

**NEVADA STATE REHABILITATION COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
Department of Employment, Training & Rehabilitation
November 17, 2015
*Amended & Approved March 15, 2016***

DETR/Vocational Rehabilitation
3016 W. Charleston Blvd
Las Vegas, NV 89102

DETR
500 East Third St.
Carson City, NV 89713

Elko JobConnect
172 6th Street
Elko, NV

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mathew Dorangricchia
Ernest Hall
Shelley Hendren
Mark Hinson
Kevin Hull
Robin Kincaid
Jack Mayes
Max Miller-Hooks
Kate Osti
Jean Peyton
Sherry Ramsey

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Lisa Bonie
Jane Gruner

GUESTS:

Becky Van Auken, Transcriptionist
Veronica (Roni) Dahir; University of Nevada, Reno (UNR)
Center for Research Design
Emire Stitt, President, DP Video Productions
Cyndy Ortiz Gustafson, CEO, Strategic Progress LLC
Stephanie Gardner, Certified Hearing Interpreter
Delores Parrish, Certified Hearing Interpreter
Kristine Miller
Rebecca Grayson
Pedro Gonzalez
Mike Hutchings
Robert Ruess
Reverend Dennis Hutson

STAFF:

Rose Marie Reynolds, Deputy Attorney General
Janice John, Deputy Administrator Program Services
Kim Cantiero, Rehabilitation District Manager
Kara Lang, Rehabilitation Quality Control Specialist
Salvatore Fiorentino, Rehabilitation Counselor
Kelli Quintero, Management Analyst
Veronica Sheldon, Administrative Assistant
Beth Talcott, Administrative Assistant
Jane Tetherton, Administrative Assistant
Jacque Lethbridge, Administrative Assistant

EXHIBITS:

- Nevada State Rehabilitation Council (NSRC) September 22, 2015 meeting minutes
- NSRC 2015 Annual Report draft
- Customer Satisfaction Survey sub-committee recommendations
- State Plan Sub-committee's recommendations of the Goals, Strategies and Indicators
- Request for Proposal requirements for choosing the Satisfaction Survey vendor(s)

- Open Meeting Law presentation
- Effective Communication & Section 504 Prohibition Against Retaliation presentation
- Rehabilitation Performance Indicators
- Breakdown of Bureau Services to the Blind and Visually Impaired/Bureau of Vocational Services Performance Indicators
- State Performance Indicators for Vocational Services
- FFY15, Third Quarter NSRC Goals and Indicators
- NSRC SFY 2015 Budgets

1. **ROLL CALL AND CONFIRMATION OF QUORUM**

Ernest Hall called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m.

Veronica Sheldon called the roll and determined a quorum was present.

2. **VERIFICATION OF POSTING**

Ms. Sheldon verified that the posting was accomplished on time and per Open Meeting Law requirements.

3. **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Mr. Hall welcomed everyone to the full Council meeting. He noted that the day's agenda items would be taken out of order.

4. **FIRST PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION**

"My name is Kristine Miller. I spoke before the Council before, I believe that two councils ago. I'm here again to speak in regards to follow-up. June 11, 2015. My case number was 71651.

My case has now been closed. I met with Shelley Hendren and Janice John back in I believe July of 2015. I was supposed to go back in October. However, that meeting never occurred because no one followed back up with me in mid October. I wrote a letter to Governor Sandoval. My first letter was faxed over June 16th, 2015, in regards to case No. 71651. It was responded to. However, that was responded to by Kim Cantiero which, again, if you have a problem with this office to have a letter responded back to with this office, it didn't make any sense. Shannon also responded. She said that I was a constituent, so she was a constituent respondent.

So again I sent another letter faxed on 7/17/15. Again, I was contacted by Shelley Hendren and I met with them shortly thereafter with Janice John and Shelley Hendren. Again, the letters to me, if you tell me that you're going to follow up with me in mid-October, I should have got a response in mid-October.

