

State Rehabilitation Council (SRC)

April 29, 2015

9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

MINUTES

**Utah State Board of Education
Main Conference Room**

Conference calls: 1-877-820-7831 269450#

Next Meeting: Wednesday, May 27, 2015

PRESENT: Kelly Boehmer Sharon Brand Karim Mardanolou
Jan Quinn Carter Melissa Freigang Sandy Terry
James Harvey Melissa Schindler W. Kent McGregor
Evelyn Owen Rylee Williams

PHONE: Lester Ruesch Merina Pope
Paula Seanez

EXCUSED: Susan Loving Tammy Wood Amy Powell
USOR Staff Scott Jones Jennifer Roth Rachel Anderson
Gordon Swensen Emily Stirling Eric Roux
Stacey Cummings Lynn Nelsen

GUESTS: Kris Fawson Ralph Glathar Frank Cowan
Interpreters

WELCOME/MISSION STATEMENT

Sharon Brand, Chair, welcomed Council members and called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. The mission statement was read by Kent McGregor. Sharon read the thank you letters her team put together for John, Russ and Kyle. Sharon requested any amendments or corrections to the March 2015 minutes as presented to the Council. Motion was made to approve the minutes as presented. No other corrections were given. All were in favor. None opposed.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR UPDATE AND REPORT

SCOTT JONES

Scott Jones, Interim Executive Director, stated one of his goals is to make a budget update an integral part of the SRC meeting so that the SRC as stakeholders have a clear idea on where VR stands on a month-to-month basis. Depending on when the meeting is held, some of the data may be a few weeks old. Scott introduced Jennifer Roth, newly appointed Finance Director, as the person who has all the technical skills and abilities to set conditions for the future. She will provide SRC two essential pieces of information on the overall status of the agency as a whole,

and update members on the status of the \$6.3 million supplemental money. After Jennifer's presentation, Scott said that if there are additional pieces of information the SRC would like to see in subsequent meetings, please ask Scott or Jennifer. If this report suffices we can move forward so that in future meetings we can provide this information.

FINANCIAL REPORT

JENNIFER ROTH

Jennifer gave out 2 handouts, the first being the USOR budget summary report (see charts below)

The first handout is current as of March 31, 2015, 9 months into the State Fiscal year, and at the top there is a target where we would expect to see our spending. In parenthesis it says 75%, noting that this indicates 9 out of the 12 months of the year. The color column compares the % and level of spending we're at as opposed to the target of 75%. On the left hand side is a column with the Object Category Name designated in the FINET system. This categorizes different types of expenditures. Jennifer went over each category. The Current Expense category looks at different cost aspects such as building rentals, maintenance and other things that get lumped into that category. The 2nd column is the working budget; the budget put into place in the Base system at the beginning of the State Fiscal year. Since that time adjustments have been made and you'll see those in the next Adjusted Budget column. There are adjustments that included payroll savings, paid client services, and the increase for the supplemental money given to us from the state legislature. The next column shows the actual expenditures as of March 31st for each category. The following column is where we are because of authorizations we've promised to our clients and we do have to have enough money to pay for those. The next column are our obligations in IRIS, which are authorizations we've made to clients for which bills have not been received and/or paid. Obligations in the BASE column represent Purchase Orders that have been made and even though we haven't actually expended the money, it is obligated to those purchases to pay those bills when they come in. The Total column shows the amount and the percentage. The color coding is such that those in green are at or below the target of 75%. Things in red are past the target or above. The last column shows the Budget Remaining column as well as percentage. There is a designated line-block in the middle that shows paid client services, (the reason for the money requested from the legislature for the supplemental funds). Old year items were items authorized in previous State fiscal year for which we hadn't received bills by July 1st, but we had to include those in the budget for this year as they come through. The 2nd line shows the current year, prior to the appropriations from the state legislature. The 3rd line down is paid client services from the Legislature which includes the difference from when we shut off client services. We had \$214,000 that was saved for Order of Selection and comparable services so that the total adjusted budget is \$6.5 million. As of March 31st, 2015 we had spent 5% of that appropriation.

