

Background:

Minutes of the February 12, 2010, Council meeting and February 11, 2010, Committee of the Whole meeting are attached for review.

Council Meeting

Agenda Item 3. A.

Expected Action:

The Council will review, revise as appropriate, and approve the minutes.

**COUNCIL MEETING
DRAFT MINUTES
FEBRUARY 12, 2010**

Friday, February 12, 2010

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT

Brenda Coleman-Beattie, Council Chair	Mateo Delgado Mary Durheim	Dana Perry Joe Rivas
Hunter Adkins	Mary Faithfull, AI	Clare Seagraves, HHSC
Kristine Bissmeyer	Elizabeth Gregowicz, DARS ¹	Amy Sharp, A&M CDD
Kimberly Blackmon	Cindy Johnston	Lora Taylor
Margaret Christen, TEA	Jeff Kaufmann, DADS	Rick Tisch
Kristen Cox	Diana Kern	Susan Vardell
Andy Crim	John Morris	

COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT

Marcia Dwyer	Deneesa Rasmussen
Kathy Griffis-Bailey, DSHS	Penny Seay, UT CDS

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Roger Webb, Executive Director	Cynthia Ellison	Koren Vogel
Martha Cantu	Cassie Laws-Fisher	Lucy Walker
Belinda Carlton	Angela Lello	
	Melissa Loe	

GUESTS PRESENT

Toni Byrd, DPC	Sylvia Washington, Attendant	Travis Wilson, Attendant
Linda Harman, attendant		
Jean Langendorf, DPC		

¹ Ms. Gregowicz was a non-voting member at this meeting.

CALL TO ORDER

The Texas Council for Developmental Disabilities met on Friday, February 12, 2010 in the Omni C Room of the Omni Southpark Hotel, 4140 Governor's Row, Austin, TX 78744. Council Chair Brenda Coleman-Beattie called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM.

I. INTRODUCTIONS

Council members, staff and guests were introduced.

II. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Disability Policy Consortium (DPC) Project Director Jean Langendorf provided public comments on the DPC project expressing her appreciation to the Council and staff during the transition of the grant project from UCP-Tx to Easter Seals of Central Texas. She indicated that she feels the DPC has provided measurable outcomes consistent with the project's expectations and hopes the importance of the DPC project to small disability organizations won't be overlooked as the Council considers its next steps with public policy collaboration activities.

III. CONSENT ITEMS

Chair Coleman-Beattie asked for a motion to approve minutes of the November 2009 Council and Committee of the Whole meetings as well as excused absences for the Council and Committee meetings.

MOTION: To approve the minutes of the November 12, 2009, Committee of the Whole and the November 13, 2009, Council Meeting and the excused absences of Marcia Dwyer, Kathy Griffis-Bailey, Deneesa Rasmussen, and Penny Seay.

MADE BY: Kristen Cox

SECOND: Kris Bissmeyer

The motion **passed** unanimously.

IV. CHAIR'S REPORT

Coleman-Beattie thanked Vice-Chair Mary Durham for chairing the Committee of the Whole on Thursday. Coleman-Beattie emceed the 10th Annual Central Texas African-American Family Support Conference (CTAAFSC) which she has been involved with since its inception.

Coleman-Beattie indicated the Governor's appointments office is hoping to fill the vacancy created when Rene Requenez passed away recently. She noted that one of Requenez's suggestions was to provide opportunities for members to have some informal, social time with other members such as the time Thursday evening. She asked for input and suggestions from other members as well.

Coleman-Beattie reviewed the request from state leadership for state agencies to submit plans to reduce state General Revenue (GR) spending during the current two-year biennium by 5%. Although TCDD does not receive any GR funds, the agency will continue to be mindful of expenditures and closely monitor travel expenditures.

V. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Executive Director Webb advised members that TCDD's federal allotment for Fiscal Year 2010 is \$5,106,030. This represents a 1.4% increase over funds available for Fiscal Year 2009.

Webb noted that Grants Management Director Patrice LeBlanc recently selected Wendy Jones for the Grants Management Specialist position. Jones will begin her employment with TCDD on February 16, 2010.

VI. NOMINATING COMMITTEE REPORT

Nominating Committee Chair Hunter Adkins reviewed the Committee's discussions about nominations for Council Vice-Chair and for Consumer Delegate-at-Large to the Executive Committee.

MOTION: To nominate Mary Durham as Council Vice-Chair and Cindy Johnston as Consumer Delegate-at-Large to the Executive Committee.

MADE BY: Hunter Adkins for the Nominating Committee (motions from Committee actions do not need a second)

There were no other nominations from the floor. The motion **passed** unanimously (Elizabeth Gregowicz as a non-voting member). Chair Coleman-Beattie thanked Council Member Andy Crim for his participation in and support of the nominating committee.

VII. AMENDMENTS TO TCDD POLICIES

Coleman-Beattie and Audit Committee Chair Mary Durham reviewed proposed amendments to Council policies (Attachment 1). The Audit Committee proposes amendments to clarify the functions of the Committee and to increase the number of times the Committee meets each year. The Executive Committee presented suggested amendments to the requirements for

notifying members of proposed amendments to policies. The amendment will allow members to designate if they prefer to receive such notifications by mail or electronically (i.e., e-mail).

MOTION: To approve the amendments to TCDD Policies as presented.

MADE BY: John Morris

SECOND: Lora Taylor

The motion **passed** unanimously (Elizabeth Gregowicz as a non-voting member).

VIII. REVISIONS TO TCDD POSITION STATEMENTS

Public Policy Committee Chair Rick Tisch reported that the Public Policy Committee reviewed and is proposing revisions to the Education, Criminal Competency, Children and Families and Family Support Services Position Statements (Attachments 2-5). The Position Statement on Access to Health Care Services will be reviewed after Congress takes final action on the health care reform bill.

MOTION: To approve revisions to the Education, Criminal Competency, Children and Families, and Family Support Services Position Statements as proposed.

MADE BY: Rick Tisch for the Public Policy Committee

The motion **passed** unanimously (Elizabeth Gregowicz as a non-voting member).

