NEVADA STATE REHABILITATION COUNCIL
MEETING MINUTES
Department of Employment, Training & Rehabilitation

February 28, 2012

Nevada State Legislative Building 401 S. Carson St. Carson City, NV	Great Basin College Greenhaw Technical Arts Bldg. Room 124 Elko, NV	Grant Sawyer Building 555 E. Washington St. Las Vegas, NV

MEMBERS PRESENT:
Jimmy Begay
Steve Chartrand
Maureen Cole
Jane Gruner
Robin Hall-Walker
Kevin Hull
Edina Jambor
Jennifer S. Kane
Sheena Kaufman
Jack Mayes
Kate Osti
Chris Syverson
Kathy Treants
Scott Youngs

MEMBERS ABSENT:
Brian Patchett

GUESTS:
Mark Costa, DETR Financial Management Chief
Ryan Johnston, Interpreter
Latasha Grace, Interpreter
Marsha Ferrell, Transcriber

STAFF:
Robert Whitney, Deputy Attorney General
Janice John, Deputy Administrator, Program Services
Mechelle Merrill, Rehabilitation Chief
Melissa Starr, Management Analyst II
Beth Talcott, Administrative Assistant

EXHIBITS:
- Nevada State Rehabilitation Council (NSRC) November 8, 2011 meeting minutes
- State Plan Committee State Plan recommendations
- Nevada State Rehabilitation Council (NSRC) Annual Report
- RAISON (Rehabilitation Automated Information System Of Nevada) User Manual Disability Codes
- NSRC By-Laws proposed revisions
- Agreement of Roles and Responsibilities for Project "SEARCH" Transition program of Ohio
- Project SEARCH Core Model Components
- Social Security Administration Ticket to Work Statistics
- Rehabilitation Performance Indicators
- Vocational Rehabilitation Hearing
- Senate Bill No. 503-Committee on Finance
- NSRC SFY 2012 Budget

I. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
Robin Hall-Walker called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

II. **ROLL CALL AND CONFIRMATION OF QUORUM**
Melissa Starr called the roll and determined a quorum was present.

III. **VERIFICATION OF POSTING**

Melissa Starr verified that the posting was accomplished on time and per Open Meeting Law requirements.

IV. **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Robin thanked the Council members for being prepared by reading their packets.

V. **DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION APPROVAL OF THE NEVADA STATE REHABILITATION COUNCIL (NSRC) NOVEMBER 8, 2011, MEETING MINUTES**

Kathy Treants wished to note that she was in attendance at the November 8, 2012 meeting.

Jack Mayes moved to approve the November 8, 2011 meeting minutes as amended.
Scott Youngs seconded. Motion passed.

VI. **DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION STATE PLAN COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

Scott Youngs read through the State Plan committee's proposed changes to the Nevada Rehabilitation State Plan.

After relinquishing the meeting over to Robin Hall-Walker Council Chair, state plan discussions commenced.

Kathy Treants said she was concerned as a Parent Training and Information Representative on the committee by striking that last bullet point on goal four. She understood it was thought that it was covered in goal one. However, it does not allude to the parent's organizations and/or families in early discussion. The goal talks a lot more about the educational component. Kathy suggested in incorporating part of the goal sentence to maintain language about parents and/or families.

Scott suggested moving the last bullet point in Goal Four's strategies to beneath the tenth bullet point in Goal One.

Jack Mayes also suggested adding "youth" to the tenth bullet in the Goal One Strategies.

Jennifer Kane stated in her opinion she would like to keep the fourth bullet from the bottom under goal one, strategies, and add, in addition to the teachers and parents, also add youth with disabilities themselves, the tenth bullet should read "Educating teachers, parents, and youth with disabilities regarding the Vocational Rehabilitation process, programs and referral services" and then to bring the last bullet under goal four strategies, as previously written, over, and add it to the strategies listed at goal one.

Kevin Hull agreed saying he thought we needed to have something in the strategies that stress educating the teachers.

