



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Friday, November 12, 2021

9:00 - 10:30 AM

3839 North 3rd Street, Suite 306, Phoenix, Arizona 85012

MINUTES

The Executive Committee meeting of the Arizona Developmental Disabilities Planning Council (ADDPC) was convened virtually Friday, November 12, 2021. Notice having been duly given. Present and absent were the following members of the ADDPC.

Members Present	
------------------------	--

Melissa Van Hook, Chairperson	Scott Lindbloom
J.J. Rico, Vice-Chair	Mary Slaughter
Monica Cooper	
Kelly Roberts	

Members Absent

James Rivera

Staff	Guests
--------------	---------------

Erica McFadden, Staff	
Michael Leyva, Staff	
Steve Freeman, Staff	

A. Call to Order/Welcome

Chairperson Melissa Van Hook welcomed everyone to the Arizona Developmental Disabilities Planning Council (ADDPC or Council) Executive Committee meeting. The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m. Roll call and participant introductions were completed.

B. Minutes from September 10, 2021 Meeting

Chairperson Melissa Van Hook asked members if they had a chance to review the minutes and if there were any changes. Melissa asked for a motion to accept the minutes. Motion was made by Monica Cooper, seconded by Scott Lindbloom. The motion carried.

C. Fiscal/Contract Updates

- For FY 2019 there is approximately \$1,772 remaining to be spent by the end of this December (2021). This amount should be fully liquidated by the end of the Month.
- For FY 2020 there is approximately \$317,000 remaining to be spent.
- The Administration for Community Living has provided a one-time no cost extension for FY2020 funds. Under this directive the obligation and project periods have been extended through September 30, 2022. The liquidation of funds and final reports will need to be completed by December 31, 2022. There will be no extension for FY 2021 funding.
- The Council has received the full allotment for FY 2021, in the amount of \$1,500,930 and has received reallocation of FY2021 funds from Puerto Rico in the amount of \$34,412, bringing the Council's total funding for FY 2021 to \$1,535,342.
- For FY 2021 there is an over obligation of approximately \$19,580, but this will either cover unspent contract awards and/or be obligated with FY2022 funds once received. We have met the September 2022 obligation deadline, but the work must be completed within the same timeframe. We have until September 30, 2023 to liquidate FY21 funds.

ADDPC Covid-19 Award Update

- The Council has received an additional award in the amount of \$84,288 for COVID-19 specific projects. These funds are being tracked and reported separately. The funds must be obligated and work completed by September 30, 2022.
- To date we have spent \$14,391 and have encumbered \$68,671, which leaves an available balance of \$5,728.
- Only 9 councils have spent any of their CDC funds, so everyone is struggling with how to spend their funds.
- Scott suggested having some outreach in Navajo County to help them find vaccines. Transportation has been an issue there. Erica shared the resources page for mobile vaccination clinics, and the link was shared during the meeting.

Council Funded Projects

- This sheet shows we have granted the City of Nogales-Inclusive Recreation project an additional 3-month no-cost extension through March 31, 2022.
- NAU/IHD- Adaptive Recreation Year 2 project received a 5-month no-cost extension through April 30, 2022.
- The formal request for the Sonoran UCEDD-Sexual Abuse Research project to get another 3-month no cost extension has been granted making it 6-months in total.

Arizona Developmental Disabilities Planning Council Budget Recommendation

- This sheet shows the projects that are in the Council's workplans and the anticipated funding year they will be paid from.

- It has been updated to reflect the new goal areas identified on the new 5-Year State Plan
- The NAU/IHD Post-secondary demo program renewal is highlighted on this sheet and is budgeted for.
- This sheet shows that we anticipate having surplus funds available for new projects with anticipated FY22 and 23 funding. Ideally FY22 funds will be fully obligated by September 30, 2022, so work can be completed in the second year.
- Scott asked where RFI projects would fall and if they would start by 9/30/22. Erica said the hope would be that the hope would be that most would fall in 2022 being that we have \$132,000 still left to obligate.

D. Data Hub Renewal Scope of Work & NAU-IHD Post-Secondary Education Renewal

Erica McFadden shared that we want to renew the Data Hub project so that it's annually updated. It's for \$20,000. If any Council member wants to see the scope of work before it goes out in mid-November, please let her know.

NAU-IHD is being considered for a third year for \$100,000 for its Think College model. The goal of the project was to implement a model that would allow students with IDD to get the supports they need to be successful in college. The model came from Hawaii. It's a person centered model that follows along the student to provide the support they need. The first two years they staffed up the project and began implementing the project. They've been successful in getting additional funding through a TPSID 5 year grant, but that funding only supports students with I/DD not DD alone. And it doesn't provide tuition support costs. This second year of funding supported 5 students to attend school and the model has expanded to include Coconino Community College, Mohave Community College, and Pioneer College. This past year the project helped a student in particular to be able to enroll in school by providing advocacy with VR for this student to attend to obtain a certificate program as opposed to full time but missed the deadline for VR to pay for tuition. Council funds were able to support tuition costs the first semester. They plan to expand professional development and work with AZ Western College next year and expand students' participation to up to 20 students – with TPSID funding they would be able help 100 students. Mike Leyva said that their interagency team had at least 15 interagency teams to advise. Sakenya McDonald is the project director and does a good job communicating and bringing people together. Mike said that the hope was the program could be replicated to Yuma. There was not a lot of feedback from the evaluations this year – only 2 out of 5 students completed it. NAU-IHD is going to modify the eval to show the real impact of the program on the students.