The 2nd sheet looks just at the supplemental dollars of \$6.3 million updated as of April 28th 2015. On the 2nd sheet, the first column shows where we are per district and where we are in terms of the supplemental money. These first columns show what was allocated to each district and what the percentage is for each district.

USOR Budget Summary for SFY15 – as of 3/31/15. We are currently 9 months (75%) through SFY15 **PBAA PED Office of Rehabilitation**

Object_Category_Name	Working Budget	Adjusted Budget	Actual Expenditures as of 3/31/15 - SFYTD	Obligations in Base as of 4/3/15	Obligations in Iris as of 3/31/15	Total		Budget Remaining	
AA Personnel Services	37,441,950.06	35,055,246.	24,920,752.05			24,920,752.0	71%	10,134,494.27	29%
BB Travel/In State	229,959.56	224,959.56	95,828.63			95,828.63	43%	129,130.93	57%
CC Travel/Out of State	144,120.22	149,120.22	66,489.88			66,489.88	45%	82,630.34	55%
DD Current Expense	6,993,608.35	6,993,608.3	4,549,423.80	244,629.50		4,794,053.30	69%	2,199,555.05	31%
EE Data Processing Current Expense	791,258.68	791,258.68	570,870.41	15,128.88		585,999.29	74%	205,259.39	26%
FF Data Processing Capital Expenditure	780,654.28	780,654.28	585,584.71			585,584.71	75%	195,069.57	25%
GG Capital Expenditure	561,032.49	561,032.49	555,720.66			555,720.66	99%	5,311.83	1%
HH Other Charges/Pass Through - Paid Client Services (7203) - Old Year (T624)	-	1,502,545.3	1,350,185.60		52,960.32	1,403,145.92	93%	99,399.42	7%
HH Other Charges/Pass Through - Paid Client Services (7203) - Current Year	17,862,355.21	18,020,335.	11,933,820.01		5,689,092.98	17,622,912.9	98%	397,422.73	2%
HH Other Charges/Pass Through - Paid Client Services (7203) - supplemental	-	6,514,000.0	57.00		300,048.20	300,105.20	5%	6,213,894.80	95%
HH Other Charges/Pass Through - Case Services (7203) - DDS	3,092,866.05	3,092,866.0	2,510,244.91			2,510,244.91		582,621.14	19%
HH Other Charges/Pass Through - Independent Living (7512)	3,531,930.00	3,531,930.0	1,996,103.29			1,996,103.29	57%	1,535,826.71	43%
HH Other Charges/Pass Through - Everything Else	7,363,254.84	7,380,266.8	2,827,728.19			2,827,728.19	38%	4,552,538.65	62%
TA Trust & Agency Disbursements	-	-	-			-		-	-
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	78,792,989.74	84,597,823.	51,962,809.14	259,758.38	6,042,101.5	58,264,669.0	69%	26,333,154.83	31%

Points to Consider

- 1 - The portion of this spreadsheet that has the black border around it represents total paid client services for Vocational Rehabilitation for SFY15, including the supplemental appropriation.

T635/T955 Update - \$6.3 million State Supplemental + Reserve for Determining Initial Eligibility