Goal 1:

Emphasize the employment potential of students with disabilities, and improve transition from school to work and school to post-secondary education.

Strategies:

- Explore the utilization of social and Web-based media as a communication tool.
- Improve special outreach efforts to Transition Students, i.e. camps, Transition Summit Leadership trainings.
- Encourage participation of successful transition students in the referral and outreach activities of other students (peer support mechanism).

- Serve more Transition Students by developing referral mechanisms with secondary schools and post-secondary institutions.
- Comparison to states with similar population and demographics, and in accordance with the recommendations of the Needs Assessment.
- Identification of students that have fallen out of Vocational Rehabilitation programs.
- Creative marketing to schools and students.
- Maintain Statewide "Transition Connect" Expansion Project.
- Increased communication between Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor, Special Education Teachers and 504 Coordinators.
- Educating teachers, parents, and youth with disabilities regarding the Vocational Rehabilitation process, programs and referral services.
- Work with youth with disabilities, the Nevada Department of Education, local education authorities, parent organizations and families to encourage early discussions with students about the expectations of employment and their skills, abilities, and talents that will empower them to achieve self-sufficiency.
- Vocational rehabilitation representatives to participate with parent/teacher Individualized
- Educational Plan (IEP) conferences.
- Consider Assistive Technology in relation to this goal.

All other changes to language pertaining to Goal One through Five were accepted as presented and a vote was taken.

Scott Youngs moved to approve the State Plan changes as amended.
Jack Mayes seconded. Motion passed.

VII. DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING THE 2012 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NEVADA STATE REHABILITATION COUNCIL (NSRC)

Melissa Starr began we are gearing up to prepare the 2012 NSRC annual report, we hope to continue to prepare this report better and better with each passing year, and we added that piece of collaborations, which was really great, in 2012 we would really like to dedicate two full pages to collaborations.

Melissa asked the Council to capture and share digital photographs at any upcoming events they participate in, to be included in the Report. She said she is currently working to get the Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors to submit their client's success stories after each quarter year, to help Counselors remember who has a successful closure instead of waiting eight to twelve months to report.

Jack said he would like to see a Nevadan on the cover. Melissa replied the Division had a contest asking Counselors and clients to submit photos for the front cover.

Mechelle Merrill said the intention, when we started the contest was to give counselors an opportunity to illustrate the art of their clients. So we put it out to our staff statewide inviting them, that if they had a client who was an artist in any medium, to please bring forth something that they thought was worthy of the cover of our report. And so the cover of the NSRC 2011 Annual Report was taken by a client, who is a Nevadan, and Reno, Northern Nevada illustrated in the background, and it was an event held in Northern Nevada.

VIII. DISCUSSION/REPORT RAISON UPDATE

Mechelle Merrill began, in response to a conversation that was held in our January 2012 State Plan Meeting, we were talking about disability codes, and that led to a conversation about different aspects of Rehabilitation Automated Information system Of Nevada (RAISON), what RAISON tracks. The administration was asked to research and report to the Council how Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) is classifying our disabilities, and what specific disabilities fall under which category.

Because depending on how individual counselor sitting face-to-face with the individual in that moment on that day, is a very unique transaction, things can be recorded in a multitude of ways.

It is going to be the nuanced conversation between the counselor and the client, and what is heard by the counselor, and I think nuance is the right word, because two people can have the same diagnoses upon paper, but depending on how you explain yourself to your counselor, the counselor's individual background what they hear, what you discuss, it can come to paper in a different way and so our analysis concludes that RSA does not really give us any specific outlines about how to code. So the choices the counselors have in making the commitment to the RAISON system of how they're going to code the client and the disability came through diligent research, and cannot be changed as these codes are specific to what the code is. We do not have the ability to change it, as it would change the integrity of everything we report from the past and going forward, it is important that the codes remain as is. We have RSA's blessing on our coding system. Mechelle said she thought the Division could do a better job of training their staff to understand the implications of what they commit at the time of coding. The Division has done this at the last training that they recently had with our QA team, and staff have requested that the Division do more of it, and we will. Mechelle stated the supervisors in the field are sensitive to this issue, and they are working with new staff as the Division helps them to understand the impact of these trainings.

