Illinois SILC position paper regarding Assistive Technology:

It is the position of the Statewide Independent Living Council of Illinois that persons with disabilities want and need increased access to assistive technology to increase their independence in daily living, employment opportunities and quality of life. Assistive technology is any device or service that is used to increase, maintain or improve the functional capabilities of people with disabilities.
To this end, the Statewide Independent Living Council supports the expansion of available assistive technology by:

- Creating a downstate Assistive Technology Evaluation and Training Center.
- Improving the employability of people with disabilities through reasonable accommodations provided by assistive technology.
- Allowing students with disabilities equal access to an appropriate education including the provision of assistive technology.
- Reducing the inappropriate purchase of assistive technology by ensuring that assessments are made by qualified individuals.
- Increasing independence and allowing people with disabilities to remain in the home of their choice through assistive technology.
- Broadening the policies of VR and HSP to allow more people with disabilities to have access to assistive technology.

By taking these necessary steps, Illinois will be decreasing people with disabilities dependence on state or federal support and increasing their employment opportunities and independence.

Nevada Assistive Technology for Employment Summit 2011

University of Nevada, Reno

NATRC.info
Nevada Assistive Technology Resource Center

NCED.info
Nevada Center of Excellence in Disabilities

UNR
University of Nevada Reno

The Nevada Assistive Technology for Employment Summit and this report were made possible through the support of the Medicaid Infrastructure Grant (MIG), DHHS #93.768, awarded to Nevada by CMS.

Additional support was provided by the Nevada Center for Excellence in Disabilities (NCED); the Department of Employment Training and Rehabilitation (DETR) and Opportunity Village Incorporated.

Tami Brancamp, Ph.D.
George McKinlay M.S.
Scott Youngs B.A.
June 2012

Executive Summary

The importance of employment for the State of Nevada is high. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics's May 2012 report lists Nevada as worst in the nation with an unemployment rate of 11.6%. In the report *Persons with a Disability: Labor Force Characteristics Summary 2012,* the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that a person with a disability between the ages of 16-64 was more likely not to be employed than to be employed.

A Summit was held regarding assistive technology and its role in employment to assist with the successful creation, placement and retention of jobs for people with disabilities The purpose of the Summit was to: delineate priorities for the provision of AT in order to allow people with disabilities to prepare for, acquire, and maintain supportive and/or competitive employment.

Stakeholders from around the state representing agencies, service providers, practitioners, and people with disabilities came together in Las Vegas in October of 2011 to discuss critical issues and obtain information regarding assistive technology and employment. There were approximately 51 registered participants on Day 1 and 35 on Day 2, and approximately 15 staff and/or volunteers.

The format of the Summit followed the Nevada Hybrid Model for consensus work groups and strategy based outcomes, and was charged with developing recommendations and goals that would be implemented statewide by agencies and service providers in order to ultimately improve AT services.

Prior to the Summit, a steering committee was developed and engaged to create topic areas of critical issues. These were: interagency collaboration & community partnership; service delivery transitions; quality assurance & accountability; sustainability. Discussions on each of the five topic areas were coordinated by a facilitator. The primary function of each facilitator was to coordinate and organize the group and to ensure participation by all group members. Through discussions the five topic areas were expanded and defined to become; Comprehensive Service Delivery; Continuity of Services-Transitions; AT Special Interest Group-Sustainability; Resource Sharing-Interagency Collaboration; Quality Assurance-Establishing Minimum Data Sets; Quality Assurance-Establishing Minimum Standards; Funding-Sustainability.

Day 1 participants were given the topic areas and facilitators guided discussions with the groups to narrow the topic in to focus areas or idea statements that could be voted on by the group to become viable outcome statements.

Evening work groups were challenged with taking the raw information and consolidating it into outcome statements based on the original cluster of ideas (e.g., "Agencies should engage in robust sharing of information and resources.").

Day 2 participants were provided the agreed upon outcome statements and were charged with developing strategies to address them. Some groups established a specific work plan with delineated goals and timelines, while others with perhaps more difficult or interrelated topics, only established statements of need.

Results/Recommendations

The following goals/strategies were developed for each topic area and associated outcome statements Some outcome statements did not have a specific goal associated with it or it was combined in other goals. This section is abbreviated for the purpose of this summary.

