Governor's Council on Blindness and Visual Impairment (GCBVI)
Assistive Technology (AT) Committee Meeting Minutes
October 9, 2019

Members Present
Bea Shapiro, Chair
Nathan Pullen
Mark Nelson
Sue LeHew
Ed Gervasoni

Members Absent
Terri Hedgpeth

Staff Present
Lindsey Powers

Guests Present
Bob Kresmer

Call to Order and Introductions

Bea Shapiro, Chair, called the meeting to order at 3:15 pm in the RSA Conference Room, Phoenix, AZ. Introductions were made and a quorum was present.

Approval of August 21, 2019 Meeting Minutes

Nathan Pullen motioned to approve the August 21, 2019 meeting minutes. Sue LeHew seconded the motion. The minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

VRATE Discussion

Bea Shapiro inquired whether committee members had reviewed the draft Power Point presentation for the Vision Rehabilitation and Assistive Technology Expo (VRATE) and had any feedback. Sue LeHew stated the Power Point presentation should specify the individuals that were mandatory to attend a worksite assessment and the individuals that were not mandatory. Sue LeHew stated the Power Point presentation did not include some of the information that was discussed during the previous AT Committee meeting. Sue LeHew stated the Power Point presentation slides

were a light yellow and suggested the presentation include some graphics as well. Ms. LeHew reviewed the presentation slides and suggested that Slide 3 include more information from Joy Zabala's website and to define what a SETT framework was. Nathan Pullen stated that a non-Assistive Technology (AT) professional would not be familiar with a SETT protocol. Sue LeHew stated that she would include information describing the SETT protocol. Bea Shapiro suggested that "student" be dropped from Slide 4 and just include "specific individual". Sue LeHew stated her understanding that the SETT protocol included "student" and inquired whether that description should include vocational goal. Mark Nelson suggested the description include vocational/educational goal. Sue LeHew inquired whether the slide should include SETT under the title. Bea Shapiro suggested the slide include a graphic, such as a student working at a desk for the first letter in SETT. Sue LeHew stated the letters SET, were red to represent stop, and the last T was green to represent go. Mark Nelson inquired whether the slide could include lines to indicate that the process would continue once the tools had been identified to ensure they were a right fit for the individual. Ms. Shapiro stated that graphics could be used to further illustrate the process. Sue LeHew stated she would locate some graphics to reflect that the process was not linear.

Sue LeHew stated that Slide 5 included the term Clinical Low Vision Evaluation (CLVE) and inquired whether that was the correct term. Ed Gervasoni stated that low vision optometrists used that term. Sue LeHew inquired whether the slide should include information regarding the functional low vision evaluation. Ed Gervasoni stated his understanding that a functional evaluation would be included in an Individualized Education Plan (IEP). Bea Shapiro stated the ophthalmologist performing the evaluation would include the functional assessment information in their report. Ed Gervasoni stated the functional assessment would take place in the individual's environment and would ensure whether the individual could use the equipment or perform the necessary tasks. Sue LeHew stated the clinical assessment would come from the ophthalmologist and the functional assessment would come from the certified specialist. Sue LeHew inquired whether the slide should include additional information regarding the professionals conducting the assessments. Ed Gervasoni stated the slide could include Certified Low Vision Therapist (CLVT). Sue LeHew stated the slide would indicate that individuals should bring the prescribed equipment to the assessment. Ed Gervasoni stated he would recommend using a term other than equipment and inquired whether the assessment team would work with IT professionals. Bea Shapiro stated that IT staff would be included in the assessment team.