Scott Lindbloom was concerned about students who aren't academically successful that they could be suspended and be required to pay back their financial aid. He wanted to know how this program addresses that issue. Erica said that NAU-IHD would help people apply for financial aid and offer academic support. Kelly Roberts said that they could look into what happened to the student and their financial aid if their overall GPA fell below a 2.0. Kelly said they walk through with each student through the financial aid process and

any ramifications they may have. Kelly offered to provide more information if that is what is needed. JJ Rico made a motion to approve the NAU-IHD post-secondary education renewal. Scott Lindbloom seconded the motion. Kelly Roberts abstained. The motion carried.

E. Executive Director Succession Plan

Melissa Van Hook sat in on national council meetings and became nervous when she heard from other councils about the need for succession plans, and ADDPC doesn't have one. She's also personally seen so many change their careers or get sick recently. This had been on the agenda back in May but had to be tabled due to all the work that had to be completed with the 5-year plan. Melissa is seeking more clarity. JJ Rico is the co-chair and the AZ Center for Disability Law Executive Director. JJ said this succession plan is to be sure there is a transparent plan available for Council or staff if something should happen to the ED. The plan being considered today is from Texas, created in 2013. JJ inserted ADDPC by-law language and requirement of AZ's HR policies. This plan includes staff, and a separate committee from the Council so it all doesn't fall on the Executive Committee. It's important to include some staff since they may be more knowledgeable about day to day challenges the ED may face. The succession plan also includes the outgoing ED helping to transition the new ED so the new ED has the information they need to ensure a smooth transition. The plan highlights what the outgoing ED needs to share with the new ED.

Mary Slaughter was excited to see this, and she said that this is one of the best succession plans she's ever seen. Under page 1 under Guiding Principles, Mary was concerned about not conducting a competitive search if an existing staff person was identified for the position. She thought that clause would give the Council too easy of an out without looking at a pool of applicants. JJ thought there would still have to be a formal process to conduct the search. He was hoping to save time and money with that clause. Erica suggested they eliminate that sentence because she thought it might go against state HR policy. And the line regarding internal candidates should be left in. Scott was asking about how to evaluate staff and salary in the by-laws. JJ clarified the role of the Council. It's not to control staff salaries.

Mary brought up the sentence of who should be included on the Transition Committee. She was concerned that it said to include ADDPC staff, but there were no numbers attached. She wanted to be sure the Transition Committee wasn't too heavy on the staff and controlling the Council's decision. JJ said that staff weren't involved in his decision when he was hired, and they weren't bought in. JJ suggested 2 of the 5 staff being included. Melissa said the staff know very well what Erica does and they should definitely have input. Mary agreed they absolutely need input but not the majority of input. Scott suggested that the Council look at the leadership training AZ SILC does for Council members. JJ thinks this plan could be used by anyone and that there would be training including, e.g., from DES HR folks. JJ said there is a review component in it that says it needs to be reviewed annually. The plan also includes a commitment to diverse candidates. Scott Lindbloom made a motion to approve the succession plan with the following edits:

- On page 1, strike “*A competitive search will be conducted unless the Board concludes that a current staff member is appropriate and available for the job.*”
- Add 2 to the number of staff included on the Transition Committee.

Mary Slaughter seconded it. The motion unanimously carried. JJ said he'd send a clean version that could be signed and date by Melissa.

F. Executive Director Job Re-Classification

Melissa Van Hook brought up the need to re-classify the Executive Director position. The current job description is at grade 23. Erica is at the top of the pay scale and was brought in that way under the previous ED. There is no room to grow for her or for any other person who would fill this position down the road. They are looking at re-classifying her job description and revising the job description to include the tasks she actually does. The draft description shared is reflective of what she actually does. If the Council approves of the new job description, it is sent to HR and they then move to reclassify the job. The Council Chair is the ED's supervisor. Scott is asking if the ED position requires a Human Services background and the educational background. Mary said the job description is very thorough and leads to what is needed for degrees, etc... There is an internal doc that requires degree and all of that. It flows from the job description and should kick it way up. The skills and knowledge needed would flow from the job description. The HR person is leaving at the beginning of January so this has also been expedited before she leaves. Scott Lindbloom made a motion to approve the revised language of the ED job description. Monica Cooper seconded. The motion unanimously carried.

G. Monitoring Council Goals & Objectives

Melissa Van Hook shared that the Executive Committee should be monitoring progress of Council goals, objectives, and activities. Erica McFadden shared a document that highlighted at month 3 where we are in the workplan with barriers and significant accomplishments.

One of the barriers we ran into was establishing an Employment First office. We've run into resistance in the committee.

The only other issue is around the Self Advocacy Coalition. They have been struggling to recruit. Their reporting is inadequate and communication hasn't been great. The staff intended to grant another no cost extension to allow them to expend funds. We are required to support a statewide self advocacy coalition through federal requirements. The hope is that they address the barriers in his renewal application. Growing self advocacy has always been hard, but we can't see that they are trying different approaches in their recruiting.

We are also trying to determine if there are other minority serving orgs we should partner with to tackle disability issues.

The Executive Committee members liked the way we reported this information. They like that we don't have to create a new report.

H. Full Council Agenda Review

Scott may not be able to make the meeting next Friday, but he will try to call in. ASU Therapeutic Inclusive Recreation Project report out is next Friday. Melissa reviewed the draft agenda. Scott will talk with Jason about his committee report out. Jason will have to fill in for him.

I. Announcements

Scott is getting together an ADA Advisory Committee with Navajo & Apache Counties and Navajo Nation and owners of Motel 6 to strengthen employment for workers with disabilities in northern AZ. Scott is hoping to include this initiative under the Employment First committee.

The motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Monica Cooper and seconded by Scott Lindbloom. The meeting unanimously carried. The meeting adjourned at 10:36am.

Dated this 16th day of November 2021
Arizona Developmental Disabilities Planning Council