Topic Area	Outcome Statements	Goals
Comprehensive Service Delivery	Ensure comparability, improve training, driven by the consumer who may have broader needs, of high quality.	By 9-30-13, 25 service providers statewide will have AT assessment and best practice guidelines
		By 9-30-14 Establish a web-based system of statewide education and exposure to provide quarterly training opportunities for all stakeholders to foster informed decision making. (in general)
Continuity of Services—transitions	Increase education, long term view as needs and AT change, Person Centered Planning, AT follows the person during transitions	By 9-30-14 Establish a web-based system of statewide education and exposure to provide quarterly training opportunities for all stakeholders to foster informed decision making. (specific to transition)
AT special interest group—sustainability	Support consumer driven decision making, expand knowledge base, embrace a culture of change	AT training & awareness for community, policy changes for continual funding for services, create database of resources: agency providers manufacturers/vendors funds and grants available give consumer choices
Resource sharing—interagency collaboration	To enhance the quality of life for people with disabilities throughout their lifespan, by expanding access to assistive technology devices, resources, and services.	Increase outreach efforts in all medias. Establish a consortium on funding, remove barriers, identify gaps, address further dilemmas, host a statewide AT conference in Nevada, improve services
Establish minimum data set—quality assurance	Define the data sets needed, consistent and measurable, web based, accountability, funding of the instrument	Creation of an interagency AT data committee to begin the process of identifying key data elements and other service delivery related indicators that would identify the role and scope of AT services in Nevada.
Establish minimum standards—quality assurance	Develop or establish outcome-based guidelines for assessments, quality services and accountability, training and support.	Standards committee to be formed to pursue several tasks. First, identify and encourage the adoption of effective AT service delivery models by identifying successful national AT programs. Second, establish a statewide registry of AT service providers as part of a process of defining a set of basic expectations and practices. Eventually, the expectations and practices would be formalized into competencies and standards that AT service providers could adhere to.
Funding—sustainability	Continuity and stability of services, effective accountability mechanisms, braiding	Funding is well coordinated; identify funding options and braid when appropriate. Thoughtfully targeted; best practices check list for decision making regarding A.T. funding. Explore or utilize matching or leveraged funding options.

Contents

Disability, Assistive Technology & Employment 1

Defining AT in period of rapid technological change 1

The contemporary workplace 2

Summit Results 3

1 Comprehensive Service Delivery 3

2 Continuity of Services—Transitions 5

3 AT Special Interest Group—Sustainability 6

4 Resource Sharing—Interagency Collaboration 7

5 Establish Minimum Data Set—Quality Assurance 8

6 Establish Minimum Standards—Quality Assurance 9

7 Funding—Sustainability 10

Changes to the included data. 11

Background to NATES 12

Developing the AT summit 12

Establishing the topic areas 12

Disability, Assistive Technology & Employment

The importance of employment for the State of Nevada is high. The U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics's May 2012 report lists Nevada as worst in the nation with an unemployment rate of 11.6%. In the report *Persons with a Disability: Labor Force Characteristics Summary 2012,* the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that a person with a disability between the ages of 16-64 was more likely not to be employed than to be employed.The Bureau of Labour in *Persons with a Disability: Labor Force Characteristics Summary 2010* reports that*:*

- Persons with a disability were over three times as likely as those with no disability to be age 65 and over.
- For all age groups, the employment-population ratio was much lower for persons with a disability than for those with no disability.
- The unemployment rate for persons with a disability was about the same in 2011 as in 2010. The rate for persons without a disability fell over the year.
- One-third of workers with a disability were employed part time, compared with about one-fifth of those with no disability.
- Employed persons with a disability were more likely to be self- employed than those with no disability.

The NV 2010 Employment Policy Summit brought numerous agencies and individuals together to identify and propose system changes to increase the employment of people with disabilities in Nevada. Six recommendations were made:

1. Involve all stakeholders in the improvement of interagency collaboration and communication.
2. Engage individuals with disabilities in developmental career experiences at a younger age.
3. Develop and institute training and educational systems and public awareness programs for people with disabilities, providers, families, employers and community partners that focus on employment of individuals with developmental disabilities.
4. Review, define, revise, implement and enforce a reimbursement structure for service providers that increases employment of persons with disabilities.
5. Expand and enhance transportation options for persons with disabilities.
6. *Define, expand and educate the use of assistive technology to increase employment options.*

The sixth recommendation identified the importance of Assistive Technology with a key action of holding an Assistive Technology (AT) summit. This report is the result of the AT summit.

Defining AT in period of rapid technological change

The Technology Related Assistance to Individuals with Disabilities Act of 1988 (Tech Act) described an assistive technology device as "any item, piece of equipment, or product system, whether acquired commercially off the shelf, modified, or customized, that is used to increase, maintain, or improve functional capabilities of individuals with disabilities." AT services are described in the The Tech Act as "any service that directly assists an individual with a disability in selection, acquisition or use of an assistive technology device."

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) of 2004 uses the same definition as the Tech Act, but specifically excludes surgically implanted medical devices. The IDEA defines AT as "any item, piece of equipment, or product system, whether acquired commercially off the shelf, modified, or customized, that is used to increase, maintain, or improve functional capabilities of a child with a disability. Exception. —The term does not include a medical device that is surgically implanted, or the replacement of such device." (§ 602(1)).

An AT service is defined under the IDEA as "any service that directly assists a child with a disability in the selection, acquisition, or use of an assistive technology device." (§ 602(2)). The term includes:

(A) the evaluation of the needs of such child, including a functional evaluation of the child in the child's customary environment;
(B) purchasing, leasing, or otherwise providing for the acquisition of assistive technology devices by such child;
(C) selecting, designing, fitting, customizing, adapting, applying, maintaining, repairing, or replacing assistive technology devices;
(D) coordinating and using other therapies, interventions, or services with assistive technology devices, such as those associated with existing education and rehabilitation plans and programs;
(E) training or technical assistance for such child, or, where appropriate, the family of such child; and
(F) training or technical assistance for professionals (including individuals providing education and rehabilitation services), employers, or other individuals who provide services to, employ, or are otherwise substantially involved in the major life functions of such child.