A new enhancement that the Division has added to the RAISON system is the Assistive Technology (AT) is being performed and provided in our state, but as an agency we have not been able to do a very accurate job of capturing in any measurable way of what is going on. The system tracked in a lot of different ways but not in one coherent, clear way. For every case that has achieved employment outcome and is ready to close successfully or unsuccessfully, any closure, the counselor is required, before they can finish the closure, to go through this screen.

The new computer enhancements to AT captures answers to the question, "Was assistive technology considered in this case?" yes or no. If you say yes, it says, "What did you provide." There is a drop-down of five choices:

- Assessment,
- Equipment,
- Information or referral to a specialist,
- Adaptation or accommodation,
- Training on assistive technology.

The computer program will not let you pass this screen, it will not let you close the case, you cannot avoid this portion of the computer program without answering the questions. The Division has found that to be really good news because it is forcing us, and it gives us the ability after the fact, to go back, and now we can run reports starting January 1, 2012 documenting everything that is happened in assistive technology. We believe this is going to be nice, we can see how many assessments have been done, we can see, if we just referred to a specialist or we can see a combination of these five choices. It is going to give us a much better snapshot as we move forward to see what we have been doing.

Maureen asked Mechelle, if she would walk the Council through what happens if the counselors checks "no", that assistive technology was not considered.

Mechelle responded the Counselor would revert to what Counselors have always done the case would be a closure just like any other. For example the client was an education case. We help the person achieve their education, but no technology of any sort or accommodation for it or consideration was given, it wasn't required.

If the counselor checks "no", that piece of the screen remains grayed out, which in our system means you cannot touch it. And you would assign your closure date in that top field and you would move on to the next screen. So it just would not be a feature of that case.

Robin asked; would a psycho-educational individual with dyslexia and you are going to do a psycho-education to confirm that diagnosis, in turn would mean you would need some special AT programming for computers, would something like this be included? Mechelle replied; typically no, Madam Chair. She said that would be more our traditional or medical type of assessments that the Division has always done. This is something specific to if a person needs a certain accommodation to return to work, complete their education, something of that nature. For example it would be if a student or a working individual needs

someone to come out and assess their work station or the station where they do their homework, their computer station at home or their work site, to make sure it is ergonomically appropriate and fits their needs, or if someone has a computer, and maybe there is a visual impairment, and someone needs to help them determine what software they need to make the computer most usable. Anything along that nature would be the assessments we are describing.

Robin replied so would we get the same credit for someone that has the math-phobic or dyslexic individuals that might need those same kind of assistive technology enhancements so where a person with vision impairment may need JAWS, a person with dyslexia may need the WYNN program.
[Note: Two assistive technology programs. Job Access with Speech (JAWS) screen reading software and WYNN- literacy software for reading and writing]

Mechelle Merrill said "Correct." Her understanding is that would be two assessments. The first assessment would be to determine if the client reports to the counselor "I'm terrified of taking this math class that I need to complete my education, because I just get so overwhelmed by the thought of it", and so that would indicate the need for the type of assessment you are describing. That would probably precede the AT assessment, which then, once we know there is the diagnosis, then we would do an AT assessment which would define the exact technology to help bridge that gap. We would do both.

Robin said I am trying to make sure we are headed in the right direction and we are not filtering out individuals that we actually could count. You know, that we provide those services but because we do not code it, we will lose it. We do not want to lose out any of the services we are providing.

Mechelle agreed, no, we certainly do not, and I do not believe we are.

Jack and Scott commented this move shows that you can make changes that go beyond what is required by federal standards. This is an example of others to follow, as well.