IX. CONSIDERATION OF FUTURE FUNDING ACTIVITIES

Coleman-Beattie asked for a summary from the Public Policy Committee and Project Development Committee Chairs on discussions about future TCDD public policy collaboration activities. Tisch reported that the Public Policy Committee recommended that the Council make a decision on future TCDD public policy collaboration activities no later than the May 2010 Council meetings. Project Development Committee Chair Susan Vardell indicated that the consensus of Project Development Committee members is to solicit proposals for new projects by an open Request for Proposals (RFP) with specific measurable outcomes, and to consider awarding funds for more than one project. Further, the Committee suggests that project outcomes should come from the recommendations of the ad-hoc workgroup that were approved by the Committee of the Whole at its meeting on Thursday. (Attachment included with Committee of the Whole minutes.)

John Morris suggested that measurable outcomes could be added to the current Disability Policy Consortium (DPC) project activities and TCDD could solicit proposals for a new project with an open RFP. Morris encouraged that a transition period be considered for the current DPC grant after the current funding period that concludes June 30, 2010.

Coleman-Beattie summarized recommendations from the Committees to include 1) a decision on future TCDD public policy collaboration projects should be made by the conclusion of the May 2010 meetings, and should use recommendations of the ad-hoc workgroup regarding performance outcome measures for future projects as the basis for developing an open RFP, and 2) consideration of additional transition funding for the current (DPC). Coleman-Beattie proposed entertaining one motion on process and a separate motion on transition funding for the current project. Members concurred with this proposal.

Andy Crim noted that the majority consensus from the Project Development Committee, with some dissent, was to allow funding for the current DPC project to conclude on June 30, 2010, as currently designated by previous action of the Council (i.e., August 2009 Council meeting).

MOTION: Direct staff to develop an Executive Summary for future TCDD public policy collaboration activities using the performance outcome measures recommended by the ad hoc workgroup and with a subsequent release of an open Request for Proposals for those activities, with an initial review of the Executive Summary by the Executive Committee in April and final review by the Council in May.

MADE BY: Rick Tisch

SECOND: Lora Taylor

Jeff Kaufmann asked staff to review the proposed measures carefully to determine if they were reliable, consistent with the Council's mission, definable, measurable, etc. Kaufmann indicated that he did not feel there was a consensus regarding the measures, particularly the measurability of some measures. After discussion, members agreed for the Executive Committee to provide a preliminary review of the draft material during an April Executive Committee meeting. That agreement was accepted as part of the motion. Coleman-Beattie encouraged members to join the Committee for that discussion if interested.

The motion **passed**. Claire Seagraves abstained (Elizabeth Gregowicz non-voting member).

Coleman-Beattie next asked members for additional thoughts regarding any additional transition activities past the end of the current DPC grant period June 30, 2010. Tisch indicated that the Public Policy Committee did not have any further recommendations, while noting that the Committee anticipated further discussion at the May meeting. Crim again noted that the consensus from Project Development, with some dissent, was to allow DPC project funding to conclude as planned on June 30, 2010.

Morris indicated he was the dissenting opinion on the Project Development Committee and suggested that it is important to continue funding the DPC project until there is a transition to another project. He disagreed with the suggestion that the consortium could continue without funding. Amy Sharp agreed with Morris stating that organizations do not continue without funding. Additionally, she felt the Council's advocacy training effort would be "diluted" similar to the transition at the end of funding for the Partners in Policymaking project, and does not want to see the public policy collaboration efforts through the DPC have the same outcome. Kristen Cox noted that TCDD has funds available that are not allocated at this point that could be spent on transition activities. Mary Durham added that her research about consortiums in Washington, DC, suggests that most exist without funding. In response to a question about the amount of funding necessary to continue current DPC support through December 2011, Council members were advised that \$80,000 would continue project activities for an additional six months at the current level funding.

MOTION: To not provide additional funding during the transition period following the conclusion of current DPC project funding June 30, 2010, and for TCDD staff to continue their usual public policy collaboration duties and activities.

MADE BY: Susan Vardell for the Project Development Committee

SECOND: Andy Crim

John Morris questioned if an additional, conflicting motion could be entertained after the vote. Coleman-Beattie clarified that the outcome of the motion under consideration would determine if a subsequent motion would be in order.

Mary Faithfull clarified that if the motion is approved, funding for current DPC project activities will stop on June 30, 2010, before another project is in place. Tisch noted that the Council will not “stop funding” as suggested since the current project’s authorization period has expired. Faithfull suggested that members were being asked to make a decision without knowing the future alternatives. Coleman-Beattie indicated that until a new project is in place TCDD staff will continue their various public policy collaboration duties and activities. Vardell commented that the discussion is about how to get to the end goals regarding public policy collaboration activities, not about the current project. Durham added that just because the grant expires, as would any grant, collaboration and DPC activities do not have to cease to exist.

The motion **passed**. Claire Seagraves abstained (Elizabeth Gregowicz non-voting member).

Vardell reported on other discussions of the Project Development Committee for future projects. The Committee reviewed an Executive Summary for a Meaningful Relationships project and modified the project timeline. The Committee also added directions to include collaboration with organizations that promote safety issues such as the National Center on Missing and Exploited Children, especially where “online” activities are concerned. TCDD will require prior approval of grantee materials and will review completed materials prior to distribution.

MOTION: To approve the Executive Summary for a Meaningful Relationships project as proposed by the Project Development Committee authorizing up to \$125,000 per year for up to 3 years with 4th year of funding available if a project is successful and able to promote to other areas of the state.

MADE BY: Susan Vardell for the Project Development Committee (motions from Committee actions do not need a second)

The motion **passed** without opposition. Amy Sharp abstained. (Attachment 6 as approved.)

Vardell reported that the Project Development Committee did not revise Future Project Funding Priorities and did not take action on any other matters.

X. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

Coleman-Beattie discussed the Conflict of Interest disclosure reports and noted that Hunter Adkins provided additional information not yet reflected on the report. Adkins disclosed that she participates in an Easter Seals summer program. No concerns were noted by the Executive Committee from reviewing the reports. Members were asked to review their disclosures and provide updates to TCDD staff.

Coleman-Beattie reviewed information about continuation grant awards and stipends awards approved during the quarter. The Executive Committee also discussed concerns about the progress of one current grant project and will review that matter in more detail at the April committee meeting.

Financial reports were discussed and no concerns were noted. Operations Director Martha Cantu reviewed the financial reports for the close of FY 2009 and for FY 2010 to date and provided clarifications concerning expenses for travel and operating expenses. Both expense categories had large expenses during the first part of the fiscal year but will even out throughout the course of the year. Coleman-Beattie thanked Cantu for her work.