Since the enactment of the Tech Act, defining AT as a distinct technology has become increasingly difficult. Such distinctions are especially difficult in areas involving information and communications technology (IT and CT)— and distinctions between IT & CT themselves are increasingly hard to make. The increasingly pervasive role of of technology in society, the consumerization of technology, and the influence of universal design principles has resulted in technologies that assist virtually all members of society. For most people, technology makes things easier. For people with disabilities, technology can make things possible.

The contemporary workplace

The last decades have seen significant changes in communication, technology and the workplace. In the last ten years there has been a dramatic change in the workplace:

First, there has been a significant shift in the adoption patterns of new communication and information technologies. New technologies are first embraced by the consumer market, then permeate into the business sector, and finally into government agencies. Increasingly consumer markets are now seen as the primary driver of innovation. The rapid consumer adoption of touch screen telephones and cellular tablets has substantially lowered the cost of adoption.

Second, there has been a move away from corporate software development and acquisition processes toward smaller and more focussed "app" and "web-based" development and purchases. The catch-phrase "an app for that" signifies smaller software development teams and extremely low cost applications. Instead of a few monolithic applications costing hundreds or thousands of dollars. These new vertical applications are now costing a few dollars at most. Such applications are increasingly interchangeable, with data being shared across Software as a Service (SaaS) platforms.The ability of smaller workgroups, even individuals, to develop highly efficient workflows and apply responsive business logic processes lowers the cost of workplace accommodations for people with disabilities. By embracing flexible end user adopted technology solutions the contemporary workplace is itself becoming universally designed.

AT has seen significant changes over the last two decades.AT has historically extended the ability of individuals with disabilities to carry out activities. Much of "traditional AT" has focussed on overcoming physical and sensory challenges to participation. Technological improvements and an increasing shift toward an information society has resulted in an explosion in AT possibilities and a concomitant increase in the availability of virtual or online activi-

ties. Potentially, physical, intellectual and sensory disabilities are less restrictive in a virtual society—if a person with such disabilities makes it past the digital divide.

AT allows people to carry out activities they *may not otherwise be able to do, or to do in a timely and effective manner*. The productivity gains from the adoption of appropriate AT in the workplace permits individuals with disabilities to either remain competitively employed or allows them to be cost-effectively placed in employment settings.

Background to NATES

The Nevada Assistive Technology for Employment Summit (NATES) was a project funded by the 2011 Nevada Medicaid Infrastructure Grant which was awarded to the Nevada Assistive Technology Resource Center (NATRC), a project of the Nevada University Center for Excellence in Disabilities (NCED) at the University of Nevada, Reno.

The NATRC proposed a statewide Assistive Technology for Employment Summit based upon the findings of the 2010 Nevada Employment Policy Summit. The results of the Employment Summit indicated there is an important need to expand and enhance the use of AT to improve employment opportunities for people with disabilities in Nevada.

Based on selected outcomes of the 2010 Nevada Employment Policy Summit, the following goals were established:

- The AT Summit will identify gaps in service delivery throughout Nevada.
- The AT Summit will delineate priorities for the provision of AT in order to allow people with disabilities to prepare for, acquire, and maintain supportive and/or competitive employment.
- Priorities established during the Summit will be developed into actionable outcome statements and published as a report that can be used by agencies to enhance the use of assistive technology statewide.

Developing the AT summit

The NATES Executive Committee invited agency leaders to participate in the NV AT Summit as members of the Steering Committee and as participants of the Summit. If agency heads were unable to participate, they were asked to indicate a designee. Agencies included those which provide services to people with disabilities including State of Nevada departments (e.g., Welfare, Medicaid, Education, Aging & Disability Services), service providers, education and training entities (e.g., K-12 education, regional centers, university representatives, Easter Seals) and advocacy organizations (e.g., NDALC, NV PEP). A full listing of steering committee members is located in Appendix A.

The primary role of the steering committee was to set the agenda for the two-day AT Summit. Steering committee members participated in three teleconference calls. The initial conference call explained the overall purpose of the AT Summit and the requested role of committee members. Members were requested to provide 3-5 areas of emphasis they felt were most important for Assistive Technology in Nevada. Based on steering committee input, five topic areas were formed.

Establishing the topic areas

The NV Assistive Technology for Employment Summit focused on five topic areas. Participants were provided with the following descriptions of each topic area for the purpose of NATES.

- **Interagency Collaboration & Community Partnership—**Formal and informal agreements, memorandums of understanding, shared indicators, shared events, trainings and facilities
- **Service Delivery—**to produce the promised, desired, or expected results; intake, education, consultation, brainstorming, comprehensive AT evaluation, assistance with funding process, access to loan
- **Transitions—**a passage from one state, stage, subject or place to another: Early intervention to K-12, K-16, transition from education to employment Part C to Part B; transitions between agencies or spheres of responsibility
- **Quality Assurance & Accountability—**Identifying frameworks for developing fully integrated information about agencies' missions and strategic priorities, results-

oriented performance goals that flow from those priorities, performance data to show the achievement (or not) of those goals, and accurate and audited financial information about the costs of achieving mission outcomes.