Scott said he appreciated Mechelle coming to the State AT Council meeting and presenting us information about data gathering, and that there is a huge gap in what data is available and what we need to track. So whether it is Kindergarten through the twelfth grade (K -12) education, AT is not really tracked a lot for that, there is not a federal standard saying that they have to track certain things, but we know that all these organizations that serve folks are doing a lot more. Even if it is just providing information about how to use your smart phone as a reminder aid to get things done. He appreciates that.

IX. DISCUSSION/POSSIBLE ACTION NSRC MEMBERSHIP AND SUGGESTED BYLAWS REVISIONS

Maureen Cole began as you know, there has been lot of focus and discussion recently about the function, purpose and the authority that State Rehabilitation Councils have. We have two members of the Council who are going to go to Washington, D.C. in April to attend the National Organization of State Rehabilitation Councils, and we are really pleased that there is that kind of interest on the part of the Council.

As a result of all that focus and discussion, the Rehabilitation Administration took a look at the Council bylaws and thought there might be some opportunities to clarify some of the language and just make sure that we are in compliance and that we are giving our Council the best opportunity to operate in the manner in which it was intended to operate. So we have put together some recommended revisions to the current bylaws which have not been updated since 2009.

Some of them are technical stylistic items, in section seven we did clarify the terms of employment for Council members and defined the reasonable period of sit-out that a former Council member must observe before they are eligible to be reappointed to the Council. We suggest a period of three years, each term is three years, this seems like a reasonable length of time, and that is a state prerogative that each state can choose a reasonable period, we would suggest that three years is that reasonable period.

Robin said the terms are three years, and a person can do three years twice on the Council, with the exception of required program representation from the Client Assistance Program (CAP) and the Native American programs, and then there would be a three year break. We do not have that language from RSA, this is a suggestion, and we can either take it under advisement, we can vote to accept it, we can do some

additional research we can convene our bylaw committee. It is at the pleasure of the Council. This is just a suggestion.
Maureen answered Yes that is correct. Just as you said, each term is three years. Each member is limited except for the two you mentioned, who have unlimited terms. Each member is limited to two consecutive terms. They can sit out then for a period of three years, and then become eligible for reappointment.

Chris Syverson said in reviewing these changes, they seem to be reasonable, and they seem in line with the RSA recommendation, so I would like to make a motion that we approve this change to the bylaws. Robin interrupted notifying Chris that she had not called for a motion.

Both Kathy Treants and Jennifer Kane expressed concern over the proposed three year interim as both of their seats are required, however, in the recent past there have been issues with finding individuals to fill those seats. They expressed that three years seems a long time to sit out if they only really have one or two logical people from the required organizations to be on the board.

Maureen clarified, that after that reasonable period of sit-out, the individual can come back, but in a different seat than they occupied previously.

Robin asked if they come back and it is a required seat, they're coming back to what they did before, because that is their area of expertise. How will we be able to do that and tap into those resources, because we have limited individuals?

Maureen responded that could be an issue, we can confer with RSA and get their input on that. The whole purpose, of course, is to involve a wider range of people within the state to serve on the Council. In a small state, where, as Jennifer points out, we have very few people serving in any given capacity, it makes it much more difficult. She believes RSA would be willing to work with the Council on this. The rule is, generally speaking, and generally applied, that those who would come back and would have to sit in a different seat, occupy a different required membership seat, than the one you did previously.

Robin called for a motion on the proposed by-laws.

Chris Syverson said she stood behind her previous motion, given that the bylaws that have been presented are in line with the RSA recommendations. And we can certainly have a second, lack of second or a discussion.

Kathy asked for clarification believing her seat as the Nevada PEP could only be filled by herself.

Jane Gruner asked Kathy if there was another Nevada PEP office in Northern Nevada and if there was another person in the position or a similar job to hers. Kathy responded in the affirmative.