Coleman-Beattie reviewed revisions to Travel Procedures approved by the Executive Committee. Staff were asked to draft further clarification concerning reimbursements for respite

care in response to a comment from members. That item will be reviewed by the Committee at its next meeting.

XI. PUBLIC POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee Chair Tisch reviewed items discussed by the Public Policy Committee including reviews of various position statements and discussion about future TCDD public policy collaboration activities as reported previously. Committee members received a report on the TCDD Annual Report and other public information activities.

XII. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE REPORT

Committee Chair Vardell reviewed discussions of the Project Development Committee including the current RFP for a conference similar to the Central Texas African American Family Support Conference as well as ideas for other projects.

Committee Chair Vardell noted that TCDD staff estimate that approximately \$500,000 is currently available for new projects. Coleman-Beattie reminded Vardell that projects under discussion but not yet authorized, such as future public policy collaboration activities, are not included in those estimates. Coleman-Beattie asked the Committee to review their plans for future projects during the May meeting. A question was raised about reconsidering the option of providing transition funding for the DPC project since funds are currently available. It was suggested that some members feel that issue was unresolved. Vardell stated that she felt the issue was resolved since the motion approved by the Council clarified that funding for the DPC project ends June 30, 2010, as previously scheduled.

Tisch indicated that the Public Policy Committee did not reach a decision on any "transition" funding for this project. Coleman-Beattie agreed that her sense was that the motion approved by the Council was clear in determining to end funding support as previously scheduled. Amy Sharp asked if a motion could be offered to add transition funding for the current DPC project. Coleman-Beattie offered a concern that doing so would establish a precedent to add transition periods of funding for all ending grants. Sharp responded that exceptions should be made since public policy is such an important issue and that any future project could use the experience of current DPC staff. Mateo Delgado noted that the Council's earlier motion was quite clear in providing a decision to end the project. Delgado added that other DPC organizations could offer to support various DPC activities or offer some funding support if they felt it necessary to maintain funding for those activities of the organization. Delgado also noted that the DPC project has been aware of the duration of the initial funding period and the subsequent six-month extension of funding through June 30, 2010, for a significant period of time and added that TCDD staff would address various transition activities.

A question was asked concerning whether remaining DD federal funds would be returned if not spent by the project. Executive Director Webb clarified TCDD has two years to obligate each year of federal funds and a third year to fully liquidate those funds. TCDD is not at the point where any of the funds are in jeopardy of being returned.

XIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPDATES

Future meeting dates were discussed and members were asked to notify staff if the dates presented conflicts.

ADJOURN

Chair Coleman-Beattie adjourned the Council meeting at 10:36 AM.

Roger A. Webb
Secretary to the Council

Date

TCDD Policies

Proposed Amendments

VII. COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL

D. Audit Committee Duties and Composition

1. The Audit Committee shall have the following powers and duties, and others that may be designated from time to time by the Council.
 - a. **Annually review and make** recommendations to the Council regarding an internal audit charter, an annual internal audit plan and any special audits;
 - b. Approve submittal of the annual internal audit plan subject to review and revision by the Council; and
 - c. Review audit reports from the internal auditor and make recommendations to the Council concerning actions or resolutions.
 - d. **Provide guidance and oversight to the process to solicit offers for internal audit services when determined to be appropriate, and recommend the final selection of an internal auditor to the Council.**
 - e. **Ensure the External Quality Assurance Review of the TCDD internal audit function is conducted according to the Texas Internal Audit Act and the report is reviewed by the Audit Committee.**
2. The Audit Committee shall be comprised of no more than five (5) members including the Chair.
 - a. The Council Vice-Chair shall serve as Chair of the Committee;
 - b. The Council Chair shall appoint other members of the Committee subject to approval by the Council;
 - c. The Council Chair shall be a non-voting ex-officio member of the committee.
3. **The Audit Committee shall meet at least two (2) times yearly.**

XII. AMENDMENT OF POLICIES

Council policies may be adopted or revised by a two-thirds (2/3) majority of the members present at a regular or called Council meeting providing a quorum is present at that time. ~~Written~~ **Notice of the proposed amendment(s) must be provided to Council members at least 10 days prior to any such action in either written (ie., hard copy, mailed) or electronic (e-mail) form in accordance with each Council member's preference.**

Amendments may be proposed by a recommendation of the Executive Committee or by written request of any five (5) members of the Council.



(512) 437-5432 / 1-800-262-0334

Fax (512) 437-5434

6201 E. Oltorf, Suite 600, Austin, TX 78741-7509

TCDD@tcdd.state.tx.us / <http://www.txddc.state.tx.us>

Education Position Statement

All people with disabilities in Texas should have the opportunity to achieve their maximum potential for independence, productivity and integration into the community. Education is a lifelong learning process which is vital to attaining a full and complete life. The postsecondary results of an appropriate public school education for students with disabilities should be evidenced by employment, enrollment in postsecondary education, or both within one year of leaving high school.

The Texas Council for Developmental Disabilities believes that all students regardless of individual needs must be provided with individualized appropriate instruction, research-based positive behavioral interventions and supports, access to the general curriculum, and related services in the least restrictive environment. Related services include but are not limited to adaptive aids, assistive technology, modifications, therapies and supplementary aides. The delivery of individually appropriate instruction and related services must be provided by qualified teachers and service providers with administrative support and opportunities for continued/ongoing professional development in all areas of identified need. It is the position of the Council, as well as the policy of the state, that all children should be treated with dignity and respect when addressing their behavioral and disciplinary needs.

The Council believes charter schools or schools accepting voucher payments must provide students the same educational rights and opportunities that they would be accorded in the public education system. The Council believes that schools that accept state money to educate students must accept any student with a developmental disability who may apply for admission to that school, abide by federal and state education laws that protect the rights of students with disabilities, abide by Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act that requires any entity receiving federal funds to include people with disabilities in its program, and accept any student at the state rate of payment asking for no additional tuition or fees beyond the normal fees required by the student's independent school district. If these criteria are not met, then the Council adamantly opposes publicly funded school vouchers and charter schools. The Council is opposed to any initiative that would deplete funds from the public education system and ultimately from funds available for the education of students with disabilities.

The Council believes that full inclusion should be approached as a value and underlying philosophy by which we educate all students. We believe that successful inclusion requires that teacher education programs prepare all educators and administrators to work with the full range of students in inclusive settings. Special education is not a separate educational system, but rather a service provided to people with specific needs within the general educational system. Professional preparation programs should emphasize the shared responsibility of all educators and administrators for every student.