- **Sustainability—**sustainability as a growth model for meeting the AT needs of our constituents in the present and the future. Also defined as the capacity to endure; long-term maintenance of well being; economic sustainability is various strategies for making the most out of available resourcesThe Summit Process

NATES was held October 24 and 25, 2011 at Opportunity Village in Las Vegas. The Nevada Hybrid Model was utilized in the summit, with three distinct organization steps:

- **Day One:** Sessions identified and quantified the barriers for successful AT acquisition for Nevadans.
- **Evening Data Crunch Group:** Findings were organized into themes and quantified to establish Day Two priority workgroups.
- **Day Two:** Summit participants selected one focus area/workgroup. Each workgroup designed a specific plan of action that detailed what each expected outcome would look like when completed, the precise steps needed to reach the outcome, who would be involved, and a timeline for completion.

There were 51 registered participants for Day 1. Participants were randomly assigned to one of five groups. Group membership remained the same throughout Day 1 activities. Groups rotated through the five topic areas.

Each of the five topic areas were coordinated by a facilitator. Each facilitator stayed with the same topic through Day 1 activities. The primary function of each facilitator was to coordinate and organize the group and to ensure participation by all group members.

Day 1 of the NATES process followed the Consensus Workshop method (Miller, 2006). A Consensus Workshop enables a large group of people to learn from each other as they discuss a complex multi-faceted issue, thereby converting a diversity of perspectives into a common theme. The consensus method follows five steps.

1. **Set a context:** The group focused on one topic area (e.g., Interagency Collaboration).
2. **Brainstorm in layers:** Participants wrote their own ideas about the topic area onto individual cards. Their individual ideas were then shared with the whole group. Each idea was then posted onto the wall.
3. **Cluster ideas:** Facilitators asked group participants to identify similarities among the cards. Cards were then clustered into similar ideas.
4. **Name the clusters:** Participants named each idea cluster.
5. **Resolve the names:** Participants decided on outcome statements based on the cluster of ideas (e.g., “Agencies should engage in robust sharing of information and resources.”

This process was completed by each group within each of the five topic areas. This resulted in five sets of outcome statements for each topic area. Each of these were tallied and and entered into a database so they could be tallied at the end of the first day.

At the end of Day 1, participants were invited to stay into the evening to group and count the outcome statements from each of the topic areas. These tallies and reworked statements were used to focus on specifics for the development of Day 2 activities. A smaller group of individuals condensed the topic area sets of outcome statements into one set for each topic area. Trends were discussed and work-plan groups were established for Day 2

Day 2 activities included 35 participants. Each participant self-identified the work-plan group in which s/he intended to participate. Work-plan group members worked together to establish a goal statement, a list of goals, stakeholders and a potential timeline. Work-plans from all the groups were presented to all participants at the end of Day 2.

Summit Results

1 Comprehensive Service Delivery

Day 1 Areas of focus

Areas of focus were drawn solely from the service delivery discussions during the summit and incorporated all group sessions from Day 2. The service delivery focus provided the greatest number of ideas. The outcome statements were:

1. Ensure comparable service delivery through education, training and program evaluation
2. Improve AT process and training for consumers and professionals
3. Promote consumer-driven service delivery that is initiated early, is iterative, accessible and ethical
4. Increase the availability of high quality, comprehensive AT assessment, training and evaluation
5. Provide evaluation and assessment that addresses the broader needs of the consumer.

Day 2 Work-plan development

The comprehensive service delivery workgroup identified two specific goals: the establishment of a set of AT assessment and practice guidelines, and second, the development and provision of training opportunities that foster coordinated AT transitions.

The first goal overlaps with the tasks of the minimum standards workgroup for quality assurance. Standardizing assessment protocols would simplify AT transitions, since assessments could be shared more easily between agencies. In addition, standardized assessments would have the potential to reduce service duplication and encourage the consideration of needs beyond those of meeting specific agency goals.

Goal 1: By 9-30-13, 25 service providers statewide will have AT assessment and best practice guidelines

What do we need to do?	How do we do it?	Who will be responsible?	When is it due?	What do we need to do next?
Identify stakeholders statewide	Request list from AT Council	AT Council will assist in identifying of stakeholders	By Dec 1, 2013	
Meet with stakeholder	‣List from AT Council ‣Schedule meeting	Group chair	February/ March 2013	Collect stakeholder protocols and assessments and buy-in
Work group to develop assessment tool/ guidelines with data points	Schedule meting and compile common assessment tool and best practice guidelines	SDC Comm.	6/30/2014	Move to Goal #2

The task of identifying stakeholders statewide and contacting stakeholders is a narrower subset of the stakeholder-related tasks established by the Minimum Standards and Minimum Data workgroup. To avoid duplication the three workgroups will need to communicate with each other in order to ensure alignment of tasks. Identifying shared indicators and outcome goals across the major transitions phases could provide all three workgroups with important insights into their tasks and successes. In turn, these change indicators would

permit data-informed decisions that could further improve services through various funding and organizational configurations.

Goal 2: By 9-30-14 Establish a web-based system of statewide education and exposure to provide quarterly training opportunities for all stakeholders to foster informed decision making.