Sue LeHew stated that Slide 6 described the report template and the

information that would be included in the assessment report and inquired whether the presentation should include a slide including the process steps. Ed Gervasoni inquired whether the counselor would take the leader role in conducting the assessment and identify when different professionals would be included. Sue LeHew agreed that someone would need to recognize when to bring in alternate expertise as needed. Bob Kresmer inquired whether an Occupational Therapist (OT) would have communicated the required technology prior to the worksite assessment. Bea Shapiro stated if an individual had physical limitations, the OT would attend the worksite evaluation as well. Sue LeHew stated the process slide could include the steps of identifying the team members, which were client/employee, employer, IT team, AT specialist, clinical specialists, and VR counselor. Bea Shapiro inquired whether a worksite assessment would require an Orientation and Mobility (O&M) instructor if the work environment was difficult to navigate. Ed Gervasoni stated an O&M instructor would attend depending on the work environment and the needs of the individual. Mr. Gervasoni stated the team could be called the work education team/Career, Technology, and Education (CTE) team. Sue LeHew stated the team would then schedule a date and time to perform the assessment and list all the employment related tasks the individual would be required to perform. Bea Shapiro noted that there could be more than one assessment to ensure the individual received the appropriate technology. Sue LeHew inquired whether the slide should include that the team would validate the client's computer skills. Bea Shapiro stated that the counselor should ensure that the client is job ready and has the appropriate skills to perform the job functions. Sue LeHew stated there was a separate assessment, the computer access assessment, that evaluated an individual's computer skills. Ms. LeHew stated that schools did not create separate IT reports, and all the information was included in the IEP. Sue LeHew stated that she included information indicating the assessment team would work with IT staff at the individual's worksite. Mark Nelson noted that some companies such as insurance and financial institutes were not allowed to work with the assessment team. Mr. Nelson stated the companies did not allow outside providers to work with the employee due to the confidential nature of the job. Sue LeHew inquired whether the AT provider should create a disclosure form. Bea Shapiro stated she worked with an individual that was employed at a health insurance company and required that outside individual sign a disclosure form. Sue LeHew stated the AT would need to be tested in an environment that did not share customer data.

Sue LeHew inquired regarding the appropriate place to discuss the client's computer skills. Bea Shapiro stated that should be discussed at the beginning. Sue LeHew inquired whether the team would validate the client's computer skills. Bea Shapiro stated the client/employee should be job ready

and should have the required computer skills already. Sue LeHew stated the slide could indicate that AT/IT skills should be optimized before the client was job ready, however in the community, the computer skills may be part of the worksite assessment process. Bea Shapiro suggested the slide indicate that the individual should have the appropriate skills to transition into the workplace. Sue LeHew stated if an individual was attempting to save their job or was transitioning to unfamiliar technology, such as mouse to keyboard control, the individual would need to have transferable skills. Mark Nelson stated the assessment team would need to evaluate the effectiveness of the equipment. Sue LeHew stated the slide could indicate that the team would work with the student/employee to validate the effectiveness of each potential AT tool for the individual. Ms. LeHew suggested whether the committee members should bring copies of the Report Template to distribute during the VRATE presentation. Mark Nelson inquired regarding when the Report Template was developed. Bea Shapiro stated the Report Template was created approximately five years prior. Sue LeHew stated Slide 6 included the information to be included in the assessment report. She noted that Slide 7 included the agencies and individual that were community resources that performed worksite evaluations. Mark Nelson stated the slide did not need to specify that there was only one credentialed individual that could provide the assessments but could just list the information. Sue LeHew stated the slide could include the link to the information and the individual could conduct that search. Bea Shapiro suggested the slide indicate the resources were providers. Nathan Pullen suggested the agencies be spelled out, such as Foundation for Blind Children (FBC) and the agencies could be listed in alphabetical order so as not to show a preference. Ed Gervasoni stated that more organizations provided worksite evaluations and could be included. Bea Shapiro stated that Sue LeHew would make the suggested changes to the Power Point and committee members could provide comments at the next committee meeting.

AT Trends

This item was tabled.

Collaboration with Education Committee Discussion

This item was tabled.

Agenda and Date for Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Assistive Technology Committee was scheduled for September 30, 2019 from 3:00-4:30 pm in the RSA Conference Room,

Phoenix, AZ. Agenda items are as follows:

- VRATE Presentation Discussion
- AT Trends

Announcements

There were no announcements.

Public Comment

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

Adjournment of Meeting

Mark Nelson motioned to adjourn the meeting. Nathan Pullen seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.