(Continued)

The Council believes that full inclusion requires the ongoing, shared responsibility of students, parents, guardians, educators, administrators and the community at large.

It is therefore the position of the Texas Council for Developmental Disabilities that all students have a right to learn, play and work with students their own age, with and without disabilities, in the same schools, classrooms and other educational programs attended by their brothers, sisters and neighbors, and that schools, classrooms and programs must be both physically and programmatically accessible to all students.

Reviewed February 12, 2010



Criminal Competency Position Statement

People with disabilities often experience more frequent contact with the criminal justice system than other individuals for a variety of reasons, including discrimination, lack of knowledge and training about disabilities, and inadequate community supports. People with developmental disabilities are more likely than the general population to be arrested, convicted, sentenced to prison, and victimized while there.¹ Once individuals with disabilities enter the system, inadequate representation in criminal proceedings furthers unfavorable outcomes.

People with developmental disabilities may have functional support needs in one or more spheres of mental functioning that involve perceptual, memory, and judgment modalities. Their ability to process and retain information and to relate cause and effect may be affected. Accommodating individuals with cognitive and mental health disabilities in the criminal justice system thus presents various hurdles.² A particular problem is invalid and inconsistent assessments for: 1) competency to stand trial; and 2) criminal responsibility due to mental disease or defect (the insanity defense) as current assessment procedures do not fully address the needs of people with disabilities.

The Texas Council for Developmental Disabilities believes that the following fundamental principles apply to people with disabilities who undergo competency evaluations.

- People with cognitive and mental health disabilities³ have the right to equal protection and due process under the law.
- People with disabilities are entitled to certain protections, rights and benefits under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act, and these protections, rights and benefits extend to involvement in the criminal justice system.
- A diagnosis of mental retardation or mental illness does not necessarily mean that a person is incompetent to stand trial, but it is incumbent upon counsel and the court to raise competency as an issue in appropriate cases and at any point in the proceedings where the defendant's competency is in question.

The Council believes that criminal assessment procedures must fully address the needs of people with disabilities and include the following components:

- Early intervention that includes a valid and clinically appropriate disability screening prior to, during, and following arrest, and comprehensive officer training in booking and intake procedures of individuals with developmental disabilities.

(Continued)

- ❑ Ongoing training of criminal justice professionals that is based on research and best practices in assessment of individuals with disabilities. Curriculum should include training on recognizing the possible existence of a developmental or psychiatric disability, appropriate communication skills, and stereotypes and stigma about disabilities unrelated to criminal activity.
- ❑ A competency evaluation that is performed by skilled professionals who have specialized training and experience in forensic evaluation. This specialized training should include training in legal competency for adults and fitness to proceed for juveniles.
- ❑ Due process protections that include reliable, age-specific and culturally competent assessments of and standards for:
 - Determining the existence of cognitive and mental health disabilities -- example formats include the uniform mental health assessment and the diagnostic eligibility for mental retardation and related conditions formats; and
 - Determining legal competency for adults and fitness to proceed for juveniles -- example instruments include the CAST-MR (Competency Assessment for Standing Trial for Defendants with MR) and the MacCAT-CA (MacArthur Competence Assessment Tool – Criminal Adjudication).
- ❑ These assessments should take into account any relevant impact on the results because of the individual’s cultural background, primary language, communication style, physical or sensory impairments, motivation, attentiveness, or emotional factors.
- ❑ Reasonable accommodations must be provided at all stages of criminal proceedings to assist the individual in understanding and participating in the proceedings and their defense.

The Council recognizes that early intervention, assessment due process protections, and reasonable accommodations are overlapping components of a system that is responsive to the needs to people with disabilities and that these components must be available to alleged offenders at all stages of the individual’s involvement in the criminal justice system.

Reviewed February 12, 2010

***While the preferred terminology for “mental retardation” has changed to “intellectual and developmental disabilities,” mental retardation is still used in this position statement because of legal implications based on a specific diagnosis of “mental retardation.”*

¹ Up to 24 percent of this country’s adult prison populations are individuals with mental retardation. (Dagher-Margosian, J., Representing the Cognitively Disabled Client in a Criminal Case. Disabilities Project Newsletter, State Bar of Michigan, Volume 2, Issue 2, March 2006, Committee on Justice Initiatives and Equal Access Initiative Disabilities Project. Retrieved 9-24-09 at http://www.michbar.org/programs/Disabilities_news_6.html)

² It is estimated that between 50-75 percent of youth in the juvenile justice system have diagnosable mental health disorders. (Texas Juvenile Probation Commission. “Mental Health and Juvenile Justice in Texas.” 2003. <http://www.tjpc.state.tx.us/publications/reports/RPTOTH200302.pdf>)

³ 20-35% of all persons with intellectual disabilities have a co-occurring psychiatric disorder. (Effective Interagency Collaboration for People with Co-Occurring Mental Illness and Developmental Disabilities. Kathryn duPree, Deputy Commissioner, Connecticut Department of Mental Retardation Retrieved September 24, 2009 from <http://www.nasdds.org/pdf/EffectiveInteragencyCollaboration.pdf>)



(512) 437-5432 / 1-800-262-0334

Fax (512) 437-5434

6201 E. Oltorf, Suite 600, Austin, TX 78741-7509

TCDD@tcdd.state.tx.us / <http://www.txddc.state.tx.us>

Children and Families

Position Statement

All children belong in families that provide love, caring, nurturing, bonding and a sense of belonging and permanence that best enables them to grow, develop and thrive. Children with disabilities are no different from other children in their need for the unique benefits that come only from growing up in a permanent family relationship. All children benefit and are enriched by being part of an inclusive environment that promotes physical, social, and intellectual well-being and leads to independence and self-determination.

Families of children with disabilities often need supports and services to sustain family life and keep their child at home and included in the community. Family support services are intended to strengthen the family's role as primary caregiver, prevent expensive out-of-home placement of individuals with disabilities, maintain family unity, and foster self-determination.