I had my pastor, which is Pastor Hutson from Advent United Methodist, with me as a witness. I was told at that point in time I would get a follow-up in mid-October. However, we are now in November, mid-November, and I still have not got a response.

Subsequently my case has been closed. I was told that I would have an opportunity to go back to school, which I am going back to school at UNLV matriculating in school, but DETR has not provided any monetary support for me. And I have gone ahead and secured almost \$10,000 in loans, which according to DETR and me going back to school, that should have been a cost that would have been incurred by DETR. So when I was reading the minutes and I saw there that \$600,000 was returned because of unused funds, imagine my surprise that I have to incur \$10,000 in fees, and being on public support and disability, and I have to pay back \$10,000 in

loans because they closed my case, and here they are giving back \$600,000 when we definitely have need for funds to be used to get us back into work.

I do have a concern with that, and as a public person and doing this public comment, I definitely feel that we need to be able to get back to work. And I'm going back to school to regenerate my ability to get skills to get back to work. As DETR says, we need to be able to get back to our skills and our services and get our skills and services back to the ability to get back to work, and that is my sufficient goal is to get back to work and to be able to get back to work. Thank you for your time“

“I'm Veronica Dahir from the University of Nevada, Reno, and I'm on the customer satisfaction survey development subcommittee. And I just wanted to let you know since I can't comment during the time; everybody should have received the draft, which I think you all have it, that I revised since our last subcommittee meeting. And I just wanted to let you guys know that as I was going through it, I know there were suggested changes during the meeting, but as I was going through it some of the wording didn't make sense to me.

So I used some of the wording that we had already validated from the previous surveys. So questions that were taken out, that some of the members of the subcommittee thought should be left in, so I put those back in. When you see some of those questions back in there and they're not exactly worded the way that we discussed it's because I made an executive decision as I was developing the survey to change them.

So if you guys are still unhappy with those questions as you discuss them, just let me know, just talk about it during the session and then give me those comments -- have Veronica give me those comments later and I'll develop them some more.

Then in the back you'll notice in the demographics section, we talked about taking all those demographics out, but I did make a note here that some of these questions cannot be removed for weighting purposes. They have to be in the actual survey. We have to ask the respondent those questions. So we can talk about those afterwards as well.

So I just wanted to let you know that some of those are still in there. And I cannot stay until the second public comment session if it's going to be at 12:45. So I don't know if you're allowed to address me during the meeting or if you could have a second public comment earlier, but I have to leave here around 11:15.“

After closing the first Public Comment session Mr. Hall asked the Council Liaison, Veronica Sheldon, why no Certified Deaf Interpreters (CDIs) have been provided. Ms. Sheldon replied the accommodation request came in after the deadline. The division did try to make CDI arrangements with all contracted interpreting services but there was no one available at such a short notice.

5. **FOR POSSIBLE ACTION APPROVAL OF THE NEVADA STATE REHABILITATION COUNCIL (NSRC) SEPTEMBER 22, 2015 MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Hall asked if there were any additions or corrections to the meeting minutes. Robin Kincaid requested a change of the word “wine” to “run” as the NVPEP event announcement made at the September meeting. Jean Peyton added at the top in the first sentence, rather than the word Council it should be Blindconnect. She had been talking about some of the experiences that were experienced in her office.

Mr. Hall asked for other corrections or additions, hearing none asked for a motion to accept the amended meeting minutes.

Jean Peyton moved to approve the minutes as amended.
Jack Mayes seconded. Motion passed.

6. **FOR POSSIBLE ACTION PRESENTATION OF THE NSRC 2015 ANNUAL REPORT DRAFT FOR CONSIDERATION, DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE APPROVAL**

Kelli Quintero reported the Nevada State Rehabilitation Council must prepare and submit to the Governor and to the Secretary of the US Department of Education, RSA, no later than 90 days after the end of the federal fiscal year an annual report on the status of vocational rehabilitation programs operated within the state and make the report available to the public through appropriate modes of communication. She sent colored copies via email, to the Council members so they could get a visual idea of what the report would look like. She said the colored copy also had several corrections that the black and white one in your packet did not contain at that time.

