

303188

Report on Regional Site Visits

F.Y. 1980

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY
STATE OF MINNESOTA

Developmental Disabilities Planning Office
Minnesota State Planning Agency
October, 1980

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| 2. Regional Site Visit Reports: | |
| -- Region 1 | 5 |
| Site Visit Report | |
| Case Studies: Infant Stimulation Project | |
| Parent Advocacy Coalition for Educational | |
| Rights (PACER) Workshop | |
| Site Visit Team Review Sheets (3) | |
| -- Region 4 | 23 |
| Site Visit Report | |
| Case Studies: Grant Writing: | |
| Rape Grant | |
| Human Services Grant | |
| Public Information Education | |
| Site Visit Team Review Sheets (3) | |
| -- Region 6E, 6W, 8 | 41 |
| Site Visit Report | |
| Case Studies: Legislative Position Statements | |
| Human Fullfillment Workshop | |
| Site Visit Team Review Sheets (3) | |
| -- Region 7E | 57 |
| Site Visit Report | |
| Case Studies: Parent Advocacy Coalition for Educational | |
| Rights (PACER) Workshop | |
| Slide/Tape and Service Directory | |
| Site Visit Team Review Sheets (4) | |
| -- Region 9 | 75 |
| Site Visit Report | |
| Case Studies: Respite Care | |
| Comprehensive Vocational Training and | |
| Competitive Job Placement Program for | |
| Secondary Level Handicapped Youth | |
| Site Visit Team Review Sheets (3) | |

-- Region 10 91

Site Visit Report

Case Studies: Access Employment Conference

Elderly with Special Needs Conference

Site Team Review Sheets (3)

-- Region 11 109

Site Visit Report

Case Studies: D.D. Information Exchange/Newsletter

Developmental Disabilities Information System

Site Visit Team Review Sheets (5)

Since 1972 Regional Developmental Disabilities Planning Programs have been operating through grants from the State Planning Agency on the recommendation of the State D.D. Planning Council. The rationale for support of regional planning programs included a desire to conduct, stimulate and coordinate planning at the local level to achieve a continuum of programs and services for persons with developmental disabilities in each region of the state. So that Regional Developmental Disabilities Planning Programs would not exist in isolation of other local planning efforts, the State Council stressed that Regional Developmental Disabilities Planning Programs must be linked to regional administrative agencies with broad based planning responsibility and the potential to influence the development of local services. Regional Development Commissions were selected as the most appropriate regional administrative agencies.

Regional Development Commissions (RDCs) were created under the Regional Development Act of 1969 to coordinate federal, state and local planning programs within the framework of broad regional growth and development policies. The role and authority of RDCs are such that linking Regional Developmental Disabilities Planning Programs with them should assure that the concerns of persons with developmental disabilities are reflected in plans addressing the regions' general physical, social and economic needs. Furthermore, the composition of RDCs includes county commissioners from each county in the state as well as other key local policy-makers maximizing the opportunity to educate and inform local elected officials of the needs of persons with developmental disabilities.

*To be considered for a Developmental Disabilities grant, an RDC must develop a work program with specific concrete and manageable tasks which address priority service needs of the developmentally disabled population of the region. These service needs must be supported by a general overview of the region, documentation of the capacity of existing regional resources to meet the needs of persons with developmental disabilities, a projection of additional resources which must be developed and finally, community resources such as money, manpower, public information channels, etc. which may be useful in developing services. An additional requirement of the grant is the need to provide staff support and develop a regional advisory committee composed of consumers, persons who have developmental disabilities or their parents or guardians, services providers and members of the general public.

Wishing to determine the overall strengths/weaknesses and impact of the Developmental Disabilities Regional Program, the State D.D. Council established an adhoc committee on regionalism. Membership included persons on the State D.D. Council and persons employed as planners by individual regional D.D. programs located throughout the state. As one of its first tasks the committee reviewed a summary of accomplishments of each region. This summary was prepared by staff of the State Planning Agency utilizing quarterly narrative reports and supplemental material which regional programs must submit as part of the reporting requirement for receipt of Developmental Disabilities grant funds. Once the

*Beginning with the 1981 Program Year, RDCs responded to a Request for Proposal with a focus on technical assistance, public information and coordination rather than emphasizing planning as in the past.

committee had reviewed the accomplishments of each region, it was decided that a visit to each region would lead to a better understanding of the regional programs as a whole. This decision was in keeping with a practice begun by the State Planning Agency in 1979. That is, along with members of the Grant Review Committee of the State Council, making a minimum of one site visit per year to programs which have received D.D. grant funds for demonstration purposes.

In preparation for its site visit each region was asked to complete two documents. These documents were case study sheets and region site visit criteria. Subjects for the case studies were determined from the list of accomplishments prepared for each region. The State Planning Agency and the particular region each randomly selected one accomplishment to be used as a topic for case study. The regional programs prepared case study sheets for each of the subjects which were selected. The second document to be completed was the region site visit criteria (domains) developed by the Regionalism Committee. Each region was asked to review the domains. The domains included: 1) Needs Assessment/Planning, 2) Coordination/Interagency Linkages, 3) Public Information/Public Education/Training Technical Assistance, 4) Legislation, 5) Review activities, 6) Advocacy and 7) Information and Referral. Each region was to prioritize the domains as they relate to its activities. Focusing on the top three domains the region was to raise specific items for discussion during the site visit. This document was to be submitted along with the case study forms to the State Planning Agency/Developmental Disabilities Planning Office.

To schedule the site visit, the regions were to work in conjunction with the state office staff. The first half of the day was usually spent interviewing regional program staff, consumers and providers of services. (A list of team members and interviewees appears in each regional section.) Regional program staff were encouraged to include persons who were actively involved with their program through membership on the D.D. Council as well as persons from the region who had had little or no direct contact with the program. The second half of the day was spent reviewing documents or interviewing persons whose content/knowledge served as verification for the case studies. The day closed with a wrap up session at which the site visit team shared some of its initial findings and obtained additional clarification from regional program personnel on any points which had arisen during the day.

The reports on each region follow and includes:

- 1) Identification of the host agency,
- 2) Staff and budget
- 3) A summary of the case studies and their verification
- 4) The region's response to the question of domain selection
- 5) A list of site visit team members
- 6) A list of interviewees and
- 7) Team Findings

Following each report are the case study sheets and review sheets for the region completed by individual site visit team members.