4 / 15 wks
26.67%

5 / 15 wks
33.33%

6 / 15
wks
40.00%

	Budget	% of Budget	Cumulative Authorized as of 4/14/2015	% of District Budget	% of Total Expenditures	Cumulative Authorized as of 4/21/2015	% of District Budget	% of Total Expenditures	Cumulative Authorized as of 4/28/2015	% of District Budget	% of Total Expenditures
District 10	432,749.38	6.6%	10,002.57	2.31%	2.00%	18,262.18	4.22%	2.90%	19,190.02	4.43%	2.42%
District 15	712,025.62	10.9%	38,413.40	5.39%	7.69%	40,563.58	5.70%	6.43%	44,730.73	6.28%	5.64%
District 20	716,335.24	11.0%	55,004.02	7.68%	11.01%	68,157.86	9.51%	10.81%	82,451.18	11.51%	10.39%
District 25	492,197.97	7.6%	43,208.02	8.78%	8.65%	53,851.70	10.94%	8.54%	69,430.15	14.11%	8.75%
District 30	819,432.23	12.6%	74,231.80	9.06%	14.85%	82,886.63	10.12%	13.14%	103,933.57	12.68%	13.10%
District 40	805,060.00	12.4%	30,317.79	3.77%	6.07%	47,012.62	5.84%	7.46%	66,039.05	8.20%	8.32%
District 45	595,059.90	9.1%	41,014.42	6.89%	8.21%	59,426.17	9.99%	9.42%	62,197.92	10.45%	7.84%
District 50	655,766.01	10.1%	58,229.06	8.88%	11.65%	65,867.38	10.04%	10.45%	83,236.11	12.69%	10.49%
District 55	503,665.22	7.7%	34,886.75	6.93%	6.98%	57,430.12	11.40%	9.11%	101,574.21	20.17%	12.80%
District 60	630,245.43	9.7%	81,848.35	12.99%	16.38%	93,113.14	14.77%	14.77%	106,334.79	16.87%	13.40%
District 80	151,463.00	2.3%	32,580.79	21.51%	6.52%	44,013.40	29.06%	6.98%	54,215.16	35.79%	6.83%
	6,514,000.00	100.0%	499,736.97	7.67%	100.00%	630,584.78	9.68%	100.00%	793,332.89	12.18%	100.00%

	Weekly Authorizations	Budget Remaining
3/20/2015	83,898.80	6,423,031.70
3/27/2015	102,937.01	6,320,094.69
3/31/2015	106,199.89	6,213,894.80
4/7/2015	81,819.65	6,132,075.15
4/14/2015	117,812.12	6,014,263.03
4/21/2015	130,847.81	5,883,415.22
4/28/2015	162,748.11	5,720,667.11
5/5/2015		

	Weekly Authorizations	Budget Remaining
5/12/2015		
5/19/2015		
5/26/2015		
6/2/2015		
6/9/2015		
6/16/2015		
6/23/2015		
6/30/2015		

The remaining columns show where we were as of weeks 4, 5, and 6 (as of April 28, 2015). There is a target % at top that shows we could/should be at 40% spending of the \$6.5 million dollars. At the bottom of each column it shows we have actually spent \$793,000 or 12.18% of that appropriation. So we are within target range of 40%. Below this it shows the actual authorizations made during that week and where it leaves us in regards to the budget. Jennifer pointed out that now we run the report every Tuesday/Wednesday because the governor signed the appropriations bill on a Wednesday and that will get us through the end of the state fiscal year which ends on a Tuesday.

Scott said there may be concerns within the council why at this point spending is not as high as anticipated. The data was analyzed and it was attributed to several factors. First is Order of Selection (OOS). There is also a lower referral rate as well as feedback from the field that other services/comparable benefits are being sought for our customers. After seeing these statistics, the decision was made to proceed with offering summer tuition where appropriate. That is relatively new, since in past years due to budget concerns we have not done that. This can potentially be seen as a pay-off, since we are accelerating the possibility of having closures sooner under favorable 26/28 status. The opportunity to take summer courses would translate into the possibility that we would be able to open up the first category of OOS sooner than anticipated. All this data is going to the Board of Education next week. SRC is the first advisory group to hear these statistics. We want to make sure the SRC as an advisory group has the latest and most updated information. We are also looking at the possibility that we can carry forward the supplemental amount. At first, we were to use it by the end of June, and while we don't want to arbitrarily spend this money, we can spend it efficiently to sustain paid client services and also to set conditions for the future. There are still a multitude of concerns over how and when we can open up the categories of OOS.

Kent asked if the summer tuition payment was for those already in plan, and Scott replied that was the case. It is for existing clients only. We will have to go back to the Subcommittees in the Legislature to make sure they understand the reasons why we want to carry over the funding, if this becomes an issue. Scott anticipates no detrimental effects on our Maintenance of Effort (MOE) if we do carry over the funds. We are at 12.18%, and we need to be very clear as to why we're at that level.