Speaking to the Council Ms. Quintero stated now is your opportunity for input, if this is how you want the report to look, any additional or edited information. Ms. Quintero noted it was still a work in progress. We want to make sure that it all comes together because information is coming in from different individuals.

Ms. Kincaid said on the satisfaction survey portion she would like to note those surveys are given to participants as they exited from the program. Mr. Hall restated the first sentence should say "vocational rehabilitation participants who have exited the program" so it is clear to everyone.

Ms. Kincaid added on page 36 we talk about success. She only saw Northern Nevada successes asking if there were any Southern Nevada successes. Janice John responded with 72 percent of the population in the south, we are highlighting the success of the other percentage. We do have successes in the Clark County School District, I agree, we could certainly add a couple. We definitely have plenty of successes statewide this year.

Kate Osti noted a typo on page thirteen, in the title. Ms. Quintero so noted this correction.

Kate Osti moved to accept the draft with clarifications and for consistency editorial items and add additional information from the South for success.

Jean Peyton seconded the motion. Motion carried.

15. **REPORT ON THE COUNCIL'S STATE FISCAL YEAR (SFY) 2015 BUDGET (taken out of agenda order)**

Ms. Quintero said the attached budget is an estimate where expenditures should be spent. The Council is not bound by the line items and is proactively planning for expenditures that require additional funding. Attached is the budget status report which is new for fiscal year 2016. Ms. Quintero asked if there were any questions or concerns.

7. **FOR POSSIBLE ACTION DISCUSSION OF THE CUSTOMER SATISFACTION SURVEY SUB-COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING POSSIBLE REVISIONS TO THE 2016 PARTICIPANT SATISFACTION SURVEY**

Jack Mayes introduced himself as being the Chair of the Customer Satisfaction Survey Sub-

committee. The subcommittee was developed to reevaluate and reassess the survey questions being used in our annual satisfaction questionnaire. The first round the sub-committee went through and discussed the kind of information we were looking for and gave feedback to Dr. Dahir. Then we met again to reassess the work that she had done and give her additional feedback on what has been distributed through email and handouts. He asked Dr. Dahir if she would go over some of the highlights of that survey; what they approved.

Dr. Dahir said basically we were asked to create a shorter version of all three surveys. In the past we have performed three separate surveys. We were asked to streamline them and create one survey with about 20 questions. So that is what we have done.

At our last sub-committee meeting we basically went through all three surveys and decided which questions we did not need to ask anymore and kept only those questions that we thought were meeting the objectives of the division and that were the most important questions to ask and then, most importantly, making it short for the participants so that they would be more inclined to participate as well as not taking up too much of their time.

Dr. Dahir continued that it was made clear at the last sub-committee meeting that this is still a draft. Even after today it is a draft. We still have to program the survey and test the survey. It always changes. No matter what you approve today, even if you approve it in two months, whenever we go live with the survey, it is not going to be the same exact survey you see because after we test it and program it and our interviewers test it, we do extensive cognitive testing with this. There could still be wording changes that we in-house will decide executively that we need to make for clarity, for making sure it makes sense, for making sure it's programmed correctly, et cetera. And, of course, I will always work directly with Jack and the committee to make sure they see the final survey before we finish it.

While reading through the questions and possible answers, a discussion ensued on how question number 6 should read. Dr. Dahir asked for a definition of community-based assessment. She said that if you do want to get current employment status, and not just closed cases in the future she wanted to make sure this question (#6) gets the information the division wants.

Ms. John said she believes this question is too complex. You already asked the next question, "Are you currently employed?" What do we really want in the Satisfaction Survey? You want to know if someone got services they were pleased with, were they timely, did they get a job, and are you currently employed. She suggested maybe they were trying to make it too complex, saying if we are having problems with this, then our clients are going to be confused. Maybe we need to throw it out and just not use it.