Date of Visit: May 29, 1980

Region No: 1

HOST AGENCY: Northwest Regional Development Commission
425 Woodland
Crookston, MN 56716

Executive Director: Tom Jorgens

D.D. Staff: Sari Clark

Time Commitment: 52%

Budget: F.Y. 1980 (October 1, 1979 - September 30, 1980)

D.D. Funds: \$12,500

Local Match: \$ 9,294

Total: \$21,794

CASE STUDIES

1. Subject: Infant Stimulation Project (Riverview Hospital)
 - a. Problem Statement: Sari Clark, D.D. staff, was contacted by Nancy Koering, Occupational Therapy Director, to request assistance in seeking funding for the Infant Stimulation Program.
 - b. Verification: While the project was not funded, work on the application led to: an inter-agency preschool task force (formed 3-13-80), 17 children served in an infant stimulation program paid for by a variety of sources and the Polk County commissioners approval of a DAC home-bound program. The team members saw a copy of the proposal, letters of support and minutes of meetings. In addition, team members interviewed the occupational therapist, physical therapist, preschool coordinator and the Special Education Director for Northwest Interdistrict Council, the Association for Retarded Citizens field representative and the D.D. Coordinator for Northwestern Mental Health Center. The proposal has been submitted to the Skogmo and Annie F. Paper Foundations.
2. Subject: PACER Workshop
 - a. Problem Statement: The Regional Advisory Board identifies parent education as one of the top priorities for action in the region.
 - b. Verification: The Site Visit Team saw two newspaper articles. 500 flyers were distributed by PACER to a variety of agencies and consumer groups.

Domain Selection: Prioritization of Domains lists seven items: 1) Coordination and Inter-agency Linkages 2) Public Information/Public Education/Training/Technical Assistance 3) Needs Assessment/Planning 4) Review Activities 5) Advocacy 6) I and R and 7) Legislation.

Site Visit Team:

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Affiliation</u> |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| Linda Yates | State Council Member |
| Marvin Tritz | State Council Member |
| Marylee Fithian | State Staff |

Interviewees:

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Affiliation</u> |
|--------------------|--|
| Terry Pankow | N.W. Mental Health Center |
| Liz Brouse | Riverview Hospital Physical Therapist |
| Nancy Koering | Riverview Hospital Occupational Therapist |
| Doris Gust | Northwest Regional Interdistrict Council (NWRIC) |
| Harry Sutherland | Parent D.D. Advisory Board Member |
| Sheryl C. Irvine | |
| Bill Brinkman | Central High School |
| Winton Gackstetter | NWRIC Director |
| Sandy Johnson | ARC Field Representative for Region 1 |

TEAM FINDINGS

Program Strengths:

- 1) The program helps to link the education, medical and general community. Examples of such a linkage are: the preschool coordination task force, infant stimulation program and the PACER workshop.
- 2) The D.D. Planner provides good technical assistance and is viewed as a good neutral facilitator.
- 3) The program is seen as a good resource for information and referral.

Program Weaknesses:

- 1) The geographic area of the region is large and rural, making service difficult.
- 2) More activity is needed in the northern half of the region.
- 3) Advisory Board members are selected by the Area Mental Health Board allowing little control by the D.D. program.
- 4) More people need to be informed of the D.D. Program's existence.

Recommendations :

- 1) Efforts should be made to secure representation from the northern part of the region on the advisory board.
- 2) Steps should be taken to include county social service directors and county commissioners in coordination activities.
- 3) The State D.D. Office should do more publicity efforts in conjunction with the regional programs.
- 4) Public information about existing services and other information needs to be provided to consumers and professionals.

Case Study
Data Collection Instrument

T.A. Infant Stimulation Project
Riverview Hospital

Region 1

I. Function (check appropriate boxes):

☒ Influencing ☐ Planning ☐ Evaluation

II. Domain of Activity (check appropriate box/boxes):

☐ Needs Assessment/Planning ☒ Coordination/Interagency Linkages
☒ Public Awareness/Training/T.A. ☐ Legislation ☐ Review Activities
☐ Advocacy ☐ I & R ☐ Other _____

III. Problem Statement (historical events that precipitated Council action):

Clark was contacted by Nancy Koering, Occupational Therapy Director, to request assistance in seeking funding for the Infant Stimulation Program.

IV. Objective (Expected Outcomes) of Activity:

Increased services to high risk infants in Region I.

V. Target Group/Audience to Which Activity was Addressed:

High risk infants.

VI. Process (activities/steps involved in implementing objectives):

| | Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ | |
|--|----------------------------|---------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| | | | Council | Other by Sources |
| A. Consult re: writing application | Koering Clark Brouse | Sept. | X | X |
| B. Forming Task Force to promote interagency cooperation and support of project. | Koering Clark Brouse | Sept.26 | X | X |
| C. Needs assessment | Koering Brouse | Sept. | | X |

VI. Continued:

| | Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ | |
|---|------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| | | | Council | Other by Sources |
| D. Submission of application. | Koering | | | |
| E. Follow-up activities in pre-school coordination. | Clark Simonson Koering | Mar.27 Apr.23 May 12 | X | X |
| F. | | | | |

VII. Concurrent Environmental Factors

VIII. Outcome(s) of Activity:

| | New Resources/Funds Obtained (\$) (Identify Source) |
|---------------|---|
| A. Intended | *Funds were not obtained from sources expected, but new sources are being pursued. |
| B. Unintended | *Increase in infant referrals - identification. *Formation of Pre-School Interagency Coordination Task Force *Information gathering on use of telecommunications in service deliveries and DD in rural areas. |

IX. Verification Process for Determining Impact of Activity:

- * Application and correspondence relating to it.
- * Interview with Nancy Koering, Liz Brouse and Linda Yates.
- * Correspondence.
- * Minutes of Pre-School Interagency Coordination Task Force.

COOPERATING AGENCIES/PERSONS

- Sari Clark, NWRDC
- Nancy Koering, Occupational Therapy, Riverview Hospital
- Liz Brouse, Physical Therapy, Riverview Hospital
- Al More, Asst. Adm., Riverview Hospital
- Linda Yates, Social Worker, Riverview Hospital
- Richard Simonson, Director Gully DAC

(Persons attending information/advisory meeting list
will be available at the time of the site review.)

Case Study
Data Collection Instrument

Region 1
PACER

I. Function (check appropriate boxes):

☒ Influencing ☐ Planning ☐ Evaluation

II. Domain of Activity (check appropriate box/boxes):

☐ Needs Assessment/Planning ☒ Coordination/Interagency Linkages
☒ Public Awareness/Training/T.A. ☐ Legislation ☐ Review Activities
☒ Advocacy ☐ I & R ☐ Other _____

III. Problem Statement (historical events that precipitated Council action):

The identification by the Regional Advisory Board of parent education as one of the top priorities for action in the Region.

IV. Objective (Expected Outcomes) of Activity:

Increased awareness by parents of their rights and responsibilities visavis the school system leading to enhancement of services to individual children.