Maureen read from the RSA handout, this comes from the Rehabilitation Act. Regarding the composition of the State Rehabilitation Councils or in our bylaws but it comes from the statute. At least one representative of a parent training and information center established pursuant to section 682 A of the individuals with disabilities education act, as added by section 101 of the individuals with disabilities education act amendments of 1997, public law 15-17.

So although we certainly value the participation of Kathy over these many years, we are bound by the statutory requirements. If she were not able to continue to participate filling that seat, she could certainly participate after the meaningful sit-out period in another position, and someone else could represent that body. They do not necessarily have to have the same position as she holds within the Nevada PEP.

Kevin Hull suggested checking with other state Rehabilitation Councils to see what their "reasonable" length of time was. Robin agreed assigning Nevada State Rehabilitation Council (NSRC) support staff to follow through accessing the listserve within the National Council of State Rehabilitation Councils (NCSRC).

Scott opinioned six years was a long time to serve in one seat. The proposed reasonable time would allow new faces, businesses, and individuals to sit on the Council to represent a great portion of individuals with disabilities in the state.
Jack Mayes seconded the motion to accept the proposed NSRC By-laws.
Robin Hall-Walker, Chair requested a roll call vote.
Melissa Starr called the roll for their individual votes:
JANE GRUNER: Aye.
KEVIN HULL: Nay.
EDINA JAMBOR: Aye.
JACK MAYES: Aye.
CHRISTINE SYVERSON: Aye.
SCOTT YOUNGS: Aye.
JIMMY BEGAY: Aye.
STEVE CHARTRAND: Aye.
JENNIFER KANE: Nay.
KATE OSTI: Opposed.
KATHY TREANTS: Aye.

Melissa reported to Robin, Madam Chair, we have eight in favor and three that are opposed.

Robin affirmed the ayes have it, the motion is carried. She thanked everyone for their participation.

Maureen said as mentioned earlier, the NSRC is having difficulty filling the seats, and so she asked the Council members if they would forward some names of potential individuals, to be contacted to give them any information they may need about the Council, and the role it plays in the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) program, and certainly to supply them with an application.

It is a slow process, and as you can tell from the roster we have a number of members who will be leaving soon after serving their two 3 year consecutive terms, unfortunately we do have some seats that have been vacant for some time.

Robin said we understand and we would like very much for the Council to be in the loop as far as contact with potential members, so that we can know who is applying, and would encourage support staff to include the chair in any communication regarding potential members and applicants, for the record.

Melissa Starr said Yes, Madam Chair, so noted.

X. DISCUSSION/REPORT PROJECT SEARCH AND ADDITIONAL COUNCIL OF STATE ADMINISTRATORS OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION (CSAVR) BEST PRACTICES

Janice John began this is a project that is near and dear to her heart she is very supportive of it. She said she was happy to be at the meeting to talk a little bit about Project Search. Rehabilitation Administrators attended the Council of State Administrators Vocational Rehabilitation (CSAVR) conference in the fall of 2011 in Arizona. There was a number of great presentations, there was definitely a theme through a number of those presentations, it was transition and this has been a focus area across the nation, and was certainly a focus area for our former commissioner, Lynnae Rutledge, and it was very strong and we all believe this is where the future lays, is to provide great programs this being one of them.

So just a couple of themes because there was a number of other conferences and presentations that dealt with transition, and some of the themes that came out of those included an importance for interagency collaboration, instruction focus on teaching life skills and soft skills and job seeking skills; the development of job shadowing programs, career development, and career exploration. And really loud and clear was the value of internships and mentoring programs for the transition. It was nice for different states to spotlight what they are doing.

So with that said, Oklahoma came up and they presented their program. Janice gave an overview. The program originated out of Cincinnati, Ohio, where the program was developed 16 years ago and currently the project is in 40 states across the country, and four countries, internationally. It is really interesting how it has just grown and it has really taken on a life of its own.