After some further discussions Mr. Hall asked for a motion to accept the survey draft.

Mark Hinson moved to approve this Satisfaction Survey (with question 6 removed) for testing and implementation by UNR for 2016.

Jack Mayes/Kate Osti simultaneously seconded. Motion passed.

8. **FOR POSSIBLE ACTION PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE STATE PLAN SUB-COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE GOALS, STRATEGIES AND INDICATORS FOR THE REHABILITATION SERVICES PORTION OF THE UNIFIED STATE PLAN FOR FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR (FFY 2017)**

Mr. Mayes reported that the State Plan Sub-committee met a couple of times. Originally they met at the beginning of the year and completed a rough review of the goals and objectives. They were put on hold because of potential changes in relationship to WIOA. Then as the rules related to WIOA came out giving better guidance and direction, we had a follow-up meeting in October and reviewed our goals and strategies and discovered that we had done a pretty good job. So we made a recommendation to forward our portion of the State Plan onto the full Council for consideration of adoption.

After much discussion between Council members and Support Staff the consensus was to keep the recommendations from the Sub-committee's January 2015 meetings.

Jean Peyton moved to approve the state plan sub-committee's recommendations to be accepted and approved as the new goals, strategies and performance measures for fiscal year 2017

Mark Hinson seconded. Motion passed.

9. **FOR POSSIBLE ACTION DISCUSSION OF THE CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS FOR THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) FOR A PARTICIPANT SATISFACTION SURVEY VENDOR FOR FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR (FFY) 2017**

Mr. Hall proceeded with the issue of selecting a vendor after the 2016 UNR contract expires.

Ms. Kincaid expressed a need to understand the difference between inter-local and competitive bid.

Mr. Hall replied for clarity regarding the scope would be about the data points that we were discussing, the option to have it at more than just the exit point in the survey, and that -- and we currently have two options as far as I understand it.

We can bid through inter-local contracts which we currently have with UNR, and we can go out for bid. There is a more streamlined process that we work with other state agencies.

Mr. Hall then asked for assistance from Shelley Hendren.

Ms. Hendren replied we currently have a contract. We could continue that inter-local contract. Basically that is a contract between government agencies. We could amend the contract and stay with the current contract and make changes. If we want to open it up for others to potentially bid to do the work, then we have to do the competitive bid process and send out an RFP (Request For Proposal). There is a timeline provided in the exhibits to show what it might look like. We would need to have the RFP ready to be released by July of next year. We would have about six months if we wanted to work on making changes and how that might look.

Mr. Hall determined that the Council would need to decide the question about competitive bid more than they needed to decide what the scope changes are going to be as they are going to be related. His understanding of the consensus during all the customer satisfaction meetings was we wanted more data touch points, we wanted a survey process redesigned that would integrate with service delivery, would not rely solely on the outcome at the end of the exit plan and would collect data in more than one way. He suggested that the Council have the discussion about whether the Council feels strongly about going through a competitive bid process or whether we want to modify the scope of the agreement with our current contractor

today. He thought they could have that discussion as the scope was going to be a discussion that they would have either way.

Jean Peyton indicated that she liked the idea of competitive bids because it is not known what else is out there. She did not know if there are other places that would do perform these types of surveys she suggested San Diego or somewhere else.

Ms. John said she did know that UNLV had the contract prior to UNR, and we were not pleased with their research team. It was a very small team; was not nearly as comprehensive as the UNR team. What the UNLV team looks like now is unknown.

Mr. Hall added he is always a fan of competition if it makes sense. "There is a huge advantage in this relationship to longevity of knowledge of survey data and history. The Council by nature is transient.

Competitive bids worry me in the sense of what happens to the understanding of the survey growth, development, what we did nine years ago, 10 years ago, with the survey and how it compares to today. He said he is a big fan of doing business with Nevada, and the competitive bid process would also allow entities from other states to submit for the bid and be considered, which is fine, but I still advocate for Nevada.