V. Target Group/Audience to Which Activity was Addressed:

Parents of handicapped children, service providers, particularly educators.

VI. Process (activities/steps involved in implementing objectives):

| | Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ | |
|--|---------------------------|-------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| | | | Council | Other by Sources |
| A. Planning | Clark | Aug. | X | X |
| | Johnson | Sept. | | |
| | Wallace | Oct. | | |
| B. Site choices. | Pankow PACER Staff | | | |
| C. Preparation of mailings, news releases, etc. | DD Planner PACER Staff | | X | X |

VI. Continued:

| | Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ Council | Other by Sources |
|--|--------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| D. Direct mailings to parents mailings to schools, news releases and agencies. | Johnson SERC Clark | Oct. | X | X X |
| E. Registration | Clark Evenson | | | |
| F. Presentation | PACER, Inc. | Oct.29 Oct.30 | | |

VII. Concurrent Environmental Factors

VIII. Outcome(s) of Activity:

| | New Resources/Funds Obtained (\$) (Identify Source) |
|---------------|---|
| A. Intended | * Conveyance of information to parents and service providers. * Improved services to children with handicaps. * Parent group in Thief River Falls was formed after the workshop. |
| B. Unintended | * Beginning of interest in the Count Me In Program. This has resulted in the choice of Region I as a target region for the Count Me In Outreach Program to begin in October. (Planning will begin in June.) |

IX. Verification Process for Determining Impact of Activity:

- 1) Attendance at workshop.
- 2) PACER, Inc. evaluated responses by the persons attending.
- 3) Correspondence file.

COOPERATING AGENCIES/SPONSORS

- PACER Center, Inc.
- Sari Clark, Northwest Regional Development Commission
- Sandy Johnson, Region I Association for Retarded Citizens
- Terry Pankow, Northwestern Mental Health Center
- Terry Wallace, SERC
- Ann Evanson, Epilepsy Outreach Worker

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

- A central information source.
- Technical assistance availability.
- Use by professionals of coordinator's services.
- Strong resourceful coordinator.
- Cooperation between agencies.
- Sharing of DD and MH advisory boards.
- Improved communications.
- Information source for parents.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

- Large size of area served.
- Long distances to travel.
- Lack of public awareness of services available.
- Lack of strength in regional DD board.
- Public unaware of information available.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

- Less duplication of services.
- Increased inter-agency cooperation.
- Public awareness and education increased.
- Information source to parents.
- Workshops co-sponsored.
- Aided in grants recieved.
- Resource person for program and agencies.
- Less turf guarding.
- Increase of other funds through cooperation.

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

- Public information to create awareness of services and information available to professionals and consumers.
- Planning to make services available to outlying areas.
- Increasing strength of area board.
- More planning in social service area.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

Good.

A great deal accomplished; assistance in grant writing resulting in Region L A.R.C. camp for retarded receiving \$2,300.

D.A.C. - new building

Formation of consumer task force

PACER workshops - good attendance.

Agencies reporting coordinator most helpful in technical assistance and information.

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

Has developed a strong networking of service system with linkage effects of increased sensitivity/awareness and flow of non-DD funds in area.

Strong relationship with education.

DD Coordinator provides good technical assistance, communications resource, and neutral facilitations when issues arise.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

a.) More activities needed in northern half of the region - committee representation from this area should be strengthened.

b.) Committee selected by area board, so DD program has little control over geographic/disability representation.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

Increased flow of resources (non-DD) into area and services. Has done some excellent public information.

Improved coordination and interagency linkages.

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

Try to develop better committee representation from northern part of region.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

This program has done an excellent job on quite reduced resources ($\frac{1}{2}$ the average grant). It enjoys credibility and support from both consumer and service providers. People look to it as a valuable resource for information, referral and technical assistance.

Staff is considered very responsive. The geographic size, ruralness and some turf-guarding present some problems, but overall, the program is very strong.

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

- A. Providing linkages with education, medical and general community.
 - 1. Examples - pre-school coordination task force
 - 2. Infant stimulation program
 - 3. PACER workshop efforts
- B. Good inter-agency agreement with NW Mental Health Center
 - 1. Terry Pankow of Mental Health Center & Sari Clark have mutual board resulting in no overlapping.
 - 2. Current state priority of alternative living arrangements is already well under way by push of the mental health center.
- C. Strong efforts are being made in coordination efforts to try and overcome-turf guarding - Sari is a good neutral facilitator
 - 1. In the future, Sari is looking at more county social service involvement keeping a close watch on the community social service block grant.
 - 2. A lot of professional consultation is being done
- D. Good insight into the needs of the region
- E. A lot of good seminars held within the last year.
- F. Provides a good information and referral agency.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

- A. More publicity of Sari Clark and her position and her role.
 - 1. many people have just kind of heard of her through grapevine information.
 - 2. Needs to become more viable.
- B. Region 2 is not really being covered - is this Sari's responsibility?
 - 1. Difficulty in covering region due to the vast ruralness.
- C. Not much going on in the northern part of the region yet.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

Providing a working coordination of present agencies and utilization of services presently available in the region.

Participating and acting as a catalyst for new programming.

Offering support on prevention subcommittees as well as other committees.

Offering information and referral information readily available to any group.

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

Providing another person for more coverage in Region II - territory is presently extremely large.

The state office possibly do more publicity efforts in conjunction with regional directors.

Careful handling of the county social service directors and commissioners in the region to include them in the overall coordinating effort.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

Good

1. Seventeen children are presently being served in a coordinated infant stimulation program which was aided by much technical assistance of Sari Clark. This program is presently being developed to serve the 22 school districts surrounding the Crookston area and hopes to be expanded to the entire region.
2. Good PACER workshops were held in the area with additional ones being planned for fall. 140 parents and professionals were involved in the first two. Assistance has been given in the development of many others.

Inter-agency coordination efforts are growing and much credit goes to a neutral facilitator, Sari Clark.

Sari is developing her role as a Case Manager and professionals in the region are looking at Sari as a consultant.

Sari has done an exceptional job in aiding in grant funding. This includes grant received for A.R.C. camp, art grants obtained for region, Assistance to infant stimulation grant.

Sari is involved on many subcommittees and committees throughout the region including A.R.C. groups, subcommittees on respite care, infant stimulation, pre-school task forces, etc.