What do we need to do?	How do we do it?	Who will be responsible?	When is it due?	What do we need to do next?
Collaborate with resource sharing work groups	Schedule meeting	SDC comm.	Dec. 2013	Determine best practice needs as a group
Determine best practice training needs	Survey of stakeholders	Work group	March 2013	Compile survey of best practice
Compile survey and best practice		Data group	June 2013	Send to statewide agencies
Advertise/market to stakeholders	AT Council, DD Councils, etc.	Statewide disseminated through all available agencies and organizations	June 2013	Recruit NCED staff to develop training opportunities
Develop, schedule, and provide quarterly web-based training opportunities	Recruit NCED-NATRC	NCED-NATRC	9/30/ 2014	

The second goal, establishing a web-based system of education and dissemination, builds an informed and connected network of AT stakeholders that should enhance continuity of services. Developing a seamless transition process between service agencies also serves as an opportunity to identify and develop shared resources and avoid duplication beyond the transition phases.

2 Continuity of Services—Transitions

Day 1 Areas of focus

The discussion on "transition" was not restricted to K-12 employment transitions. The attendees indicated critical areas for developmentally younger persons that may significantly impact the long term employability of individuals with disabilities. Transitions phases were identified as contributing to perceived or real problems of effective AT access. Areas covered included early childhood, post-secondary and aging transitions: Outcome statements were;

1. Provide continued educational opportunities on AT.
2. Take a long-term view of AT—needs and technology change.
3. Identify and implement seamless transition programs emphasizing lifelong Person Centered Planning (PCP).
4. Increase agency and community collaboration for AT pre- and post transition to ensure that AT follows the individual.

Day 2 Work-plan development

Due to the interrelated nature of transition and comprehensive services and the smaller number of people at the summit who chose to develop transition related work-plans, the Transition group was combined with the Comprehensive Service Delivery group. The combined group suggested the establishment of a transition training program as part of their Goal 2 work-plan (see above).

3 AT Special Interest Group—Sustainability

Day 1 Areas of focus

This grouping is based upon several key areas that came out of discussions on sustainability. The outcome statements were:

1. The development of a resource coalition to support consumer-driven decision making and interagency collaboration;
2. The need to expand the number of decision makers and stakeholders who are knowledgeable, invested in the issues, and understand the obligations for providing AT.
3. The need to insure that stakeholders, more specifically consumers, are involved in the special interest group.
4. The importance of embracing a *culture of change* to ensure AT is a leading solution to meet the needs of the disability community for the future. Examples of such a culture of change include accessing social media, and removing Information Technology (IT) vetoes and other constraining organizational practices.

The importance of an open and public forum for the advancement of AT in Nevada stemmed from the issue of Sustainability. Creating an informed community of AT users, professionals and decision makers was seen as necessary component to the advancement of both current as well as future AT needs.

Day 2 Work-plan development

The AT Special Interest workgroup identified three sub-focus areas: public awareness, advocacy and accessibility. The sub-focus of accessibility referred to the ability of stakeholders to seek information about AT in Nevada through specific resources.

	What do we need to do?	How do we do it?	Who will be responsible?	When is it due?	What do we need to do next?
Public Awareness	AT Training & awareness for community	‣Flyers ‣workshops ‣demonstrations of AT ‣brochures ‣public fairs ‣website ‣social media	‣All stakeholders ‣NATRC: Facebook ‣NCED/VISTA: trifold ‣Easter Seals & Nevada PEP: help collect info	‣Daily ‣FB: 30 days ‣Trifold: 30 days	‣Reach out to colleagues ‣Organize demonstrations
Advocacy	Policy changes for continual funding for services	‣Letter writing ‣emails ‣calls to congress	All stakeholders	within 90 days	‣Reach out to Disability Advocacy groups ‣People First
Accessibility	‣Create database of resources: ‣agency providers ‣manufacturers/vendors ‣funds and grants available ‣give consumer choices	‣website, social media, brochure	All stakeholders	within 120 days	contact "Resource Sharing Group" and start collecting data

4 Resource Sharing—Interagency Collaboration

Day 1 Areas of focus

Resource sharing is an important requirement for AT services in Nevada and is also a tacit acknowledgment of the scarcity of state government resources. The importance of resource sharing stemmed from the Day 1 discussions on interagency collaboration. The outcome statements were:

1. Agencies should engage in a collaborative process to establish mechanisms for effective sharing of information and resources on AT;
2. By more effectively engaging inter-agency resources the resulting savings should then be utilized to expand access to assistive technology and training;
3. Community resources and information should be aggregated to further maximize AT service delivery;
4. Legislation should be developed that incentivizes agency partnerships surrounding issues of assistive technology, i.e., a consortia of state/stakeholder agencies should be created and charged with developing common language to be used for data acquisition and recording.

Day 2 Work-plan development

The Resource Sharing workgroup delineated two approaches. The first was the development of a mechanism to enhance interagency collaboration through collaborative outreach activities—subcategorized into "online" and "traditional" methods such as newsletters. The second approach involved establishing a consortium that would seek to address a variety of key issues that were identified and discussed at the summit.

This work group did not specify individual responsibility. The group was composed of individuals from: Nevada PEP, NNCIL, DRC, DETR Voc. Rehab, BSB-DETR, and NDE.

Goal: To enhance the quality of life for people with disabilities throughout their lifespan, by expanding access to assistive technology devices, resources, and services.