Sharon stated she appreciates having the reports in hand, and thanked Scott for the transparency that is coming forward. She said it may take a while to absorb the financial data but the SRC as a council can now accurately see what is transpiring with the budget.

Lester questioned whether we could embed the reports in the minutes. This was agreed upon. Kent asked if the reports could be done in braille and Lynn will ask about this. The Budget Summary report could be brailled in time for the next SRC meeting, but the weekly report wouldn't give us time to braille before the meeting. Deja asked if she could get the reports digitally in Excel and the reports will be sent to her.

Scott proceeded with updates on USOR. The Executive Director position officially closed on April 22, 2015, and USOE is going through the applicant list to pare it down. There is no definitive timeline as to when they will be selecting someone. We will find out more about how and when the interview process will take place at next week's Board meeting. Sharon said the USBOE contacted the Council and asked if SRC would like a representative from the council to sit in on the interview process. A notice was sent to the Executive committee. As a result of this

announcement Sharon was handed 33 candidate applications to review and pare down to 8. The interview process is scheduled for the 20th or 21st of May. The Council members agreed it would be good to have an SRC representative involved in the process.

Scott spoke more about the MOE. USOE internal accounting was given the task to go back through the 425 Federal forms (which are turned into the Federal Government) to see if they were accurate. If they are not, we have the option of going back and correcting that. It looks like we are going to have to make corrections for FY13. USOR can apply for a waiver as to why we went over our MOE. The criteria for a waiver would be that there had to be extenuating circumstances such as a natural disaster, or economic downturn. Depending on finalization of USOE analysis we're probably going to pay a penalty. Scott is not sure how much it would be, and USOR will probably be paying that penalty at the beginning of state Fiscal Year 17. WIOA is still in public comment stage, and has not been finalized. Dependent upon how that comes out, it could determine whether there is a possibility for us to receive less of a penalty. Scott will keep the SRC posted on when corrections are made to the 425 Form that is turned in to RSA.

A question was asked how much of a penalty there would be and Scott replied right now we're looking at about \$5 million, subject to further analysis. We need more time to determine how much it will impact us dollar-wise. Presently there are legislative auditors looking at the way we do business across the entire agency. We want to make sure the auditors are allowed the opportunity to understand operations prior to this year to better see how we got into our situation. They are looking at what workers do on a day to day basis. In addition to looking at the financial situation of USOR and how to improve that, there is the decision of where USOR should fall agency-wise. When that is decided, if USOR should move under a different umbrella agency it would take a year or two to make that change. The auditors are not the only body making recommendations but their endorsements will be huge. It's going to take a large amount of data to make that decision. The auditors should be allowed all the time they need to gather pertinent information not only to improve our future financial status but also to determine whether or not USOR should be moved under a different agency.

Kris Fawson said this raises lots of concerns for USILC. Scott replied that we will keep SRC updated every month. Scott will email Sharon every month as more audit details come out to make sure she is kept up to date on the progress they are making. Scott also welcomed the Council's participation in the USOE board meetings to track any updates.

Scott presented a report on CSAVR next. He, Sharon and Aaron went to the CSAVR conference in Washington D.C. They took away some key points to share. Scott said that as someone coming in as an Interim Director, the CSAVR conference was extremely valuable, and he got much feedback from shared information, and best practices. Though all agencies operate under basically the same codes and laws, they've all experienced variances. Some are under Education and some are under the Labor Department. It was a phenomenal opportunity for Scott to get feedback about issues. One of the key points taken from the CSAVR conference was that collaboration with businesses can be improved. They all agreed VR was a good starting point for clients to be able to sustain employment. Utah leads the way in our business partnerships. Scott commended Leah's work with the Governor's Committee and the work of the SRC, as having to do with Utah's success of being a leader in business relationships. We can still do better, in that we need strong representation of employees with disabilities that advocate for VR within a particular business. At CSAVR there was information on relationship building with businesses, legislators and other agencies. We're heavily tied in with DWS. Aaron, having come