Date of Visit: May 22, 1980

Region No: 4

HOST AGENCY: West Central Regional Development Commission
Fergus Falls Community College
Fergus Falls, Minnesota 56537

Executive Director: James Myhra

D.D. Staff: Pat Teiken

Time Commitment:

Budget: F.Y. 1980 (October 1, 1979 - September 30, 1980)

D.D. Funds: \$25,000

Local Funds: \$ 8,333.33

Total: \$33,333.33

CASE STUDIES

1. Subject: Grant Writing (Rape Grant Application)
 - a. Problem Statement: The majority of Region IV has no services for sexual assault; especially for the handicapped population.
 - b. Verification: A copy of the grant application was provided. The project was not funded.
2. Subject: Grant Writing (Human Services Grant Application)
 - a. Problem Statement: Region 4 human service providers have historically cooperated with each other. The cooperation had not extended to joint application for funds. The Minnesota State Legislature had appropriated monies for which counties could apply for the purpose of planning and organizing human service boards. Some of this appropriation remained after the counties interested in Human Service Boards had applied for the funds. These dollars were then offered to counties in grants of \$4,000 on a first come basis to be used to improve the administration and/or planning of human services. Region IV Counties decided to submit a joint application. Even though this did not identify developmental disabilities, it was felt that action which would improve the administration and/or planning of county human services would indirectly affect developmental disabilities.

*At the request of the host agency this grant was terminated July 14, 1980.

b. Verification: A copy of the grant application was provided. The project was funded.

3. Subject: Public Information Education

a. Problem Statement: There is a lack of public information and training.

b. Verification: The site visit team was provided copies of news releases covering a variety of subjects of interest to persons with disabilities. These releases had been distributed to newspapers and radio stations throughout region 4.

Domain Selection: Material provided by the planner listed priority 1: Public information/public education; priority 2: Technical Assistance; and priority 3: Coordination/inter-agency linkages.

Site Visit Team:

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Affiliation</u> |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| Chet Oden | State Council Member |
| Mary Hinze | State Council Member |
| Marylee Fithian | State Staff |

Interviewees:

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Affiliation</u> |
|---------------------|--|
| Pat Teiken | D.D. Planner |
| Sylvia Thom | Parent School Liaison |
| Red Pierce | Special Education Regional Consultant |
| | Member D.D. Council |
| Len Howard | Parent School Coordinator |
| Molly Crawford | Criminal Justice Planner |
| Dana Worman | Association for Retarded Citizens' Field Representative, Member D.D. Council |
| Bill Casey | Vocational Rehabilitation Supervisor |
| | Member D.D. Council |
| Rick Long | Department of Economic Security |
| Jeannette Pattinson | Services for Children with Handicaps |
| | Member D.D. Council |
| Marilyn Moen | Mental Health Center, Member D.D. Council |
| Jean McKinzie | |
| Mary Sheehan | |
| Dave Aanes | State Hospital, Member D.D. Council |

TEAM FINDINGS

Program Strengths:

- 1) This program fills a real gap by providing information to the community.
- 2) This program has been a valuable resource for new professionals.
- 3) This program acts as a "watchdog" toward other programs which serve persons with disabilities.
- 4) The program appears to have a good relationship with the media and good media coverage.
- 5) The program has fostered inter and intra agency coordination.
- 6) The program has been recognized for its ability to advocate because direct services are not provided.

Program Weaknesses:

- 1) There is a lack of commitment and support from the host agency.
- 2) There is a need for greater consumer involvement.

Recommendations:

- 1) The future of the program with the host agency was uncertain at the time of the site visit, May 22, 1980. Subsequently, the host agency requested grant agreement termination effective July 14, 1980.

- Rape Grant
Data Collection Instrument

. Function (check appropriate boxes):

☐ Influencing ☒ Planning ☐ Evaluation

I. Domain of Activity (check appropriate box/boxes):

☐ Needs Assessment/Planning ☒ Coordination/Interagency Linkages
☐ Public Awareness/Training/T.A. ☐ Legislation ☐ Review Activities
☐ Advocacy ☐ I & R ☐ Other _____

II. Problem Statement (historical events that precipitated Council action):

The majority of Region IV have no services for sexual assault; especially for the handicapped population.

V. Objective (Expected Outcomes) of Activity:

Provide services to DD citizens of Region IV.

. Target Group/Audience to Which Activity was Addressed:

DD Population
General Population

I. Process (activities/steps involved in implementing objectives):

| | Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| | | | Council | Other by Sources |
| A. Incorporate | Rape Board | | | |
| B. Write Grant. | Staff | | | |
| C. Interview with D.O.C. | | | | |

VI. Continued:

D.

E.

F.

| Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ | |
|--------------------------|------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| | | Council | Other by Sources |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

VII. Concurrent Environmental Factors

None

VIII. Outcome(s) of Activity:

A. Intended

B. Unintended

| New Resources/Funds Obtained (\$) (Identify Source) | |
|--|-------------------|
| - | Committee formed. |
| - | Grant not funded. |

IX. Verification Process for Determining Impact of Activity:

Rape Grant

Data Collection Instrument

Function (check appropriate boxes):

☐ Influencing ☒ Planning ☐ Evaluation

I. Domain of Activity (check appropriate box/boxes):

☐ Needs Assessment/Planning ☒ Coordination/Interagency Linkages/Technical Assistance
☐ Public Awareness/Training/T.A. ☐ Legislation ☐ Review Activities
☐ Advocacy ☐ I & R ☐ Other _____

II. Problem Statement (historical events that precipitated Council action):

Region IV human service providers have historically cooperated with each other. The cooperation had not extended to joint application for funds. The MN State Legislature had appropriated funds for counties to apply for funds to plan and organize Human Services Boards. Some of this appropriation remained after the counties interested in Human Service Boards had applied for the funds. These dollars were then offered to counties in grants of \$4,000 on a first come basis to be used to improve the administration and/or planning of human services. Region IV counties decided to submit a joint application. Even though this did not identify developmental disabilities specifically, it was felt that actions which would improve the administration and/or

V. Objective (Expected Outcomes) of Activity: /planning of county human services would indi-

- A) Improved cooperation between county social /rectly affect developmental disabilities.
 services.
 B) Improved services to the developmentally disabled.
 C) Improved image and identification of Region IV Developmental Disabilities Council.