The Texas Council for Developmental Disabilities believes that:

- All children can and should live in a family. All children need a family to best grow, develop and thrive. All children deserve the love, nurturing and permanency that are unique to family life.
- Families come from many cultures and are multidimensional. No matter its composition or cultural background, a family offers a child a home and a lifelong commitment to love, belonging and permanency. Parents with disabilities are capable of and do provide loving families and homes to children.
- Families, including parents with disabilities, should have available the level of supports and services needed to keep children with disabilities in their own homes. Family support services should include, but are not limited to, respite care, provision of rehabilitation and assistive technologies, personal assistant services, parent training and counseling, vehicular and home modifications, and assistance with extraordinary expenses associated with disabilities. In addition, since the vast majority (over 85%) of individuals with disabilities reside with families in their own households, families of children with disabilities need access to appropriate child care and to before- and after-school programs. Child care for children with disabilities should be affordable, safe, appropriate and in the most integrated setting.
- Providers of family support services must have education and training that will prepare them to work with people with disabilities in inclusive settings to achieve this goal.
- To be effective and beneficial, supports and services must be easy to access, family-driven, individualized, flexible to changing needs and circumstances, culturally sensitive and based on functional needs rather than categorical labels.

(Continued)

- ❑ When children cannot remain in their own families, for whatever reason, they still deserve to live and grow up in a family. The first priority should be to reunite the family through the infusion of services and supports. When that is not possible and the family can remain actively involved in the child's life, the natural family should be a key participant in selecting an alternate family situation for their child, including foster families, co-parenting and adoption.
- ❑ When families are not actively involved in their child's life, permanency planning must occur to allow the child to live in a family.
- ❑ School districts are an integral source of information and training for parents. Coordination among school districts and outside agencies is critical to provide parents with accurate, timely information regarding services and eligibility requirements.
- ❑ The state Child Protective Services system is essential to guarantee that all children are safe from abuse and neglect. Support of the families of children with disabilities from this system is critical to make sure children remain in a safe, family environment and are not unnecessarily removed from families due to the absence of necessary services and supports.

The Council also believes that when children with disabilities grow up in families, the community at large accepts the value of providing supports to children and families at home so that children become and remain participants and contributors to their communities.

The Council believes that the state of Texas should adopt a public policy statement recognizing the value of families in children's lives and develop programs, policies and funding mechanisms that allow all children to live and grow up in a family.

Reviewed February 12, 2010



(512) 437-5432 / 1-800-262-0334

Fax (512) 437-5434

6201 E. Oltorf, Suite 600, Austin, TX 78741-7509

TCDD@tcdd.state.tx.us / <http://www.txddc.state.tx.us>

Family Support Services Position Statement

National caregiver studies estimate that more than 85 percent of individuals with developmental disabilities reside with and rely on their families for care. Families that care for individuals with disabilities range from young parents learning to care for children with physical and mental disabilities, to parents caring for teenagers and young adults with disabilities, to frail and elderly parents of aging, dependent adults with disabilities. Emotional, social and economic challenges accompany a family's commitment to their family member with a developmental disability. To provide sustained care for a child, a sibling, or an adult with disabilities, families need access to supports and services.

Services to families with a family member with disabilities have a dual focus. Those services support the health and integrity of family units, and they maximize the strengths and potential of individuals with disabilities to independently participate in and be included in their communities. During childhood, family support services are intended to strengthen the family's role as primary caregiver and prevent institutional placement of individuals with disabilities. Throughout an individual's life span, family support services are intended to strengthen and maintain family connections while fostering self-determination, independence, and participation in school, job, recreational and community settings. Adequate support services must be available to people with disabilities so that they can remain in the community rather than face inappropriate institutional placements.

The Texas Council for Developmental Disabilities supports the provision of a full array of flexible family support services that include but are not limited to:

- adaptive equipment and specialized clothing;
- assistive technology devices and services;
- counseling services;
- financial assistance with the extra expenses of providing support;
- home modifications;
- leisure-time planning;
- person-centered comprehensive planning for transition from early childhood to school, from school to adult life, and from adult life to retirement;
- personal assistance services/direct care services;
- respite care that is affordable, safe, age-appropriate and in the most integrated setting;
- service coordination including information and referral services;
- training to empower people with disabilities and their families to advocate for lifestyles they choose;
- transportation; and
- vehicular modifications.

(Continued)

Providers of family support services must have education and training that will prepare them to work with families and people with disabilities of all ages in inclusive settings to maximize each individual's potential and inclusion with their peer groups.

To be effective and beneficial, family supports and services must be affordable, easy to access, designed by the individual and their family, individualized based on functional needs, flexible to changing needs and circumstances, and culturally sensitive.

Reviewed February 12, 2010

Future Funding Proposal Executive Summary Meaningful Relationships

Background:

The Texas Council for Developmental Disabilities (TCDD) exists to create change so that all people with developmental disabilities are fully included in their communities and exercise control over their own lives. TCDD's numerous grant projects have sought to remove barriers related to the education, housing, employment, transportation, healthcare, and recreation needs of people with disabilities, striving with all projects to improve quality of life for Texans with developmental disabilities. Numerous studies have indicated that close, meaningful relationships and other types of supportive relationships can significantly improve one's perception of quality of life, have a positive effect on one's health, and increase one's ability to withstand the effects of stress. In addition, it has been hypothesized that individuals with severe disabilities may be less likely to experience abuse and/or neglect if they have meaningful personal relationships with others. Unfortunately, anecdotal data indicates that many people with severe disabilities experience an absence of support for meaningful personal relationships.

Many of the identified barriers to building meaningful relationships are related to a lack of sufficient support to overcome such logistical problems such as geographical isolation, transportation problems, and/or financial hardship that does not allow participation in many of the types of activities through which people typically form relationships with others outside of their family. However, attitudinal barriers - including active discouragement (or prohibition) of romantic relationships by administrators of congregate facilities and/or group homes, and/or by family members – also prevent many people with developmental disabilities from even having the opportunity to experience close, healthy relationships with people outside of their families and/or care givers.

Effective programs to introduce people to each other and to provide supports to facilitate healthy friendships, romantic relationships, and marriages have been demonstrated in other states and countries. Partnerships between organizations that are concerned mainly with “disability issues” and more generic community service agencies (such as Planned Parenthood) also have been successful in providing support to individuals with developmental disabilities in their relationships.

In FY 2009, TCDD issued a “Request for Ideas” for projects that might demonstrate or establish supports in Texas to assist individuals to form the kinds of meaningful relationships that they desire. In November of 2009, TCDD's Project Development Committee reviewed 8 project ideas and expressed interest in funding a project that would blend concepts from many of the ideas submitted. In particular, the Committee was interested in seeing:

1. Demonstrations of how service clubs and volunteer organizations can, if necessary, alter their culture and activities to support full and equal participation by individuals with developmental disabilities in a way that will promote the development of relationships based on common interests and shared values.