It is a licensed program that the agencies purchase, the purchase price is about $250, just the site license. and the programs are audited. Especially if the state wants to expand, the site coordinators will come out and they actually will audit the program to make sure the integrity is instilled and it is doing what it is supposed to be doing. Oklahoma has five sites four of which are in medical and hospital settings. One of them is in Chesapeake Energy Corporation, Janice stated she was in awe as this was a huge company where this particular Project Search was located, it initially started a couple years ago, has 10,000 employees in its complex , the employees call it the campus. The eight clients that are working at this particular site do a variety of jobs. This particular campus has a health club, human resources, just everything you could imagine, so these clients rotate to these various positions. Janice said she thought it was interesting the health club and the food services, sites could be directly related to and transfer into the community. The other thing Janice thought was interesting was the percentage of successful employment closures have increased definitely as a result of the Oklahoma project.

Oklahoma has a unique partnership with the university. Normally, with Project Search you usually see it as a school district coming forth buying the license, buying the program, the vocational rehabilitation partner comes in there and they provide the job coach, the school district provides the teacher. Then the host site, which is the employer, provides a classroom setting for the students to meet in, and the job rotations for them to work in.

Just describing what the program looks like, the students can earn credit in English part of the morning class session, because they will talk about and read, preparation, soft skills, those kinds of things. So they can get credit, four hours are spent on the job working with job coaches providing that support. Two hours a day are spent in the classroom. Theirs is a 10 week work rotation to try out different jobs and state wide they have a very nice success rate of 57 and 60 percent for employment.

Janice also shared that we also have this program, the school district purchased the program in 2009 and our site is University Medical Center of Southern Nevada (UMC). The program operates only during the school year. It is collaboration between the school district and the VR counselors who actually work together to appoint and nominate students that they think would be a good match for this program.

Janice described future plans, indicating 10 students are scheduled to come on board in the fall and we are looking to expand sites.

Jennifer Kane confirmed when you refer to school district you are talking about Clark County School District? Janice replied, yes.

Jennifer then asked if there are any talks about doing this in Washoe County, she was curious if there have been discussions about doing this north or rural? Janice replied there haven't been any discussion up to this point, I think we're ready to, I think this was a great pilot for us, I think we had some good experience we understand a little better what is working, what is not working, and can really see it grow.

Scott asked about the funding source. Janice replied in Oklahoma the clients are paid through Vocational Rehabilitation to retain an individual as a consultant.

Kathy Treants asked about the average size for a site. Janice responded 8 to 10 is usually what they like to have.

Kathy asked if the students receive a paycheck. Janice responded no, they are not getting a paycheck as this is part of our school training, so these are students that are going to be in the 18 to 22 age group. Janice continued that it is a little bit of a different with each program, and that is with the blessing of Project Search, everything you want to modify needs to go through them first.

XI. OTHER REPORTS

Kate Osti reported The Independent Living Council has three individuals that are interested in becoming Certified Deaf Interpreters (CDI) who should be certified by the end of 2012. She asked the Council if the

members may know of individuals who would like to serve on the Independent Living Council as they would like to find individuals with disabilities that are willing to serve.

XII **ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT**

Maureen introduced Mark Costa, DETR's new Chief Financial Officer, who was in attendance at the northern location. She said Mr. Costa had been in state service for a number of years, he brings with him a wealth of experience and is very welcome in our agency.

Maureen announced a few Rehabilitation Administration changes. Melissa Starr accepted the Management Analyst II position.
Mr. Mark Bedrosian was hired as the Management Analyst III. He will be overseeing the Ticket to Work contract development and monitoring audits as well as other functions that support Vocational Rehabilitation (VR).

Mr. Ken Pierson has been hired as the Rehabilitation Division's new Business Development Manager. He came to the Division from the Economic Development office and he has a number of contacts throughout the state. He has been in the economic development business for a number of years, He is out meeting and greeting and selling VR as a viable option to any kind of Human Resource (HR) needs employers may have. Ken is doing a wonderful job.