. Target Group/Audience to Which Activity was Addressed:

Social Service Recipients

I. Process (activities/steps involved in implementing objectives):

| | Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ | |
|---|-----------------------|------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| | | | Council | Other by Sources |
| A. Research into and information obtained from State Planning Agency. | DD Planner | | | |
| B. Met with County Commissioners as a group at the District Ass'n. of Minn. Counties meeting. | DD Planner | | | |
| C. Received approval from RDC Board to continue working on grant. | DD Planner | | | |

VI. Continued:

| | Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ | |
|--|-----------------------|------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| | | | Council | Other by Sources |
| D. Wrote Grant | DD Planner | | | |
| E. Met with individual County Boards to get County Board approval. | DD Planner | | | |
| F. Stood in line to submit Grant at State Planning Agency. | DD Planner | | | |

VII. Concurrent Environmental Factors

VIII. Outcome(s) of Activity:

A. Intended

B. Unintended

| New Resources/Funds Obtained (\$) (Identify Source) | 20,250.00 |
|--|-----------|
| <p>-A cooperative grant was submitted by 8 of the 9 counties in Region IV.</p> <p>-Credibility of the Region IV Council was enhanced.</p> <p>-Services were improved to DD clients because of increased planning and/or organization and/or programs.</p> <p>-DD planner was called by social services with increased frequency.</p> | |

IX. Verification Process for Determining Impact of Activity:

Human Service Grant

----- - Public Information-Education
Data Collection Instrument

I. Function (check appropriate boxes):

☒ Influencing ☐ Planning ☐ Evaluation

II. Domain of Activity (check appropriate box/boxes):

☐ Needs Assessment/Planning ☐ Coordination/Interagency Linkages
☒ Public Awareness/Training/T.A. ☐ Legislation ☐ Review Activities
☐ Advocacy ☐ I & R ☐ Other _____

III. Problem Statement (historical events that precipitated Council action):

Lack of public information and training.

IV. Objective (Expected Outcomes) of Activity:

Better information and training.

V. Target Group/Audience to Which Activity was Addressed:

General public.
DD Consumers.
DD Providers.

VI. Process (activities/steps involved in implementing objectives):

| | Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| | | | Council | Other by Sources |
| A. News releases as needed. | Staff & Council | As Needed | | |
| B. Workshops as needed. | Staff & Council | As Needed | | |
| C. | | | | |

VI. Continued:

D.

E.

F.

| Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ | |
|--------------------------|------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| | | Council | Other by Sources |
| | | | |

VII. Concurrent Environmental Factors

Coordination with other agencies.

VIII. Outcome(s) of Activity:

A. Intended

B. Unintended

| New Resources/Funds Obtained (\$) (Identify Source) | |
|--|--|
| A. Intended | - News releases released. |
| | - Workshop for 600 people. |
| B. Unintended | - Better coordination with other agencies. |

IX. Verification Process for Determining Impact of Activity:

List of Workshops*
Attached News Releases

*1) Sponsored or co-sponsored the following workshops:

| Workshop | Location | Attendance |
|---|--------------|------------|
| a) PACER | Fergus Falls | 120 people |
| | Alexandria | 70 people |
| b) How to Increase Your Advocacy I.Q. | St. Paul | 80 people |
| c) Human Fulfillment | Willmar | 60 people |
| d) Law Enforcement & Working With a Person with A Developmental Disability | Fergus Falls | 25 people |
| e) Macaroni at Midnight | Fergus Falls | 150 people |
| f) Influencing Strategies | Fergus Falls | 25 people |
| g) Vocational Activities & the Handicapped Person | Fergus Falls | 40 people |
| h) Nominal Group Process | St. Paul | 30 people |

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

The Developmental Disabilities Council has provided a public forum and served a number of important functions which would not occur without Developmental Disabilities program.

- a. "Watchdog" on other programs
- b. coordination, both inter- & intra-agency
- c. watches out for people caught in the cracks
- d. advocacy
- e. objective evaluation of services

Has increased community awareness and been a valuable resource for new professionals.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

- a.) need improved consumer involvement
- b.) Developmental Disabilities Coordinator has been given many non-Developmental Disabilities assignments so has not been able to concentrate on Developmental Disabilities issues.
- c.) Lack of support by RDC administration.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

Increased coordination and cooperation with the Developmental Disabilities community (consumers and providers). Has filled a void especially in area of community awareness.

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

At the time of the site visit the RDC Director had announced the decision to cancel the program. He expressed to the RDC that the program was not doing anything worthwhile and expressed to SPA that it was due to financial resource problems.

This decision was not agreed with by service providers or consumers in the region and was made with no prior communication with those impacted on nor with any opportunity to provide input to either the RDC Director nor members of the Commission.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

This program has enjoyed good credibility within the human services and Developmental Disabilities Community. It has served as an excellent facilitator and communication source. It will be sorely missed when disbanded and it has been expressed that a void will continue to exist.

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

Really did give a vehicle to people in community for finding about available services. Filled real void in information-giving to community.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

- a. Powerless status of regional staff person.
- b. Diffusiveness of coordinator's role assignments (being assigned non-DD related tasks. Time being parceled in a non-constructive way) also confusion between Dd and mental health tasks.
- c. Not a clear understanding in community among some agencies as to role/purpose of DD (e.g., sheltered workshop).
- d. No vehicle for staff person to communicate philosophy/purpose of the program.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

For those who have taken advantage of DD program--

- better view of total service system;
- heightened awareness;
- has provided persons seeking service or trying to help others seek service with an advocate.

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

- better dissemination of philosophy/purpose of program;
- clearer articulation of what job/program means to agency supervisor and community so time not capriciously assigned to other duties;
- increased use of technical assistance and support available from state office.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

Very good; staff is concerned. Knowledgeable about interactions going on in area; seems well respected and competent.

Appears to be a cloud hanging over staff's head regarding ability to act. What the program really needs is what the planner has articulated, but is afraid to act upon; perception that supervisor and community stultifies her in terms of "political", "advocacy" activities based on fear but not necessarily fact.

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

- *Identification as people oriented and involving consumers.
- * Good media relationships and good media coverage.
- *Impact on public awareness by means of workshops, PSAs.
- *Technical assistance offered to human service professionals new in area.
- *Effective coordination with education, criminal justice, aging, health, housing to provide DD perspective on programs and services.
- *Recognized ability to advocate because it is not a direct service program.
- * Provides information and referral services not available elsewhere in region.
- *Is a "voice" for low incidence handicapped person concerns not provided elsewhere in region.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

- Lack of commitment and support by the RDC host agency.
- Need to maintain "low profile" as a human service program in an agency oriented to land use concerns. Effects ability to lobby effectively.
- Assignment of other duties to planner, thus reducing time for DD concerns.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

The project's overall impact has been positive in the region, especially in its identification as "people" concerned, and as involving consumers. The project has been especially successful in increasing awareness through its sponsorship and co-sponsorship of a host of workshops and other projects directed to specific audiences as well as the general public.

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

Serious effort will have to be made to re-establish the project in Region IV either through the RDC, or, if that proves impossible, to make the necessary agreements for another agency to host. At least two agencies, the ECSU and the Mental Retardation Advisory Committee, are interested.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

I was very positively impressed by the project and its activities. It is showing signs of maturing, of making a unique contribution in the region. Community persons and agencies are viewing the project positively, and good interaction seems to be taking place. The project is visible and enjoys good access to the media in the region. Members of the Council display a sense of concern about the abrupt termination of the project and want to take the steps that may be needed to reinstate the project or establish it in another host agency. This is a positive indication of community support and should be considered as decisions are made about this region in the near future.