In Nevada, I cannot think of any research institutions that would have the reputation UNR has for data collection. There are lots of hospitality survey companies out there and customer satisfaction companies, but as a research institution, the universities take a different look at things than commercial survey folks who are there to turn out a product and give you some data and usually let you interpret it, where UNR is working with students to teach them how to analyze data and to do that. Unless the Council is unhappy or has knowledge of somebody who could do this quality of job we have been getting, I would offer we do scope and not a competitive bid."

Ms. Hendren added a couple of pieces of information, one that was passed to her that is very relevant to this discussion, there are three to four vendors that have put in to be part of a master services agreement for the state, and those will or will not be approved in January to do data collection and survey information. So perhaps we want to wait and see how many additional vendors are added. Then we wouldn't have to go through the competitive RFP process because we could select anyone that's part of that Master Services Agreement.

Mr. Hall responded that this addresses my concern about history and balances that with the competitive process to make sure that more than one person is being considered without adding undue burden to the Council to figure out how to do a competitive process with our limited volunteer resources. We now need to figure out how we are going to complete the revised scope of what we want. He then asked Robin Kincaid to look at what other states are doing. Models that kind of match what the committee has been looking for. Ms. Kincaid accepted the task.

10. **DISCUSSION/REPORT VR-NEVADA SOCIAL MEDIA OVERVIEW**
Emire Stitt and Cyndy Gustafson representing the team of DP Video Productions, Strategic Progress, and Campbell and Associates, presented their results of the VR media campaign. For an entire year they conducted an awareness campaign to the Nevada public and, more

specifically, to the business community as the agency's main goal was to make the employers and the business community in Nevada aware of the existence of vocational rehabilitation as a business partner and a great resource for qualified employees.

Ms. Stitt said, "We wanted to expose the public to the fact that hiring people with disabilities brings tremendous benefits and has great positive impact. First of all, people with disabilities are really highly quality, very dedicated employees. They also bring diversity to the workplace. It shows social responsibility and it definitely boosts morale in the workplace.

Among the interviews that were conducted we found that in many cases, people with disabilities are better employees than anybody else, and they actually make the rest of the employees strive for that excellence.

We used a variety of components in this campaign. First we created a branded logo and image of vocational rehabilitation that speaks to the business community with clean lines, sophisticated colors, and we created a website that is easy to navigate. And for busy business people or human resources people or business owners, they can very quickly navigate through the site and see the benefits of hiring people with disabilities.

We also did a variety of media campaigns including television, radio, social media, and all of that was done based on meticulous marketing research and, at the end, evaluation. Everything was based on the theory of change."

Ms. Stitt turned the presentation over to Cyndy Gustafson. Ms. Gustafson began with, "One of the really interesting things about this project was the focus on the pre-campaign research and the post campaign evaluation research." She disclosed, she is a disability mom. "I have a 15-year-old son with special needs, and so the research was particularly interesting for me as I get ready to watch my little guy transition into the workforce.

Some of the interviews were a little bit jarring to hear what employers had to say about hiring a person with disabilities. Some of the insight was inspirational.

When we thought about our theory of change, what we really focused on was looking at baseline numbers inside Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) and thinking about how viewing campaign materials would change perception with an employer which would then lead to a change in behavior and then would lead to a change in action which would then impact data and numbers.

The campaign used actual people with disabilities that found employment, their testament and also what the actual employers that employed the people with disabilities had to say. And that was the greatest impact. We gave them voice, and that's why it is very impactful because there are peers to peers that are speaking to each other.

Also social media platform provides a huge amount of advantages. First of all, we create two kinds of posts, relevant posts that could be articles or any other information that somebody else created that we simply share with our audience to keep them engaged and informed on issues they are interested in, which relate to vocational rehabilitation and employing people with disabilities. We also created original posts, most of which are those video stories of employers sharing how happy they are that they employed people with disabilities and what a great impact it had on their businesses. We currently have 1,815 followers, but each sponsored post separately reaches, as I said, thousands more. With each sponsored post, what we do is we

create a specific audience. We define the zip code, where it goes, we define the age group, we define are they CEOs, are they interested in business, are they in human resources.”