What do we need to do?	How do we do it?		Who will be responsible?	When is it due?	What do we need to do next?
Online outreach	‣Collect information (local, state, federal) ‣Create website-using existing ‣Database (plug-in) ‣Designated ID administrators for updates	‣Elicit funding ‣Categories ‣E news ‣Database feedback-resources ‣BOBBY standards		Meet at DRC Sept, 2012	
Outreach	‣Newsletters ‣Hardcopies ‣Utilize other agencies ‣person-to-person				
Consortium	‣Funding ‣Remove barriers ‣Gaps ‣Address further dilemmas ‣CSUN in Nevada ‣Services				

5 Establish Minimum Data Set—Quality Assurance

Day 1 Areas of focus

The importance of adequate data for informed decision making stressed the need for both quantitative interagency measures as well as qualitative data. Shared indicators and simple data points were emphasized. The need for funding such a web-based system was emphasized. The outcome statements were

1. Formulate consistent and measurable data-driven definitions of who receives services and to what extent;
2. Clearly define a minimum data set. For example, define type of disability, receipt of AT services (yes or no), total expenditures and quantitative employment productivity outcomes.
3. Establish a uniform web-based system of data collection and evaluation that includes user impacts and satisfaction,both qualitative and quantitative.
4. Develop and implement appropriate accountability outcomes/measurements.
5. Identify funding source(s) to pay for unified data collection.

Day 2 Work-plan development

The Minimum Data Set workgroup and Establish Minimum Standards workgroup were combined due to insufficient numbers of participants within each group alone. Both workgroups arose from the Quality Assurance topic area discussions and their concerns were closely related. However, each workgroup was treated distinctly in the discussion, and the recommendations of each group are being reported separately.

The need to identify and justify the purpose of data collection was considered paramount. A component of this process would be the identification of existing stakeholders and their existing data systems to avoid onerous reporting requirements and mismatched data sets. The workgroup proposed the creation of an interagency AT data committee to begin the process of identifying key data elements and other service delivery related indicators that would identify the role and scope of AT services in Nevada.

What do we need to do?		How do we do it?	Who will be responsible?	When is it due?	What do we need to do next?
Identify what data is needed statewide and why.		Identify an interagency data collection strategy	NCED	March 2013	Recruit additional committee members by December 1, 2012 (max 6)
Possible Stakeholders: ‣Ed K-12 ‣VR ‣Regional Centers ‣DRC ‣ILC ‣Medicaid ‣Employers (HR)	‣CRPs ‣Vendors ‣Consumers ‣Aging ‣Family ‣NSHE ‣NEIS	Develop strategies to collect AT data from ‣transition points ‣exit IEPs ‣VR closure, etc.	NCED		
		Identify what data we already have	NCED		

6 Establish Minimum Standards—Quality Assurance

Day 1 Areas of focus

Two distinct areas of emphasis emerged: the need to improve the consistency of AT services, especially assessments across agencies and regions; and second, the need for accreditation or some form of licensing for the provision of AT services. Linked to the concerns about AT service delivery was the need for effective training of associated AT and referring professionals.

Quality assurance concerns stemmed in part from the experiences of some summit participants where AT services may not have been a specifically designated service component in a given agency, or where the provision of AT services appeared inconsistently or as an afterthought The outcome statements were:

1. Develop or establish outcome-based guidelines for assessments.
2. Establish minimum standards for AT providers to provide quality services and accountability.
3. Ensure that training and support are planned and funded as part of AT services.
4. Be accountable by establishing adherence to best practice guidelines for AT Services in Nevada.

Day 2 Work-plan development

As discussed above, the Minimum Data Set workgroup and Establish Minimum Standards workgroup were combined due to insufficient numbers of participants in each group alone.

The combined workgroup proposed that a Standards committee be formed to pursue several tasks. The first task was to identify and encourage the adoption of effective AT service delivery models by identifying successful national AT programs.

As with the Minimum Data Set workgroup, the second task, identification of stakeholders, would serve as an important step in defining and setting minimum standards for AT service delivery. The workgroup would establish a statewide registry of AT service providers as part of a process of defining a set of basic expectations and practices. Eventually, the expectations and practices would be formalized into competencies and standards that AT service providers could adhere to.

What do we need to do?		How do we do it?	Who will be responsible?	When is it due?	What do we need to do next?
Identify best practices for service delivery and standards for providers		To establish a model for service delivery by gathering data from nationwide resources (QUAT, RSA, AUCD, etc.)	‣Easter Seals ‣NCED ‣School districts	March 2013	Recruit additional committee members by December 1, 2012 (max 6)
Possible Stakeholders: ‣VR ‣Consumers ‣CRPs ‣Insurance/ Funders ‣Regional Centers	‣NSHE ‣K-12 ed. ‣NEIS ‣ILCs ‣Aging ‣Mental Health ‣Vendor	To establish minimum standards for AT providers	‣Easter Seals ‣NCED ‣School districts		
		Examine the process of a statewide registry	‣Easter Seals ‣NCED ‣School districts		

7 Funding—Sustainability

Day 1 Areas of focus

Funding was an important outcome of the sustainability topic area. The outcome statements were:

1. Funding from multiple sources to ensure continuity and stability of services and includes federal, state, third party insurance and private pay. as sources of funding.
2. Effective accountability mechanisms are important in order to justify the validity of AT. While the costs of reducing AT services are somewhat visible, the hidden cost of not providing AT services is not. Establishing effective cost-benefit accounting was seen as a way to make a stronger case for AT funding now and in the future.
3. The braiding of services and funding streams between agencies should help to ensure effective service delivery and commitment.