One of the things Ken is marketing as he visits Nevada employers is that VR employees come with a warranty. Unlike other employees that you hire from any other source, if you have a problem with that employee, you are your own to figure out how that employee is going to work out, or unfortunately, not work out. With a VR client you have someone that you can call, and they will bring all kinds of resources to bear, to smooth that problem over, to provide training, to provide assistive technology, whatever it takes to make that business owner happy with that employment decision. We as a Division believe that is a great selling point. We are delighted to have all of those folks with us.

In regards to the budget it is going to have some pretty significant ramifications for the Rehabilitation Division. The Rehabilitation Act allows Section 110 funds to be carried over. You have to match those funds in the first year of the grant. You can, in effect, pre-match some of those funds, not spend them in the first year of the grant, carry the funds over to the second year of the grant that helps you manage money in a more effective way, smooth's out some of the bumps in the road that we know can occur, and allows the Division to target money for certain kinds of projects.

In the past the Rehabilitation Division has carried over some of that pre-match money, it is all money that has been pre-matched with non-general fund match, and we have carried those over. When you carry funds forward you do what is called a Work Program which is a document that indicates what funds you have, where you want to move them, what their purpose is going to be. That goes through the Budget Division, it goes to the Legislative Council Bureau's (LCB) Fiscal Analysis Division, and then in most cases if it is over a certain dollar amount, and ours always are, it goes to the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) for their review and approval. In years past we have followed that process. The Work Programs with the carry-over funds have gone to budget, they have gone to the Fiscal Analysis Unit of LCB, they have gone in front of the Legislative Council Bureau, and everyone has kind of signed off and approved, and we have used those moneys then in the second year.

This year we did the very same process, and were astonished and astounded to find that what we had been doing for any number of years was viewed now, as a violation of the law. In every appropriation bill there is a section which states that if you receive funds from another source, you must offset your general fund appropriation by the amount of the funds from that other source. What the Division did not know, nor did anyone else until just recently, is the carry-over of the matched 110 federal funds were, are now, perceived as funds from another source, which means that we have to offset our general fund appropriation in proportion. 21.3 to 78.7.

Since these carry-over funds were Federal Fiscal Year 2011 funds, and we are now in Federal Fiscal Year 2012, and State Fiscal Year 2012, the dilemma was how you fix this situation. It is hard to fix if not impossible to fix. So both the Budget Department and LCB determined the Division could bring those

funds forward, spend what we could spend, and on June 30 the Division will "true-up" the accounts. Anything that has been spent from those funds from another source, the carry-over funds, will serve to offset our State General Fund Appropriation for 2012. At this point the Division is looking at a sizable reversion to the general fund, and a relinquishment of federal funds. Because we are not going to fix 2011, we are going to actually fix 2012 to take care of this problem. The Division is looking at reverting somewhere in the neighborhood of a million-5 to the State General Fund for State Fiscal Year 2012, and somewhere around four and a half to $5 million in federal funds, which is a huge amount to move.

There will not be any carry-over and the sense is this will not be a permissible process in the future. The Division will be using their grant within that 12 month period. We will not be moving any of that money forward. It is a very different way of doing business, and certainly, to reiterate, came as a shock when we really established a course of dealing that allowed that kind of carry-over. So the Division will be scrambling a little bit to figure out how to legitimately and legally spend some of those funds down, so that we do not lose any more than we absolutely have to.

So what we are trying to do is build an infrastructure, we are looking at a vendor rating system that comes from the same software company as our RAISON program. We are looking at the paperless case management system, which is a pretty expensive endeavor, but one that would pay off handsomely in the long run. We are also looking at some upgrades in our offices, returning the two intern positions that were taken, because we do have salary savings that can cover the costs of those positions as well as looking at other ways of using some of that money before we have to revert to the general funds.

The other part is since we did not find about this situation until February, this month, the Division is trying to make major purchases, getting all the paperwork and that process observed has been a little bit of a challenge. We have some vendors who are very willing to work with us, we are hoping for the best.