through the ranks of DWS, was able to clearly delineate to CSAVR some of the good things we're doing and some of the things we need to improve on. Another key point was that we want to educate our legislature, and we want them to know that when our consumers become employed and sustain that employment, our clients become tax payers; when these clients become tax payers, the state gets back the money they spent. Education of politicians is extremely valuable. The legislature is made up of both seasoned and freshman legislators and we'd like to establish VR as part of the orientation process for freshman legislators. It would be a good opportunity to introduce how the appropriations approved for us has had a benefit. Many of the directors at CSAVR agreed their legislatures didn't understand the benefits of VR. Clearly we have to do a better job of implementing metrics so when we're given supplemental funds we can visibly measure the return of investment of those funds. The legislature wants to see quantifiable data. When they see the return, it sets the precedence for future allocations of money. In Washington D.C., Scott, Aaron and Sharon had the opportunity to meet with our local politicians as well. Scott asked what can VR do for them as politicians, so that they receive the information needed to make informed decisions. Scott wanted to make sure the politicians understand that we're advocating for clients and sustained employment. Scott and his team were able to showcase USOR markets, talents, and our values as an agency to the politicians. Scott also pointed out that we have a lot of veterans injured in the war, and that VR should bridge with affiliated agencies like the Veterans Administration. Scott also reported a lot of concern about students and where they stand at the 15% reserve. WIOA is in public comments stage and more will be coming out about that. We really need to be clear as to where we stand on regulations like the 15% student reserve. CSAVR also emphasized third party agreements and cost sharing and the idea that we could rely on third parties to help us financially.

Sharon thanked Scott for the recap and said she was impressed with Scott and Aaron in Washington D.C. She reported Aaron was very on top with numbers and success stories, and he was able to communicate this to CSAVR.

Kent asked about the return on investment, and said in 2010 the University of Utah did a study on return of investment for VR clients and we were able to quote these figures to the legislature. The crux of that study was that there was a \$5.74 return on investment for every dollar spent on rehabilitation. He wondered if we could have that study replicated again.

Stacey said they looked at doing that last year and ran some preliminary numbers about what that figure might look like considering the recession and it was decided that it was not different enough from the previous assessment that it was not worth the thousands of dollars we'd have to spend to have it redone. VR had initially talked about doing it every 3 years but last year decided that it wouldn't have been as impressive as it was the first time.

Kent asked if it was still accurate to quote that figure, and Stacey said we had no reason to think it would not be as accurate. It was based on state dollars only. There has been some national guidance recently on return of investment studies, and there is a lot of controversy about the best way to do one. Stacey said it is something we could look at in the future. Possibly in the next 12 months, someone could go back to see what the cost was last time and see if it would be worthwhile to do again next year.

Time was taken to honor John Woeste and recognize him and his contributions to the SRC. Sharon read a poem and he was given a gift of recognition and thanked for all his valuable support.

PRESENTATION/SELF EMPLOYMENT POLICY - ERIC ROUX, EMILY STIRLING, MARGOT DANA

Self-employment is not a simple, easy thing to do. We previously had UWISE, but this was retired in 2012. USOR then created a 2-man team that was set up for self-employment referrals, and we discovered there was little screening from the referrals the team was getting. It wasn't working. Counselors were not familiar with self-employment and the skills needed to determine which clients would benefit. A Horizons task force was formed in 2014 at USOR, to develop a self-employment policy. The Horizon group gathered resources, and solicited staff feedback. In partnership with University of Montana, USOR received substantial guidance and recommendations. As a result, the self-employment process was reformulated from the ground up.

The new policy is shorter and is concise. Benefits planning details have been omitted, and there is clarification of what self-employment is or is not. This provides a clearer pathway for assessment and referrals. The single most important change is that self-employment was listed as a vocational goal and now it is considered a placement option. Counselors can complete a comprehensive assessment to determine and select an appropriate industry and vocational match for the client. The new policy outlines how counselors consult with business professionals. Well over half of our clients who did self-employment didn't work for themselves; they ended up working for other businesses, but this doesn't necessarily constitute a failure. The new policy also provides more guidance for counselors. Each step has a packet that goes with it, for staff and for business partners as well. It allows a simple plan to be implemented quickly and provides a more comprehensive development for a more complex plan. The Tier 1 plan is a simpler system with expedited pathways that have structure, while the Tier 2 plan is more long term, more expensive, and more complex.