12. **NSRC MEMBER ANNUAL TRAINING ON EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION & SECTION 504 PROHIBITION AGAINST RETALIATION (taken out of Agenda order)**

Kara Lang and Salvatore Fiorentino presented the annual Effective Communication presentation. The Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 504 and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Title II both provide that there is non-discrimination on the basis of a disability in any program or activity that receives federal financial funding. Individuals may not be excluded from participation or subject to discrimination based on his or her disability. Section 104.4 and 104.52 of the Rehabilitation Act state that there will be no direct contractual or other arranged exclusion from services on the basis of a disability of an individual that is otherwise qualified to receive services and there is no aiding other agencies, organizations or persons that discriminate based on disability. The law further indicates that we are to provide qualified individuals the opportunity to participate in and benefit from the services that are equal to services provided to others. Services are to be as effective as those offered to others, effectively meaning, equal opportunity for the same level of benefit. The manner of providing services must not limit the participation of an individual with a disability.

The ADA has a subtitle specifically on communications which generally says communications with individuals with disabilities needs to be as effective as communication with others. And that includes members of the public with a disability. We are required to furnish appropriate auxiliary aids and services necessary to afford equal opportunity in the program, primary consideration given to the request of the individual, and these must be provided in accessible formats, timely manner, respecting the individual's privacy and independence.

The ADA also tells us that individuals are not required to bring their own interpreters. In fact an adult accompanying an individual can only interpret in very limited circumstances. One is if there's an emergency involving imminent threat, the other is if the individual requests the adult interpreter and the adult agrees, it's appropriate. Even if they both agree to it, it may not always be appropriate because there may be conflicts of interest or confidential things. But if it's appropriate, then they can.

Salvatore Fiorentino reviewed several methods of communication available for Deaf and individuals who are hard of hearing for effective communication. A note-taker, video phone relay services, Ubiduo (a method of typing communication back and forth, similar to TTY) are a few of the options for effective communication. Mr. Fiorentino discussed different types of certified interpreters, American Sign Language (ASL), Pidgin Sign Language, and Mexican Sign Language (MSL). There are also certified deaf interpreters, which use body language, miming and break down the language further. Cued speech and oral interpreters are for individuals who are hard of hearing. This method is not used often and communication is achieved by relying on lip reading instead of using ASL interpreters. Another method of communication is Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) for emergency situations. A video example was viewed. Communication Access Real-Time Translation (CART) is another communication method, where a Deaf person will read a dialogue on a screen that a hearing stenographer will caption word for word. Video phones, assistive listening devices and TTY are additional resources. Use of video phone aps. on modern devices is available for smart phones and tablets as well.

13. **OTHER REPORTS**

None

14. **ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT**

Shelley Hendren, Administrator for the Rehabilitation Division, reviewed the Rehabilitation Federal Standards Performance and Indicators; stating that in 2015 the Rehabilitation Division met all (7) performance measures. For 2016, (5) of the (7) measures were met. The information within the report is for the full fiscal year 2015.

Goal# 1: successful employment outcomes, we did not meet the goal. The goals for 2015 were a 5 percent increase over the previous year. So in 2014, we had a 56 percent success rate. Then we take 5 percent of that to determine our goal for 2015. Based on the previous year, our goal for fiscal year 2015 was 59 percent. And you can see we ended up fiscal year 2015 at 54 percent. Those are the successful employment outcomes. This information matches federal performance measure that measure number one.

Goal# 2: having to do with transition services. There was an increase in the number of transition students coming to VR and we were trying to improve outcomes. The Division was helping them to move on to post-secondary education and/or helping them to become employed. And so we met all three of those pieces to performance measure No. 2. The transition population increased from 500 student applications in 2014 to 644 in 2015.