2. Demonstrations of how a facilitated process may assist people with developmental disabilities to identify and express relationship-related needs and preferences and to explore strategies for meeting and establishing relationships with others, so that they have the skills to develop meaningful personal relationships for themselves.
3. Demonstrations of how individuals who provide support for people with developmental disabilities can encourage and support those whom they support to develop and maintain close, respectful, long-term relationships. This may include providing policy change recommendations to agencies that are paid to provide such services.

State Plan Goal and Objective:

Goal 5: People with developmental disabilities receive quality care for mental and physical health and have access to wellness support in their communities.

Objective 4: Explore and consider funding activities to demonstrate the effectiveness of providing supports for individuals with developmental disabilities to form and maintain healthy, meaningful long-term relationships, by September 30, 2011.

Expected Outcome:

1. A model program will be established with the result that, over the first three years, at least 60 people with developmental disabilities (or their designee) will report increased satisfaction with their personal relationships after receiving individualized supports to enable them to meet others and develop relationships that they consider meaningful.
2. At least 3 organizations will implement policy and/or procedural change(s) in order to actively improve their ability to facilitate the development and maintenance of meaningful relationships for people with developmental disabilities.

Project Description:

One organization will be funded to implement activities in at least one site. If multiple applications are determined to be fundable and are of comparable quality, preference will be given to organizations expressing the will and the ability to implement project activities in more than one site, particularly if one of the chosen sites is a rural area.

The organization funded through this grant will work with other organizations to demonstrate:

1. How to provide *individualized* supports to people with developmental disabilities to assist them to determine their goals in relationships, to meet others, and to develop meaningful, healthy, long-term relationships with others.
2. How to provide training and/or technical assistance to enable organizations that provide services to people with developmental disabilities to improve how they encourage and support their clients to develop and maintain meaningful relationships.
3. How to provide training and/or technical assistance to enable service clubs and volunteer organizations to, if necessary, alter their culture and activities, to support full and equal participation by individuals with developmental disabilities in a way that will promote the development of relationships based on common interests, shared values, and respect.

Involvement by people with developmental disabilities in planning activities:

The organization implementing this project must assure that the development and implementation of all activities is driven by direct input from people with developmental disabilities. Project leadership and staff must include people who have disabilities, although people who do not have disabilities who have demonstrated technical expertise related to project activities may also hold leadership and staff roles. Organization(s) implementing this project would be encouraged to identify actual barriers to relationships that have been experienced by individuals with developmental disabilities and to vet strategies that might be used to achieve project goals by using focus groups of people with developmental disabilities, led by people with developmental disabilities, or through a similar activity. *Focus group information should be summarized to inform the development and implementation of the project, but specific personal information or personal situations described in focus groups may only be shared as group participants allow.*

Cultural Competency and Diversity:

Development and implementation of project activities must demonstrate an understanding of cultural competency. The grantee must include activities in the project workplan to identify specifically how ethnicity may influence the values, lifestyle, and goals of individual participants and how project activities may be adapted to successfully recruit and/or address specific needs and/or preferences of people who belong to minority ethnic groups.

Proposed Funding Amount:

Up to \$125,000 per year for one project related to this Executive Summary.

Proposed Duration:

Up to three years per project for all projects related to this Executive Summary.

Other Considerations: Activities conducted under this project will be very closely monitored by TCDD staff and may be discontinued at any time if they are deemed harmful or inappropriate.

1. Any project proposing to use online social networking technology will be required to explore safety issues with TCDD prior to obtaining approval for funding. In addition, TCDD might require the project to incorporate specific advice or cautions offered by organizations that are recognized for their expertise and work related to promoting safety in online behavior, such the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children; organizations that advocate for the civil rights of people with developmental disabilities; and organizations that exist to prevent domestic violence and other abuses that may occur in close relationships.
2. Toolkits, websites, curriculum, videos, or other products developed with the use of TCDD funds must be reviewed and approved in writing by TCDD before being made public.
3. Upon successful completion of the project activities and achievement of stated outcomes, the grantee may apply for funds for one additional year to promote any products, make presentations, and conduct other activities as appropriate to encourage replication of the program in other regions of the state.

**COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
DRAFT MINUTES
FEBRUARY 11, 2010**

Thursday, February 11, 2010

COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT

Mary Durham, Vice-Chair	Andy Crim	John Morris
Hunter Adkins	Mateo Delgado	Dana Perry
Kristine Bissmeyer	Frank Genco, HHSC	Joe Rivas
Kimberly Blackmon	Kathy Griffis-Bailey, DSHS	Amy Sharp, A&M CDD
Lynn Blackmore, DARS	Cindy Johnston	Lora Taylor
Margaret Christen, TEA	Diana Kern	Rick Tisch
Kristen Cox	Jeff Kaufmann, DADS	Susan Vardell

COUNCIL MEMBERS ABSENT

Brenda Coleman-Beattie, Council Chair	Marcia Dwyer Mary Faithfull, AI	Deneesa Rassmussen Penny Seay, UT CDS
--	------------------------------------	--

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Roger A. Webb, Executive Director	Martha Cantu Joanna Cordry Cassie Laws-Fisher	Angela Lello Melissa Loe Koren Vogel
Jeri Barnard		

GUESTS PRESENT

Toni Byrd, DPC	Sylvia Washington, Attendant	Travis Wilson, Attendant
Jean Langendorf, UCP-Tx		
Ara Merjanian, Facilitator		

CALL TO ORDER:

The Committee of the Whole of the Texas Council for Developmental Disabilities met on Thursday, February 11, 2010, in the Omni C Room of the Omni Southpark Hotel, 4140 Governor's Row Austin, TX 78744. Council Vice-Chair Mary Durham called the meeting to order at 10:03 AM.

I. INTRODUCTION

Committee members, staff and guests were introduced. Vice-Chair Durham notified members that Council Chair Brenda Coleman-Beattie is emceeding the Central Texas African American Family Support Conference, which she has been involved with since its inception.

II. REVIEW OF KEY AGENDA ITEMS

Project Development Committee Chair Susan Vardell and Public Policy Committee Chair Rick Tisch provided overviews of key discussion items planned for their respective committees.