Jack asked Maureen to help him understand the net impact on clients of Vocational Rehabilitation as a result of this budget change

Maureen replied that is actually the good news, because it does not affect our client services. We typically put most of those dollars into client services, but because of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding. We did not spend all of our ARRA money, but we wound up carrying over more than we had actually anticipated doing so that surplus funding was a little bit of a problem, with our counselor base and counselor vacancies we do find it difficult to spend as much money as we would like to spend, because it is the counselors who really write those authorizations, and who get that money flowing for the Division. There will not and has not been any reduction in the client services category. Where our surplus lies is outside of that category, and gives us an opportunity to invest in some of those long-term projects that will make us more efficient and help us divert resources to more clients and other kinds of things, instead of, for example, a rehabilitation tech moving files around, filing, sending files for audit, etc. The tech will be able to deal more with clients, setting appointments, getting information, and getting the clients' case moving down the road a little more quickly. That is the Division's hope.

Scott asked Maureen to give the Council a glimpse statewide how many vacant positions the Division has and in what locations.

Maureen answered we have seven counselor vacancies and one tech. Most of those would be in the south, a few here in the north. We recently did fill our one vacancy in the rural area.

Kate Osti commented out of curiosity. If we have been doing the carry-over funding wrong, is there any chance the Division would have to repay funds from prior years?

Maureen said there has been some discussion about that, but I do not think there is an appetite for trying to recoup those funds. It is a very complicated and difficult process because it is of an evolutionary process, and everyone who touched the process in the past agreed upon, and felt were appropriate, it is very difficult now to backtrack and say everybody made a mistake. So going forward, we will correct the process and make sure that we are on the right track from State Fiscal Year 12 going forward.

Jack asked why the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) Hearing was included in the Administrator's Reports.

Robin replied it is part of the directive that the information about hearings be in the packet when they exist. That is something that comes from the federal regulations.

Jennifer Kane asked in regards to the Performance Indicator reports if the total was an average. Maureen indicated that it was. Jennifer continued there are a couple of them that she could not figure out. For example number four on the first page, how did it come out to 40 percent? Maureen said she would confer with the Business Process Analyst for the answer.

(On March 7, 2012 Maureen responded via email to the Nevada State Rehabilitation Council members regarding the Performance Indicator percentages. "Hello, Council Members,
Heather Johnson, who compiles the performance indicators for the Rehabilitation Division, clarified why the "total" columns for reported numbers seem to be in error. This is because the totals are not a simple average of each reported month. Rather, they are weighted averages.

For BSBVI (BA 3254) through February, the actual (not weighted) averages are:
SPI #1 total is 415.1 / 8 months = 51.9%
SPI #4 total is 310.0 / 8 months = 38.8%

But these numbers aren't accurate. For BSBVI SPI #1 (July - February), the hard numbers are:

Closed Rehab	90	
Closed Other	81	
Total	171	90 / 171 = 52.6%

We use weighted averages because it represents the real percentage of the real numbers and not just a total divided by a certain number of months. SPI #4 is calculated the same way but because the numbers are so similar, it's easy to see it's not a simple average.

I hope this information is helpful to you in reviewing the Division's Performance Indicators."

XIII. REPORT ON THE COUNCIL'S STATE FISCAL YEAR 2012 BUDGET AND SUGGESTED ADJUSTMENTS

Melissa Starr presented to the Council, the printed budget materials as of October 26, 2011.

Jack Mayes asked if any changes were anticipated from last year to this year. Melissa responded the Council does have an influx in the projected expenditures for contracts which would provide members of the public with special accommodations should a request for these services be submitted.

XIV. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comments were made.

XV. ADJOURNMENT

Robin entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.
Jennifer S. Kane moved to adjourn.
Kate Osti seconded. Motion passed.
Meeting adjourned at 10: 40 a.m.

Edited By:

Melissa Starr, MA II, NSRC Liaison

Approved By:

5/15/12

Robin Hall-Walker, Chair