Day 2 Work-plan development

The Funding Workgroup developed three goals. The first goal, identification and dissemination of AT funding sources, addresses the need to ensure existing funding sources are being fully utilized. The notion of braiding refers to the ability of multiple funding sources to collaborate on meeting integrated AT needs. An individual's needs might range from durable medical equipment, to independent living arrangements, to educational and employment opportunities, e.g., a mobility device that operates a cell phone, which in turn opens a door, reads an e-textbook and is used to enter data in a spreadsheet—where each component is required to work seamlessly with the other components. Braiding of services can be used where the overall costs of the AT are high, or where one or more individual devices is outside of the funding mandate of the agency. This goal emphasizes the development of interagency collaborations to maximize the leveraging of funding sources for state and federal matched funds.

Goal 1: Well coordinated; identify funding options and braid when appropriate.

Need to do?	How do we do it?	Who will be responsible?	Due?	Need to do next?
Gather information about funding options, limitations, and guidelines	Create funding matrix to include how to braid funding and who to contact, and if match is available	ADSD A.T. Project	Dec. 2012	Disseminate information

The second goal, identifying effective protocols for AT decision making, seeks to structure the process of documenting the AT evaluation process. Not intended as a "one evaluation fits all" proposal, the checklist is intended to ensure coherent and formative communication between multiple providers and to inform the decision making needs across providers. It could also serve as "fail-safe" navigation tool to ensure aspects of a complex AT services case do not get missed or delivered out of sequence.

Goal 2: Thoughtfully targeted; best practices check list for decision making regarding A.T. funding.

Need to do?	How do we do it?	Who will be responsible?	Due?	Need to do next?
Research existing tools	Look at research journals	A.T. council for input and oversight supported by other organizations ‣VR, NCED, ADSD, school districts, etc.	Dec. 2012	Draft checklist for approval then roll out and publish
Input from subject matter experts	Ask other agencies			
	Research national T.A. organizations			

The third goal is an extension of the first goal, moving beyond the identification of funding sources. It is designed to identify new or under-utilized funds through leveraging of funding sources and the identification of match opportunities.

Goal 3: Explore or utilize matching or leveraging fund options.

Need to do?	How do we do it?	Who will be responsible?	Due?	Need to do next?
Establish inter agency work group	Bring the players together with parameters for discussion	A.T. council	Before Jan 31, 2013	MOUS or budget proposals

Changes to the included data.

The authors of this report attempted to faithfully reflect the collective outcomes of the summit participants. Very few modifications were made to the recorded data. However there were times when the material was not clear, present, or followed the established guidelines. The dates developed during the summit have been advanced nine months due to the extension in the completion of this report.

STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
AGING AND DISABILITY SERVICES DIVISION
Administrative Office
3416 Goni Road, D-132
Carson City, NV 89706
(775) 687-4210 • Fax (775) 687-0574
adsd@adsd.nv.gov

BRIAN SANDOVAL
Governor

ROMAINE GILLILAND
Director

JANE GRUNER
Administrator

DRAFT MINUTES

Name of Organization: Position Paper Subcommittee of the Nevada Assistive Technology (AT) Council

Date and Time of Meeting: August 12, 2014
1:00 p.m.

This meeting will be held and video conferenced at the following locations:

Reno: Northern Nevada Center for Independent Living
999 Pyramid Way
Sparks, NV 89431
(775) 353-3599

Las Vegas: Rebuilding All Goals Efficiently (RAGE)
2901 El Camino Ave., Suite 102
Las Vegas, NV 89102
(702) 333-1038

To join this meeting by phone, dial 1-888-251-2909 then enter Access Code 8985078 when prompted.

Minutes

I. Welcome, Roll Call and Introductions
John Rosenlund, Chairperson

A quorum being present, Mr. Rosenlund called the meeting to order at 1:07 p.m.

Members Present: Brian Patchett, John Rosenlund, Scott Youngs

Excused Members: Jesse Leaman

Public Present: Reggie Bennett, RAGE; LaaRee Drawantz, Easter Seals Nevada

Aging and Disability Services Division Staff Present: Diane Scully

II. Public Comment (No action may be taken upon a matter raised under public comment period unless the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an action item.)

There were no comments from the public.

III. Discussion of Information, Draft and Possible Approval of the Position Paper on AT Issues **(For Possible Action)**
John Rosenlund, Chairperson

Mr. Rosenlund suggested they review the topics listed in the Nevada Assistive Technology for Employment Summit 2011 report (see attached), saying the Positon Paper should include these priorities and give direction on where to go next year. Mr. Patchett agreed saying they could always make changes if needed.

Mr. Youngs said that prior to the Summit, a group of stakeholders was brought together and asked what their most important issue with Assistive Technology was statewide. This is how the topics were determined, prior to the Summit.

Mr. Youngs briefly reviewed the topics, outcomes and goals listed on Page ii of the report.