Durham provided a brief summary of the Executive Committee meeting. She reminded members that the Governor's office is looking to appoint a new Council member for the position held previously by the late Rene Requenez and would like another self-advocate from the Rio Grande Valley area. Members who have suggestions are encouraged to provide names to Coleman-Beattie or Executive Director Roger Webb. She also noted that Jeff Kaufmann has been designated as the alternate representative to Don Henderson of the Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services. Kaufmann has received orientation and is in attendance at this meeting.

III. CHAIR'S REMARKS

Durheim noted that reports from members who have recently attended conferences and other training events are included in meeting materials. Members are encouraged to read these summaries that include "takeaway moments" and useful ideas for future TCDD activities.

Durheim discussed member support during TCDD meetings. She noted that Coleman-Beattie had discussions with self-advocate members prior to the November 2009 meeting and the Executive Committee discussed this topic during this quarter's meeting. While members with disabilities may need assistance or accommodations, the best way to provide that assistance varies depending on the member. Options may range from technology to personal support. Durheim also noted that members' attendants have varying roles from providing only physical support to assisting with material. In order to allow for full participation from everyone, members were encouraged to review material ahead of time and ask for any assistance or clarification prior to the meeting. Some members have noted that bringing a notebook computer with the material "pre-loaded" makes it easier to manage. Members provided feedback on this topic including the following suggestions:

- Hiring 1-2 attendants to work through the Council meetings and be "on-call" if a self-advocate needs assistance. This would alleviate members from outside the Austin area needing to recruit attendants to travel with them.
- Modifications of material to make it easier to understand.
- A glossary of terms that applies to the material.
- "Yellow cards" or another device to alert the speaker that members are not following the discussion.

IV. FUTURE TCDD PUBLIC POLICY COLLABORATION ACTIVITIES

Diana Kern reported for the ad-hoc workgroup and reviewed the work group report and recommendations for outcomes measures for future public policy collaboration activities and other considerations for those measures. The work group recommends outcome and performance measures for each of the four focus areas discussed by the Council during the February meetings. Those areas are collaboration between organizations, inclusion of individuals, sustainability of activities, and cross-cutting outcomes. Members discussed each focus area, its outcome measures and ways to qualify those measures, as well as ideas for activities and services related to each focus area. After a lengthy discussion, members agreed to continue those discussions in the Public Policy and Project Development Committee meetings. A recommendation was made to accept the outcome measures and considerations from the ad-hoc workgroup.

MOTION: To accept the recommendations of Public Policy Collaboration Outcome Measures as presented by the ad-hoc workgroup.

MADE BY: Diana Kern for the ad-hoc workgroup (motions from Committee actions do not need a second)

The motion **passed** with 11 in favor and 6 opposed. Amy Sharp and Frank Genco abstained from voting. (Attachment 1)

RECESS

Durheim recessed the Committee of the Whole meeting at 2:06 PM.

RECONVENE

Council Chair Brenda Coleman-Beattie joined the meetings and reconvened the Committee of the Whole at 5:30 PM in the lobby of the Omni Southpark Hotel.

V. TRIBUTE TO RENE REQUENEZ

Coleman-Beattie recalled the contributions of Council member Rene Requenez prior to his untimely death in December 2009. Although he served on the Council for only one year, Requenez offered many suggestions for Council activities and policies. He and his work to improve the quality of life for people with disabilities will be missed.

Members then engaged in informal discussions.

ADJOURN

Chair Coleman-Beattie adjourned the Committee of the Whole at 6:30 PM

Roger A. Webb, Secretary to the Council

Date

DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES ASSISTANCE AND BILL OF RIGHTS ACT

SUBTITLE B: (1) *ENGAGE IN ADVOCACY, CAPACITY BUILDING, AND SYSTEMIC CHANGE ACTIVITIES* (involving Public Policy collaboration)

- TO DEVELOP AND SUPPORT COALITIONS THAT SUPPORT THE POLICY AGENDA OF THE COUNCIL
- TO ELIMINATE BARRIERS TO ACCESS AND USE OF COMMUNITY SERVICES BY INDIVIDUALS WITH DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES, ENHANCE SYSTEMS DESIGN AND REDESIGN, AND ENHANCE CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

TCDD MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Texas Council for Developmental Disabilities is to create change so that all people with disabilities are fully included in their communities and exercise control over their own lives.

TCDD GUIDING PRINCIPALS

All Council activities should be in alignment with the Council's mission statement and demonstrate:

- commitment to self-determination for individuals with disabilities and their families;
- effort to ensure that there is appropriate representation in all activities by people from diverse cultures and disabilities;
- best practices in the development and provision of services and supports, including an emphasis on measurable goals; and
- collaboration between the Council, grantees, advocacy organizations and other groups, including non-traditional partners, in activities that are consistent with the Council's mission.

TCDD STATE PLAN GOAL 10

People with developmental disabilities and family members will have the supports and services they need to be able to participate actively in their communities.

TCDD STATE PLAN OBJECTIVE 2

Collaborate, each year of the State Plan, with other agencies and organizations on an ongoing basis to develop and promote concrete policy alternatives and best practices to ensure that individuals and families can access and maintain self-directed community-based services and supports of their choice.

Focus Areas

1. **Collaboration—Organizations**
2. **Inclusion—Individuals**
3. **Sustainability**
4. **Cross-cutting Outcomes**

The tables on the following pages are organized around these focus areas, derived from enabling statutes, the Council’s State Plan, and discussions of goals/objectives, values, issues, and specific recommendations from the November 12, 2010 Committee of the Whole meeting. The first three focus areas are directly related to Public Policy Collaboration (PPC) activities while the “Cross-cutting Outcomes” area relates to various Council programs, including PPC. The primary focus of the PPC ad hoc workgroup is on the desired results/outcomes and related outcome measures described below. “Secondary” information from Council-generated ideas is also provided for context in facilitating the interpretation and discussion of outcome measures.

Primary Information

Result/Outcome Desired reflects more specific subsets of the Council’s State Plan Objective #2. These statements can be made even more specific by including outcome measure performance targets and timeframes.

Outcome Measures for these 3 primary PPC-related and 1 cross-cutting focus areas are written as percentages and reflect the desired results/outcomes.

Secondary Information

Other Measures, such as output measures (number of units of activities/services provided or number of people served), efficiency measures (dollar cost per activity/service or organization/individual served), and demand/explanatory measures (i.e. the universe to be collaborated with or served, or other relevant information) are intended to complement the outcome measures and are not intended to represent a comprehensive set of all program measures that might be used.