Date of Visit: May 15, 1980

Region No: 6E, 6W, 8
HOST AGENCY: Six East Regional Development Commission
311 West Sixth Street
Willmar, Minnesota 56201
Executive Director: Eugene Hippe
D.D. Staff: John Walsh
Time Commitment: 100%
Budget: F.Y. 1980 (October 1, 1979 - September 30, 1980)
D.D. Funds: \$25,000
Local Match: \$19,279
Total: \$44,279

CASE STUDIES

1. Subject: Legislative Position Statements
 - a. Problem Statement: Representing various disability concerns, the D.D. Committee provides a varied perspective on the needs of the handicapped. Most Services available to disabled persons are a result of legislation. It is important for legislators to be informed of potential impact of statutes and changes in laws to better address the needs.
 - b. Verification: Copies of Legislative Committee meeting minutes, position statements and correspondence to and from legislators in the regions were provided.
2. Subject: Human Fullfillment Workshop
 - a. Problem Statement: The facilities of the Human Fullfillment Project from the University of Michigan approached the State D.D. Council for direction on possible strategies on providing training in Minnesota. Being referred to the Regional D.D. Programs, regional D.D. Planners became involved in developing possible alternative approaches to address the situation in Minnesota. The planner for region 6 and 8 served as the coordinator for the state. The advisory committee, with other regional D.D. Councils, decided to co-sponsor the two-day workshop in addition to a one week training program for resource persons from Minnesota.

- b. Verification: A copy of a summary evaluation form for the two-day workshop was provided. Using workshop registration information provided by the regional planner, staff of the State Planning Agency attempted to contact participants concerning their feelings about the workshop. Most of the persons could not be contacted or had changed jobs. Those persons who were reached said that they found the workshop useful. Note: The two-day workshop was held on February 28 and March 1, 1979. Most of the participants were employed by residential facilities or developmental achievement centers which traditionally experience frequent turnover in employees.

Domain Selection:

Memorandum dated: May 6, 1980

TO: Regionalism Committee - State D.D. Council
FROM: John D. Walsh, Southwest Minnesota Developmental
Disabilities Coordinator
RE: Site Visit Discussions

Priorities listed were: 1) Public Information/Public Education/Training and Technical Assistance; 2) Legislation; 3) Needs Assessment Planning.

Site Visit Team

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Affiliation</u> |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| Marvin Tritz | State Council Member |
| Pat Teiken | D.D. Planner |
| Marylee Fithian | State Staff |

Interviewees

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Affiliation</u> |
|--------------|--|
| Eugene Hippe | Executive Director, Six East R.D.C. |
| John Walsh | D.D. Planner for 6E, 6W, 8 |
| June Monson | Developmental Achievement Center |
| Ken Kober | Glacial Ridge Training Center |
| Gary Neilson | Sheltered Workshop |
| Jan Downey | Educational Cooperative Service Unit |
| Norm Tempel | Mental Health Center, D.D. Committee Member |
| Marge Mann | Educational Cooperative Service Unit |
| Frank Moorse | County Welfare Dept., Director |
| | Member D.D. Committee |
| Dave Sams | Residential Facility, Member D.D. Committee |

NameAffiliation

Gloria VandeBrake
Irene Holmquist

Employment Training Region 8 R.D.C.
Sheltered Workshop and residential
facility, Member D.D. Committee
Consumer, Member D.D. Committee

Donna Laue

TEAM FINDINGS

Program Strengths:

- 1) People view the D.D. program/committee as a forum for discussion of issues.
- 2) The Newsletter is broadly distributed and used.
- 3) Workshops and conferences have been well received.
- 4) Legislative positions were well stated.
- 5) The program/committee help facilitate coordination and cooperation among agencies.

Program Weaknesses:

- 1) The large diverse geographical area (18 counties) covered makes work difficult.
- 2) Providers do not all recognize the program as a resource.

Recommendations:

- 1) Consumer participation should be increased.
- 2) Public information efforts should be continued.
- 3) Recognition of Developmental Disabilities in state legislation would make the program/committee's job easier.
- 4) More time is needed for the Council to meet informally. Rotation of meeting location might be one way to do this.

Data Collection Instrument

I. Function (check appropriate boxes):

☒ Influencing ☐ Planning ☐ Evaluation

II. Domain of Activity (check appropriate box/boxes):

☐ Needs Assessment/Planning ☐ Coordination/Interagency Linkages
☐ Public Awareness/Training/T.A. ☒ Legislation ☐ Review Activities
☐ Advocacy ☐ I & R ☐ Other _____

III. Problem Statement (historical events that precipitated Council action):

Representing various disability concerns the DD Committee provides a varied perspective on the needs of the handicapped. Most services available to disabled persons is a result of legislation. It is important for legislators to be informed of potential impact of statutes and changes in laws to better address the needs.

IV. Objective (Expected Outcomes) of Activity:

- Passage of laws to better address needs of disabled
- Passage of laws to benefit disabled
- Greater awareness by RDC's and legislators of needs of disabled

V. Target Group/Audience to Which Activity was Addressed:

- State Legislators
- Regional Development Commissions
- Federal Legislators - to a lesser degree

VI. Process (activities/steps involved in implementing objectives):

| | Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| | | | Council | Other by Sources |
| A. Formulate committee and objectives | Walsh Committee | 1st Qtr FY79 | | |
| B. React to bills during 1979 Session | Committee RDC's | 2nd, 3rd Qtrs-- FY79 | | |
| C. Communicate with legislators | Committee RDC's | 3rd Qtr FY79 | | |

VI. Continued:

| | Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ | |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| | | | Council | Other by Sources |
| D. Evaluate effectiveness and develop proactive stance through position statements | Legislative Committee | 4th Qtr FY79 1st Qtr FY80 | | |
| E. With approval of RDC's address legislators | Legislative & Full Committee | 1st Qtr FY80 | | |
| F. Evaluate effectiveness of effort | Legislative Committee | 3rd Qtr FY80 | | |

VII. Concurrent Environmental Factors

- Other organizations involved in legislative efforts
- Allowed for coordination
- Some RDC's not attuned to legislative action

VIII. Outcome(s) of Activity:

| | New Resources/Funds Obtained (\$) (Identify Source) |
|---------------|---|
| A. Intended | Better awareness by legislators; passage of bills benefiting handicapped |
| B. Unintended | Greater support for entire DD effort by RDC's; coordinated effort with other consumer-oriented groups |