Goal# 3: has to do with working with underserved disability groups. The goal was only a 3 percent increase over the previous year because we were already exceeding the percentage in the population. We had 64 percent in 2014, and that jumped to 75 percent in 2015, which far exceeded that goal of 66 percent, which is a 3 percent increase over the previous year.

Goal# 4: measures the underserved ethnic groups. Two populations in particular where we needed to focus our efforts were the Hispanic and Asian populations. We did in fact bring more of the Hispanic population into vocational rehab to receive services. In 2014, 15 percent of our total clients were Hispanic. In 2015 that jumped to 18 percent. We did meet that goal. In 2014, two percent of the vocational rehab population was Asian, and in 2015 that jumped to 3 percent.

Goal# 5: had to do with trying to utilize some of the federal funds that normally are relinquished. So it was determined that we would measure how much was relinquished or reallocated and then we would also measure how many third party cooperative arrangements we added each year. As you guys know from our October meeting, just illustrating how much we reallocate really isn't a measure of how the program is doing or whether we're capitalizing on those funds to the fullest extent. Hopefully that presentation helped to explain that. If the grant is not fully matched and they give us more federal money in the grant, we have more federal money to give back because the new money is not matched. In fiscal year 2016, that we're currently in, our grant was bumped up to \$28 million. We still don't match up to \$28 million, so that number is going to grow, unfortunately.

Goal# 6: has two parts. Just like with transition, number one we're trying to get more individuals in the supported employment category so people with significant and most significant disabilities are coming to VR for services. The first measurement is the number of folks coming in the door that have significant or most significant disabilities. And you can see in fiscal year 2014 we had 361 total supported employment clients. A 5 percent increase put us at pretty much the same number. But in fiscal year 2015 we actually increased that to 483 individuals with most significant disabilities. So we're definitely working more and more with that population. And we know because of WIOA that those numbers are going to grow. So we met that measure as well. The second part of Goal #6 is how we did as far as employment outcomes for that specific population. Individuals that fell under the category of most significant disabilities, which have

longer term services and typically more services which would seemingly be harder to place, we have a better placement rate than with our regular population. You can see 57 percent of those cases closed successfully, which is a higher percentage than we had for the general population, which was about 54 percent. In fiscal year 2014 we had a 58 percent successful employment. So that was our goal for 2015, and we're just shy of that, you can see, at 57 percent.

Ms. Hendren continued to a discussion of current Fair Hearings. She reported that one fair hearing decision was issued for a case from the previous year. The Division strongly disagrees with the findings and is currently petitioning it for review. A motion for a stay to seal the records and a petition for judicial review were filed by the Division. This case will likely go to District Court. There have been (2) new hearing requests. One has a hearing date scheduled in December and the other we haven't heard anything beyond the request. There is nothing else from the previous year that is pending.

There is one new Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) complaint which is being investigated. The Office of Civil Rights (OCR) has a case that has been pending for almost a year.

Mark Hinson asked if Ms. Hendren could share any of the issues that are involved in the complaints. Rose Marie Reynolds, Deputy Attorney General, explained that the only thing that the Division can give additional information on is in regard to the current petition for judicial review. The EEOC and Office of Civil Rights complaints would need to remain confidential, because of the nature of the current case and the fact that the Division has filed a motion to seal so that the fair hearing would not become public. Ms. Hendren stated that she would like to table the discussion on the circumstances of the fair hearing to a later date until there is a ruling on the motion to seal the records.

There are a few vacancies, but overall, Ms. Hendren stated that the staffing levels are very good. Ms. Hendren stated that there will probably always be some vacancies due to the number of staff in the Division. There are currently (6) rehabilitation counselor and (3) technician positions that are vacant.

The Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) Unified State Plan Strategic Vision and Goals were reviewed by Ms. Hendren. WIOA asked for inclusion of a strategic vision in the Unified State Plan for the state about how it's going to engage in workforce programs and with employers. This was created in collaboration with the Governor's office and approved by the Governor's office. This is the strategic vision that is going to be included in the Unified State Plan. We pulled out of it, the most important pieces, that were the basis for the goals that we're setting for the state.