Qualitative Measures and Considerations include key assumptions, quality considerations, and other factors relevant to understanding a balanced view of the focus areas.

Activities and Services include activities and services specifically mentioned and emphasized by Council members. Some may be existing activities/services while others may represent new ones. The activities/services noted here are not intended to represent a comprehensive set of all activities/services that are currently being or that might be employed/provided.

Focus Area 1: Collaboration—Organizations	
<i>Result/Outcome Desired</i>	Effective/improved collaborations, coordination, and support involving key Council-identified organizations as well as non-traditional organizations
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of key Council-identified organizations, including non-traditional and non-DD partners, that are part of particular state public policy collaborations • Percentage of state agencies aligning their programs and services to PPC goals and identified needs • Percentage of key PPC issues and goals successfully addressed through legislation or other means (e.g. funding levels, employment programs, priority services, attendant care pay rates and turnover, transportation access, low/slow Medicaid reimbursement rates, etc.) • Percentage of legislative and executive branch, community, business, and other Council-identified collaboration leaders indicating an awareness of key information (e.g. existence of the Council, priority issues, specific goals and proposals, etc.)
<i>Other Measures (output, demand, efficiency, explanatory)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of meetings, briefings, testimonies, events, training sessions provided/conducted (output)* • Number of people attending meetings, briefings, testimonies, events, training sessions (output)* • Number of key Council-identified organizations that are targeted to be part of the PPC (demand/explanatory) <p>*Note: These two output measures could be disaggregated to count each of the different types of activities/services should that detail be necessary.</p>
<i>Qualitative Measures and Considerations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings – review documentation (minutes, attendance, etc.), discussion, consensus recommendations, public comments, identified activities evaluated/completed; provide information/reports; achieve goals (i.e., influence, etc.) • Identification of ALL organizations that need to be at the table, assure appropriate representation, avoid duplication or exclusion, create a space so people will come • Include self-advocates and promote self-advocacy • Improve communication within the Council and with external stakeholders to promote awareness and understanding

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional comments/ideas from board members regarding the collaboration model: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Uses a contracted entity to provide core support for a coalition with multiple organizations (including TDDC) taking specific other roles (e.g. social and civic engagement and advocacy) and specific issue advocacy. TCDD should consider its role as a participant vs. convener ○ Joins other collaborative efforts that already exist via other funding ○ Considers paring things down and focusing more on a few specific areas/activities, and if we have a collaboration, one group can take the lead on multiple campaigns ○ Is careful that any change in the PPC model/approach ensures that positive components of the existing model/approach are maintained and that we do not lose ground ○ Regardless of the model, involves the Council in taking more leadership in stating its expectations ○ Continues to work with the same people to implement the new direction ○ Focuses on trust, public awareness, and practicality
<p><i>Activities and Services</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer to peer training and support • Youth activities and services, including leadership activities

Focus Area 2: Inclusion—Individuals	
<i>Result/Outcome Desired</i>	Effective/improved inclusion, representation, and active participation of people with disabilities in public policy collaboration activities
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of people/families with developmental disabilities surveyed indicating awareness of key information (e.g. existence of the Council, rights/responsibilities, local service providers, etc.) • Percent increase in the number of people/families with developmental disabilities that have interacted with Council, obtained information, and acted on it
<i>Other Measures (output, demand, efficiency, explanatory)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of people with developmental disabilities participating in/impacted by PPC activities/services
<i>Qualitative Measures and Considerations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication issue(s) related to services/supports for people with disabilities and their families • Maintain and analyze demographic data (possible source: a diverse group of providers) • Access to the internet
<i>Activities and Services</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scholarships • Youth activities/services

Focus Area 3: Sustainability	
Result/Outcome Desired	Deploy and maintain a public policy collaboration model that is sustainable
Outcome Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of collaborating organizations dedicating in-kind and/or other resources to PPC activities <li style="text-align: center;">And/Or- • Dollar amount of in-kind and other resources dedicated by collaborating organizations to PPC activities
Other Measures (output, demand, efficiency, explanatory)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost per disability organization collaborated with (efficiency) (global measure: number of organizations involved in PPC activities divided by total PPC costs)
Qualitative Measures and Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficient and effective use of resources • Identification of new resources
Activities and Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See other focus areas

Focus Area 4: Cross-cutting Outcomes	
<i>Result/Outcome Desired</i>	Effective/improved systemic strategies that improve the lives of people with developmental disabilities, allows them to live independently, and improves access to and opportunities for quality services that are self directed, community-based, and reflective of best practices
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of people with developmental disabilities able to live independently and have an active social life • Percentage of people/families with developmental disabilities who have “access” to comprehensive, cutting edge, and effective services, health care, transportation, employment, education, etc. (this can be determined through periodic surveys, census, or focus groups) • Funding per capita • Rankings/ratings • Mortality/morbidity rates • Education levels • Workforce/employment levels • Income levels
<i>Other Measures (output, demand, efficiency, explanatory)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of people with developmental disabilities served in various non-profit, private sector, and government (i.e. local, state, and federal) programs (output) • Number of people with developmental disabilities (demand) • Number of developmental disability-related organizations (demand/explanatory)
<i>Qualitative Measures and Considerations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elimination of barriers • Self-directed/self-determination (education, choice, and control) • Best practices and enhanced system design, generic and specialized services • Community-based (local access and best practices) • See other focus areas
<i>Activities and Services</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-specific disability, cross-disability, and functional service/support focus versus disability-specific services • See other focus areas

Facilitator Findings and Recommendations

1. In considering the PPC model/approach, the Council should baseline/benchmark outcome measures (where possible) for the new model/approach against current outcome levels to determine if the new model/approach is working. And, careful attention should be paid to the selection, wording, and definition of any outcome measures the Council chooses to use.
2. In considering changes to the mix of activities/services, determine if current activities/services:
 - a. are addressing a priority need issue, and/or customer demand;
 - b. reflect best practices and are delivered effectively/professionally;
 - c. are achieving their intended results;
 - d. are an efficient use of resources (i.e. produce highest results for the lowest possible cost when weighed against other available options); and
 - e. should be maintained in light of the above considerations and new activities/services that are being considered.
3. Before deploying specific outcome measures, CDD will need to develop detailed definitions of the measures (i.e. narrative description, definition of terms, calculation methodology/formula, source/reliability of the underlying data, limitations on the interpretation and use of reporting figures, etc.) to ensure accurate and consistent data collection and reporting over time.