IX. Verification Process for Determining Impact of Activity:

- Document responses from legislators from area
- Document new legislation related to position statements

Data Collection Instrument

I. Function (check appropriate boxes):

☒ Influencing ☐ Planning ☐ Evaluation

II. Domain of Activity (check appropriate box/boxes):

☐ Needs Assessment/Planning ☐ Coordination/Interagency Linkages
☒ Public Awareness/Training/T.A. ☐ Legislation ☐ Review Activities
☐ Advocacy ☐ I & R ☐ Other _____

III. Problem Statement (historical events that precipitated Council action):

The facilities of the Human Fulfillment Project from the University of Michigan approached the State DD Council for direction on possible strategies in providing training in Minnesota. Being referred to the regional DD program, regional planners became involved in developing possible alternative approaches to address the situation in Minnesota. The planner from Regions Six and Eight served as coordinator for the state. The advisory committee, with other DD Councils, decided to co-sponsor the two-day workshop in addition to a one-week training program for resource persons from Minne

IV. Objective (Expected Outcomes) of Activity:

- Establishment and training of resource team
- Local resources utilized for development of program
- Training in two-day workshop of service providers, parents or disabled

V. Target Group/Audience to Which Activity was Addressed:

Two audiences were addressed:

1. Ten individuals who would receive intensive five-day training and in turn conduct sexuality workshops in Minnesota
2. Service providers, parents and disabled persons

VI. Process (activities/steps involved in implementing objectives):

| | Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ | |
|---|--------------------------|----------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| | | | Council | Other by Sources |
| A. Met with Human Fulfillment Project Staff | | 10/31/78 | | |
| B. Arrange facility for workshop | Walsh | 11/78 | | |
| C. Identify two training team members | Walsh and other planners | 12/78 | | |

VI. Continued:

| | Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| | | | Council | Other by Sources |
| D. Develop and print brochures | Sarah Johnston | 1/79 | | |
| E. Act as coordinator and registrar | Walsh | 10/78-2/79 | | |
| F. | | | | |

VII. Concurrent Environmental Factors

VIII. Outcome(s) of Activity:

| | New Resources/Funds Obtained (\$) (Identify Source) |
|---------------|--|
| A. Intended | Ten training team members participated; subsequently conducted one two-day workshop--hopefully plan more 50 professionals or parents attended workshop |
| B. Unintended | Good opportunity for sharing of project activities with other DD programs |

IX. Verification Process for Determining Impact of Activity:

Evaluation conducted by project staff at close of workshop.

Evaluation attached.

At close of training the involvement of this committee ceased. The training teams controlled future plans and activities.

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

- a.) People view Developmental Disabilities program/committee as a forum for discussion of issues.
- b.) Newsletter broadly distributed/used.
- c.) communication link the committee provides in area. Strong support of consumers and many agency people.
- d.) information, technical assistance to new professionals
- e.) linkage to state level issues
- f.) Sponsored some excellent conferences.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

- a.) large geographic area
- b.) problem with some service providers seeing coordinator as a resource.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

Felt need by most of community without this program the pooling of ideas would not occur. Has provided some leadership in legislative issues.

Better communication for consumers.

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

- a.) accessible building
- b.) more time for Council to be together informally - perhaps rotate location of meetings
- c.) more consumers needed

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

This program has to be one of the better regional programs in Developmental Disabilities. There was an overwhelming consensus that the program and committee plays a key coordination role as well as communication and public forum role.

Consumer involvement although still needing expansion, was good and this program was seen as a key to better communication to and from consumers.

When issues arise in the area where a catalyst or neutral body is needed, the Developmental Disabilities has been called on with satisfactory response.

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

- Legislative activities
- Communication
- Technical assistance availability
- Improvement of cooperation between agencies
- Newsletter
- Workshops
- Broad base of people affected
- Centralization of technical aid and assistance
- Public education

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

- Large and diverse area covered
- Travel distance involved
- Public unawareness of DD

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

- Increased awareness of programs
- Better cooperation
- Less duplication
- Better linkage of mental health centers
- An issue discussion forum
- Broader usage of technical assistance
- Sharing of information

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

- Increased consumer participation
- Continue public information
- Better usage of DD by service providers

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

Good

Strong leadership and planning in legislative activities

Increased interaction between agencies

Better awareness of DD by public workshops

The positive feedback from interviews conducted

The lack of negative from same with the exception of area size and distances to cover.

JUN 2 1980

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

The Developmental Disabilities Program in Regions 6 and 8 seems to be maturing in a positive direction. The areas of particular strength are:

- A) Communication - The regional council allows for a forum for exchange of ideas.
- B) Catalyst - As needs are identified, the Council serves as a catalyst to spurn new programs and/or services.
- C) Public Information/Education - The monthly newsletter, as well as the workshops, provide a much needed source of information and training.
- D) Public Awareness - Increased awareness in Region of DD and program availability.
- E) Legislative - Excellent positions were taken on legislative issues with good communication with legislators - identified legislative issues were utilized by other region as well as MARC Human Services Committee. People working together for a common cause.
- F) Coordination/Cooperation - Helps facilitate coordination and cooperation between agencies.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

The only major comment stated was the geographical size of the three (3) regions and that it is difficult for one person to cover eighteen (18) counties.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

The project has definitely increased awareness and information on developmental disabilities to the regions. The forum the Council provides is excellent.

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

Minnesota pass some legislation recognizing developmental disabilities and its function of coordination and technical assistance and this would improve the concern that many agencies have recognizing developmental disabilities.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

The program has matured in the last 18 months. The community at large is starting to recognize the program. The information and referral aspect has emerged as a viable resource for area providers and consumers. Legislatively, the Council has shown that lobbying can be done low key and effectively. If this program was to be discontinued, the developmentally disabled population would be the loser.

Date of Visit: May 8, 1980

Region No: 7E

HOST AGENCY: East Central Minnesota Regional Development Commission
119 South Lake Street
Mora, Minnesota 55051

Executive Director: Roger Ames (Acting)

D.D. Planner: Phil Schroeder

Time Commitment: 66%

Budget: F.Y. 1980 (October 1, 1979 - September 30, 1980)

D.D. Funds: \$ 8,333

Local Match: \$ 3,471

Total: \$11,804

CASE STUDIES

1. Subject: Parent Advocacy Coalition for Educational Rights
(PACER) Workshop
 - a. Problem Statement: In reforming the D.D. Advisory Committee in the fall of 1979, it became apparent there were no information/education programs for parents of developmentally disabled children. There was also no forum for parents of handicapped children to meet and exchange information.
 - b. Verification: Several people who were interviewed during the site visit spoke favorably of the workshop. Subsequent to the site visit state staff received copies of the checklist used to arrange the workshop, lists of pre-registrants and those actually in attendance as well as a copy of a brochure describing the workshop and a request for expense reimbursement by a workshop presenter.
2. Subject: Slide/tape and Service Directory
 - a. Problem Statement: In the summer of 1977 the 7E Developmental Disabilities Planning Council identified a priority need. That is, the need for increased awareness on the part of local direct service providers, local units of government, policy makers, and developmentally disabled individuals and their families as to the nature of developmental disabilities and the resources which exist in Region 7E.

