or neutral on the item. She noted that if the Governor was not in support of Legislature, the GCBVI as a council made up of members appointed by the Governor, could not move forward, although the consumer groups could advocate. Amy Porterfield stated the GCBVI was made up of the committees: Executive, Public Information, Committee on Deaf-Blind Issues, Independent Living, Assistive Technology, Education and Employment, which would perform work on the GCBVI Strategic Plan goals and report back to the Full Council. Dan Martinez inquired whether the GCBVI and the SRC worked in parallel. Amy Porterfield stated the GCBVI viewed the SRC as a sister council

and collaborated with the SRC in participating on interview panels, participation on the State Plan, and evaluated and provided feedback regarding RSA policies. Dan Martinez inquired whether the GCBVI was ever at odds with the SRC. Amy Porterfield stated she felt both councils worked well together and noted there was some different viewpoints within the disability population. Amy Porterfield stated, for example, there was proposed Legislation that would require individuals with service animals to be required to demonstrate the service animal's duties. She noted that some disability groups were in favor of the Legislature, although other groups were against it as it opposed the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and would require blind and visually impaired individuals to be placed on a registry of disabled individuals.

Danita Applewhite stated that she was impressed by the GCBVI and inquired regarding the consumer groups' activities surrounding deaf-blind individuals and Independent Living (IL). Amy Porterfield stated the Committee on Deaf-Blind Issues reviewed policies and services to deaf-blind individuals or individuals with Combined Vision and Hearing Loss (CVHL). She stated that the committee was currently working with agencies to implement a statewide Support Service Provider (SSP) program that would provide SSPs to individuals with CVHL. Amy Porterfield stated a SSP would assist an individual when accessing the environment, such as going to the grocery store or bank with the deaf-blind individual. Ms. Porterfield stated the committee was interested in identifying a method for long-term funding for a SSP program. Amy Porterfield stated the IL Committee would look at the services for older blind individuals and the in preserving the specialized training to blind and visually impaired individuals. Dr. Applewhite inquired whether the council provided outreach to veterans. Amy Porterfield stated the Public Information Committee provided outreach to all blind and visually impaired populations and attended conferences and events. She added that the committee developed the EyeKnow.AZ database at <https://eyeknow.az.gov/>, which was an information and referral source for the community. Amy Porterfield stated that members from the BVA also participated on the council and were able to reach out to their local chapters and provide information regarding policies surrounding veterans.

## **Committee Reports**

### ***Employment and Community Partnerships Committee***

Judith Castro stated the Employment and Community Partnerships Committee had been reviewing the Self-Employment Policy and offered some recommendations to RSA. Ms. Castro stated the Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD) Planning Council was running a pilot program regarding self-employment. Judith Castro stated the committee discussed inviting Michael Leyva from the DDD Planning Council to attend a meeting and discuss further collaboration. She noted that the pilot was under the approval process currently, although she hoped the program would be successful. Brandi Coffland stated she anticipated sending out the updated Self-Employment Policy to the committee soon.

### ***Program Review Committee***

This item was tabled.

## **Membership Organization Updates**

## ***SILC***

Danita Applewhite stated the State Independent Living Council (SILC) had appointed the new Director, Jim Baker, who had a background in Vocational Rehabilitation (VR). Dr. Applewhite stated that SILC participated in a two-day Strategic Planning session and as a non-profit, the agency was developing a Resource Development Committee. Danita Applewhite stated the committee faced some challenges although she encouraged the committee to work under the philosophy, "There is no VR without IL". Danita Applewhite stated that she would attend the National IL Congress in Orlando. Dan Martinez inquired regarding the philosophy, "There is no VR without IL". Danita Applewhite stated her opinion that there should be more collaboration between VR and IL especially when considering Priority 2 and Priority 3 clients, who could receive IL services while waiting for VR services. Dan Martinez stated that some individuals struggled as they did not have the skills to live independently. Danita Applewhite stated veterans often required IL skills when returning to civilian life and noted that anyone with an acquired disability required some IL training. David Cheeseman stated clients in Tucson were often referred to the Centers for Independent Living to learn IL skills.

## ***American Indian VR Projects***

This item was tabled.

## ***Client Assistance Program***

This item was tabled.

## ***AzTAP***

Jill Pleasant stated that registration would open for the Arizona Technology Access Program (AzTAP) Conference hosted by the Institute for Human Development. Ms. Pleasant stated the conference would include an Assistive Technology, Evidence-Based Practices in Disability Disciplines, and an American Indian VR Training and Technical Assistance Center track. Jill Pleasant stated the conference was scheduled for July 8-10, 2018 at the We-Ko-Pa Resort in Fountain Hills and that exhibitor registration would open in March. Jill Pleasant stated that AzTAP also had an AT Lending Library through the ADE and loaned out AT to clients and could provide AT training. She noted that any council members with further questions about the program were welcome to contact her.

## **Agenda Items and Date for Next Meeting**

The next meeting of the SRC Full Council will be on May 17, 2018 from 1:00 pm to 4:00 pm. in the Video Conference Room, at 515 N. 51st Avenue, Phoenix, AZ.

## **Announcements**

There were no announcements.

## **Public Comment**

A call to the public was made with no responses forthcoming.

## **Adjournment of Meeting**

Danita Applewhite motioned to adjourn the meeting. Ana Nunez seconded the motion. The meeting stood adjourned at 2:30 pm

## Vocational Rehabilitation Scorecard – 1/28/2018-2/13/2018

Measure	Goal for "Green"	Actual
<b>Total Number of Individuals in VR program</b>	N/A	15,247
<b>Total Number of Individuals in OOS Priority 2 and 3</b>	N/A	2,064
<b>Total Number of Individuals in Priority 2</b>	N/A	1644
<b>Total Number of Individuals in Priority 3</b>	N/A	420
<b>Number of Applications VR</b>	115-143	176
<b>Average number of days from application to eligibility</b>	Less than 60 days (Federal requirement)	30.5 days
<b>Median number of days from application to eligibility</b>	Less than 60 days (Federal requirement)	20.7 days
<b>Eligibility Determination Compliance – within 60 days</b>	96-100% compliance (Federal requirement)	93.9%
<b>Number of New plans written</b>	24	110
<b>Average number of days from eligibility to IPE implementation</b>	Less than 90 days (Federal requirement)	74.6 days
<b>Median number of days from eligibility to IPE implementation</b>	Less than 90 days (Federal requirement)	58.4 days
<b>IPE Implementation Compliance – within 90 days</b>	96-100% compliance (Federal requirement)	86.7% within 90 days
<b>Average hourly wage of successful employment outcomes</b>	\$10.06	\$11.91
<b>Number of Job Placements</b>	32-39	47
<b>Number of Clients Closed Successful</b>	25-30	38