Highest level of self-sufficiency is in there. That coincides directly with the Rehabilitation Division's vision and mission statement. Another piece that was really important is demand driven curriculum, certification programs, programs of study, and internship opportunities. Collaboration is used in this strategic vision and, of course, throughout WIOA. So that's a focus of what we're writing in the Unified State Plan. A responsive network of core programs was also important and included to be responsive to the needs in the community of the employers.

Lastly, increased access to and opportunities for employment, education, training and support services is included. Whether it is physical access, technology, in rural areas, getting expertise out to the rural areas, access is an important part of the Strategic Vision.

All the core programs have submitted their responses to the different sections in the Unified State Plan template. Our state plan (VR's) in its entirety is now an attachment to the Unified State Plan.

The "Rehabilitation Services portion" of the Unified State Plan is 99 percent done. We're very close to having that ready to submit. However, we don't know when RSA is going to want it submitted to their agency.

Sometime between now and our next meeting, a draft of the Unified State Plan will be available for (30) days for comments. The Division will share that information with the council members so that you can review it and make comments, if appropriate. Mr. Hall asked that the information be shared so that the NSRC members would have the opportunity to comment if they wished.

11. **NSRC OPEN MEETING LAW REVIEW**

Rose Marie Reynolds, Deputy Attorney General (DAG) presented Open Meeting Law as it pertains to the NSRC. What this body needs to know is that for a quorum, the magic number is nine. Nine members make a quorum here. What we want to avoid is a constructive quorum. That is where you have fewer than nine people present, but somehow you have managed to line up to the nine. And how does that happen? It happens through email where two members will start a conversation about something, let us say, they realize we do not have the expertise in this, but we have got Robin on the Council and Mark on the Council who have that education and expertise. That is generally the way it happens. They take the conversation and it gets emailed and they ask for their input. All of a sudden now we've got four members. And if it just keeps growing until you have nine, you have had a conversation outside of a public meeting and it's related to something that's on the Council agenda. That is what we're trying to avoid.

Ms. Reynolds said regarding the meeting minutes suggested the minutes are presented here at this meeting, and they are debated and they are deliberated on and voted on. It is fine for you as an individual member to review the minutes and to let Veronica know, when you see it, if there is a typo or that something has not been accurately reflected, you can have that conversation with Veronica ahead of the meeting, but please do not involve any other Council members. It is just a one-on-one conversation between you and staff.

With agendas, we want to remember to always have a clear and complete agenda and are giving the public as much notice as possible as to what is going to be discussed at the meeting. Instead of just writing on the agenda "administrator's report," Shelley provides the highlights, tries to give you the topics she's going to cover as much as possible so that people know what's going to be discussed so they know whether or not they want to attend. So you've got your clear and complete agenda.

You do not want to stray from the agenda. If you do, then you are going to come up with an open meeting law violation. I will certainly speak up and tell you if you are going too far off topic and this has not been properly added to the agenda to cover that particular topic.

The other thing to always remember is public comment. We have two periods of public comment on our agenda, one at the beginning of the meeting and one at the end of the meeting. At any point in time during the meeting if the Chair wants to take public comment on a particular agenda item, he is free to do so, but we have got two designated periods for public comment on the agenda, at the beginning and the end.

The other requirement now is that minutes have to be approved within (45) days after the meeting or at the public body's next meeting. They are not saying that now you have to meet every (45) days. They are just telling you that your minutes need to be approved at your next meeting, whichever occurs later, either the meeting or 45 days.

16. **SECOND PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Mark Hinson, "For the record, if anybody wants to show anything through the special education directors to the school system, we have a list serve. Feel free to send me that information [to share with] the educators and all the teachers that they can get that momentum going as well."

17. **ADJOURNMENT**

Jean Peyton moved to adjourn.
Kate Osti seconded
Meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Edited By:

Veronica Sheldon, Administrative Assistant

Approved By:

Ernest Hall II, Chair