Within the next 4 months an updated chapter of the Case Service Manual will be published after consultation with the SRC. The published packets will be available on the USOR website. Field Service Directors will be conducting statewide and district level trainings. Along with the partnership and funding with the University of Montana, there will be complete video training materials and guides available.

There was a question about funding available to a client; would the \$7000 be a combination of funds? Eric answered the numbers given in the handout are guidelines to determine whether it's a Tier 1 or Tier 2 placement. Those numbers define complexity.

Melissa Freigang said making self-employment a placement option rather than a pass-fail test is a good idea. Creating your own business is a big responsibility and is difficult. She asked if Eric could address other things that he does to teach employment counselors how to assess resources and leverage resources within the community. Eric answered that part of it is addressed in the resource packets and ongoing training. The University of Montana are experts in the field of developing self-employment and we're trying to get as much help from them as possible, increasing our use of the Small Business Administration and having a fast track program. We also need to assess where our clients come into the process when we look at this as a placement option. The counselor should have already addressed the client's business experiences included marketing, paying their taxes, etc. In addition to that USOR is trying to develop a network of business partners with whom we could consult. We do have someone in Salt Lake City who does micro-enterprise development and consulting, and we've worked out a relationship with him where he's ready to counsel. We have guidance from Montana on getting

funding and finance, but self-employment is always going to be one of the most difficult placements for counselors to do.

Melissa said she still sees concern over accessing other state agencies so there are no further costs to the department. Montana may be able to provide the academic piece but there's also the consultant fee, that we as taxpayers are providing support for. She also felt that counselors shouldn't be the only experts.

Eric said that they engineered it so that a portion of the website is set aside for self-employment resources. Every time we become aware of a new resource we are going to provide it on the website. Melissa reported that helps her feel more confident that the academic side and the actual process will be defined.

Kris asked about the summer school for clients; is that something that is going to be explained to clients through counselors? Stacey said counselors will reach out to clients who they think might benefit. There will not be a mass mailing to inform clients. It will be done on a one-to-one basis. The initial estimates of costs were around \$800,000 to \$1 million though it may be a lot less than this.

It was asked how the Council approves items. Sharon explained the Executive Committee meets after the board meeting and if someone would like to make a motion to approve a process, it is brought forward as a motion in the Executive Committee and then seconded. It was asked if there is a way to read through the self-employment policy first before voting on it. Sharon said that Eric and Emily are moving forward on the project and if the Council needs to formulate something between now and the next meeting, please email Eric, so it may be adjusted in time for the next meeting. Stacy said the SRC can make a recommendation, and at the end of the year when we make up the state plan, everything the SRC recommends is in that plan as well as how we answered that recommendation. Stacey suggested the Council should set a date for feedback to Eric so he has adequate time to prepare before we go forward. Kent said we could probably approve this in principle, and then have a date for those who want to comment to Eric. Sharon said the Council would like to read over the data presented today, and we should be able to make a motion next meeting. Eric requested Council members email him at least a week ahead of next meeting with their recommendations.

PRESENTATION/EMPLOYMENT FIRST

RACHEL ANDERSON

Rachel was called to fill in on Employment First for Tricia Jones-Parkin. She reported she has presented on Employment First several times this past year so she will just give the Council an update. Employment First is legislation in about 40 states where employment should be the first option for people with disabilities. In our agency it falls under DSPD. They are restructuring their entire program to make sure they're promoting employment for clients with disabilities, before they go into programs, workshops or day programs. Employment can be scary for a lot of clients. Utah has had it for over three years now, and USOR has been working hard on updating policies with DSPD, VR, Mental Health, DWS, as well as with Education. There are a lot of families who spend their whole lives with a disabled child who are looking for a workshop or a placement when these children become older and ready to work. In December an Employment First group went to Washington D.C. to obtain a Technical Assistance Partnership. It is providing technical assistance to a few states and is called Employment First State Leadership Mentoring

Program. Utah was awarded a one year technical assistance grant and we're working on updating that waiver. DSPD pays community supports for families in crisis who can't look for work right now. They're getting one time funds for day programs while USOR is trying to update the waiver. Also, through VR, clients are getting long term funding for services in that way. We're trying to partner with as many agencies as possible and make sure we're following the legislation.