They are:

1. Comprehensive Service Delivery
2. Continuity of Services – Transitions
   Mr. Youngs expounded by saying this is for any transition (Early Intervention to school; K-12 to higher education or community living). Mr. Rosenlund added transition happens across the lifespan as we age and our needs change including AT needs.
3. AT Special Interest Group – Sustainability
4. Resource Sharing – Interagency Collaboration
5. Establish Minimum Data Set – Quality Assurance
   Mr. Youngs said there is a general lack of data including gaps in service and what AT is needed. Mr. Patchett feels like they are still trying to get accurate data, but it has improved over the last few years. Mr. Rosenlund said ADSD has good data to include in their reports, but what's hard to get is information on children going through school – age group, type of disability, who goes on to vocational rehabilitation (VR). Also lacking is information on the number of children leaving school and if they go on to higher education, VR or community living. This is a group that needs to know where they can go for assistance.

6. Establish Minimum Standards – Quality Assurance
   Mr. Patchett suggested getting the university (or other institution) to look at the data that's available and compare it to other states. Data needs to follow the person from AT evaluation to getting and using the device throughout their life. Mr. Youngs agreed that follow up is needed. Mr. Patchett continued, noting that if a problem arises with the device, a lot of people just stop using it. There needs to be a way to follow up 6 months, 1 year, 2 years, etc. following the client receiving the device. Mr. Rosenlund added that the client needs to be assured that if a problem arises they can come back to the program for help. He added that there is also client responsibility involved – they need to notify someone that there is a problem.
7. Funding Sustainability

Mr. Rosenlund said in doing some research he came across a position paper on AT from the Illinois Statewide Independent Living Council (SILC) (see attached). He will have staff send it via email to the other members.

Mr. Patchett said there needs to be a general position statement that includes the items from the Summit, then some very specific things that the committee would like to see happen. He suggested each member of the subcommittee take a piece to work on.

Mr. Patchett will work on the position statement. Mr. Rosenlund will work on topics 1-3 of the Summit report, and Mr. Youngs will work on topics 4-7 of the report.

Another subcommittee meeting will need to be held to review the work and possibly come up with a more complete position paper before a regular meeting of the AT Council can be held.

IV. Public Comment (No action may be taken upon a matter raised under public comment period unless the matter itself has been specifically included on an agenda as an action item)

There were no comments from the public.

V. Set Date of Next Subcommittee Meeting (**For Possible Action**)
John Rosenlund, Chairperson

The date of the next meeting will be determined at a later time, and dependent on what the members accomplish in the next few weeks. Ms. Scully noted that meeting facilities have been reserved for September 9, 2014 and October 14, 2014.

VI. Adjournment **(For Possible Action)**
John Rosenlund, Chairperson

Mr. Youngs made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Patchett. Meeting adjourned at 1:48 p.m.

NOTE: Items may be considered out of order. The public body may combine two or more agenda items for consideration. The public body may remove an item from the agenda or delay discussion relating to an item on the agenda at any time. The public body may place reasonable restrictions on the time, place, and manner of public comments but may not restrict comments based upon viewpoint.

Current Assistive Technology Subcommittee Members

John Rosenlund (Chairperson), Jesse Leaman, Brian Patchett, Scott Youngs,

NOTE: We are pleased to make reasonable accommodations for members of the public who have disabilities and wish to attend the meeting. If special arrangements for the meeting are necessary, please notify Diane Scully at (775) 687-0551 as soon as possible and at least five days in advance of the meeting. If you wish, you may e-mail her at dmscully@adsd.nv.gov. Supporting materials for this meeting are available at: 3416 Goni Road, #D-132, Carson City, NV 89706 or by contacting Diane Scully at (775) 687-0551 or by email at dmscully@adsd.nv.gov.

Agenda Posted at the Following Locations:

1. Aging and Disability Services Division, Carson City Office, 3416 Goni Road, Suite D-132, Carson City, NV 89706
2. Aging and Disability Services Division, Las Vegas Office, 1860 East Sahara Avenue, Las Vegas, NV 89104
3. Aging and Disability Services Division, Reno Office, 445 Apple Street, Suite 104, Reno, NV 89502
4. Aging and Disability Services Division, Elko Office, 1010 Ruby Vista Drive, Suite 104 Elko, NV 89801
5. Southern Nevada Center for Independent Living, 2950 S. Rainbow Blvd., #220, N. Las Vegas Blvd., Las Vegas, NV 89146
6. Disability Resources, 50 E. Greg St Suite 102, Sparks, NV 89431
7. Nevada State Library and Archives, 100 N. Stewart Street, Carson City, NV 89701
8. Desert Regional Center, 1391 So. Jones Blvd., Las Vegas, NV 89146
9. Sierra Regional Center, 605 South 21st St., Reno, NV 89431
10. Nevada Disability Advocacy & Law Center, 1865 Plumas St., #2, Reno, NV 89509
11. Northern Nevada Center for Independent Living, 999 Pyramid Way, Sparks, NV 89431
12. Department of Health and Human Services, 4126 Technology Way, Carson City, NV 89706
13. Bureau of Vocational Rehab, 1325 Corporate Blvd., Reno, NV 89502

Notice of this meeting was posted on the Internet: http://www.adsd.nv.gov/ and https://notice.nv.gov

DRAFT