In December, Employment First started working on school transition, provider transformation, and community rehabilitation group homes. We are also working with those who have day programs, and are helping them evolve into job coaching, so we can keep up with the goal of providing employment. We are in the middle of policy updates and VR has already amended our Supported Employment chapter. We will likely have to change this again once DSPD gets their waiver supports in place. Employment First just had a Summit where they spoke about employment legislation, and we're working to show people the benefit of this. We all need to move forward, and don't really have a choice because it's locked in legislation. We're really having to push, as it is law and WIOA is becoming law. There have been states that have been under investigation because of the Employment First laws, so we're trying to implement changes now that are beneficial to all the people we are serving. Rachel reported on the issues Rhode Island was having and will send out information to anyone who requests it. Rhode Island had a system where all their disabled kids coming out of the school system were going to long term workshops from the ages of 18-22. There wasn't a choice, or any other option and the Department of Justice came in and they got in trouble with the Federal Government. Kent asked if it was for all types of disabilities or just most significant? Rachel wasn't completely sure, but said it was probably most significant. They are also most likely related to intellectual disabilities because the age group was 18 to 22. There are still not a lot of choices. We are having another Employment First summit that will be about school-to-work transition. School-to-work transition is our focus, because we don't want the Rhode Island problem to happen in our state.

Sharon asked how many Utah schools we have VR in, and Rachel answered we have just over 200 schools that we're working with. There are VR counselors assigned to every high school and charter school in the state. And we have about 40 transition counselors in the field.

OPEN DISCUSSION/PUBLIC COMMENT

Sharon moved forward to open discussion and public comments.

Kris was concerned about IL being consulted in some way as far as the review committee for the new Director. They would like some kind of input if possible. Sharon said Leslee Snelson from the Utah State Board of Education is the person who is coordinating the review and interview team. She said it is appropriate for Kris to reach out to her with questions. USILC is supposed to oversee the plan for Independent Living and they have one more year to go before their state plan needs to be resubmitted. The USILC Third Annual Youth Leadership Conference will take place the 2nd week in June with 23 excellent candidates that will be attending. There is a new process where an application is filled out and they have to write an essay. Kris said to see the thinking and desires that the essays revealed from our young people was incredible.

Deja Powell says DSBVI is asking for support from the legislature to get the \$140,000 back that was taken from Business Enterprise Program and Independent Living. They are in a hiring freeze right now at DSBVI. The Blindness Training Program is at full capacity and is continuing to train students to be independent contributing members of society.

Sharon introduced Helen Post, who has been nominated to take Robyn Chidester's place as the Utah Parent's Center representative.

Helen reported the Parent's Center is offering a family activity next Friday, and hosting a Mothers' Day event free to anyone who registers for the event. There will be a guest speaker who will be talking about his son with spina-bifida. The Parent's Center website will link you to the registration forms.

Paula said they preparing for CANAR which is the consortia for the Native American Rehabilitation 121 Programs. There will be a number of presentations. The request for proposals has been released and Navajo Nation is working on 5 year grant proposal for June 8th. They did ask for a letter of support from Utah VR program and are looking forward to signing an agreement with us. They are also implementing training on motivational interviewing, and making sure all staff are trained in this.

Gordon asked Paula about the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), because it was being reviewed and now that there is a new President, Gordon was wondering about its status. The new president, Russell Begaye, comes on board May 12th and he should be able to sign it then. Paula reported she would follow up with him.

Next month is a joint meeting between SRC and USILC. Kris thinks SRC and USILC need to work together with the many issues that are coming up. Gordon and Lynn will work on getting that set up for the May 27th meeting.

There were no further comments and the meeting was adjourned at noon. Next meeting will be May 27th, 2015. Submitted by Lynn Nelsen.