- b. Verification: Site Visit team members viewed the slide/tape presentation and were provided with copies of the directory. Material subsequently submitted to state staff indicates to whom directories have been given as well as dates, places and audiences to which the slide/tape has been shown. In addition, copies of printing invoices for the directory and the check for payment for the script for the slide/tape were provided.

Domain Selection: No information was submitted.

Site Visit Team

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Affiliation</u> |
|----------------|--------------------|
| Dona Caswell | State Council |
| Dottie Spencer | State Council |
| RoseAnn Faber | State Staff |
| Lew Miller | State Staff |

Interviewees

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Affiliation</u> |
|----------------|---|
| Roger Ames | Acting Director |
| Phil Schroeder | D.D. Planner |
| Pat Leighton | County Nursing Service |
| Linda Schlieff | Rum River Citizen's League |
| Marlys Revak | Consumer, Member D.D. Advisory Committee |
| Ruby Wicklaund | President, Isanti County for the Disabled |
| Jean Kaddettz | County Welfare Department |
| Fred Hoffman | Developmental Achievement Center |

TEAM FINDINGS

Program Strengths:

- 1) Both the planner and members of the D.D. Advisory Committee are enthusiastic about the program.
- 2) Efforts are being made at coordination; the D.D. Planner, Health Systems Agency Planner for D.D. and the Mental Retardation coordinator hope to undertake a joint project next year.

Program Weaknesses:

- 1) The large rural nature of the area makes service difficult.
- 2) County Welfare departments are not involved in the program.

Recommendations:

- 1) Coordination needs to be increased. An example would be greater activity with County Welfare Departments.

I. Function (check appropriate boxes):

☒ Influencing ☐ Planning ☐ Evaluation

II. Domain of Activity (check appropriate box/boxes):

☐ Needs Assessment/Planning ☐ Coordination/Interagency Linkages
☒ Public Awareness/Training/T.A. ☐ Legislation ☐ Review Activities
☒ Advocacy ☐ I & R ☐ Other _____

III. Problem Statement (historical events that precipitated Council action):

In reforming the DD Advisory Committee in the fall of 1979, it became apparent there were no information/education programs for parents of developmentally disabled children. There was also no forum for parents of handicapped children to meet and exchange information.

IV. Objective (Expected Outcomes) of Activity:

To educate parents of pre-school or school age handicapped children as to their rights in planning an appropriate school program, and to be better advocates.

V. Target Group/Audience to Which Activity was Addressed:

Parents of pre-school and school age handicapped children.

VI. Process (activities/steps involved in implementing objectives):

| | Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ Council | Other by Sources |
|--|-----------------------|------|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| A. With assistance of DD Planning Coalition, staff contacted PACER | Staff | 1/80 | % of staff time | |
| B. Kanabec County ARC, Isanti County for Disabled and DD Advisory Committee to be co-sponsors. | Staff PACER Staff | 1/80 | | |
| C. Information on workshop received and disseminated. | Staff PACER Staff | 2/80 | | |

VI. Continued:

| | Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------|-----------------------------|--|
| | | | Council | Other by Sources |
| D. PACER Workshop held in Cambridge, MN | Staff PACER Staff Co-sponsors | 3/18/80 | | RDC - printing, postage, phone: 50.00 PACER Staff mileage: 30.00 |
| E. | | | | |
| F. | | | | |

VII. Concurrent Environmental Factors

None

VIII. Outcome(s) of Activity:

| | New Resources/Funds Obtained (\$) (Identify Source) |
|---|--|
| A. Intended Education of parents | |
| B. Unintended Awareness of D.D. Advisory Committee and their activities by school officials. | |

IX. Verification Process for Determining Impact of Activity:

58 parents directly impacted as a result of the activity.

Data Collection Instrument

I. Function (check appropriate boxes):

☒ Influencing ☐ Planning ☐ Evaluation

II. Domain of Activity (check appropriate box/boxes):

☐ Needs Assessment/Planning ☐ Coordination/Interagency Linkages
☒ Public Awareness/Training/T.A. ☐ Legislation ☐ Review Activities
☒ Advocacy ☒ I & R ☐ Other _____

III. Problem Statement (historical events that precipitated Council action):

In the summer of 1977, the 7E Developmental Disabilities Planning Council identified as a priority need in 7E the need for increased awareness on the part of local direct service providers, local units of government and policy makers, and developmentally disabled individuals and their families as to the nature of developmental disabilities and the resources which exist in Region 7E.

IV. Objective (Expected Outcomes) of Activity:

The written directory of resources was developed to be utilized by local physicians, social service providers, schools, and other professionals, as well as consumers, in locating/referring appropriate resources required in effectively dealing with a particular handicap. The slide/tape presentation focused on the definition of dd, locally available resources, special needs of developmentally disabled people and their families, and the potentials of developmentally disabled persons.

V. Target Group/Audience to Which Activity was Addressed:

Local physicians, social service agencies, county nursing departments, and school officials.

VI. Process (activities/steps involved in implementing objectives):

| | Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ | |
|--|-----------------------|----------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| | | | Council | Other by Sources |
| A. Resource assessment questionnaire finalized and data gathered. | DD Committee | Sept '78 | | |
| B. Format for project is developed- booklet format and content, slide and tape presentation developed. | DD Committee | Mar '79 | | |
| C. Resource Directory printed and disseminated to service providers. | DD Committee | June '79 | 314.00 | |

VI. Continued:

| | Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ | |
|--|---|---------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| | | | Council | Other by Sources |
| D. Slides taken, narration developed and program finalized. Program ready for use. | Staff, DD Committee Photographer Writer | Oct '79 | 736.00 | 40. - RDC |
| E. Target groups selected and informed of project and its availability. | DD Committee | ongoing | | |
| F. Program is presented to at least two groups in each county. | Staff, Committee | ongoing | | |

VII. Concurrent Environmental Factors

Because there were not any programs at all concurrent to this was the reason it was developed.

VIII. Outcome(s) of Activity:

| | New Resources/Funds Obtained (\$) (Identify Source) |
|--|--|
| A. Intended Awareness on the part of persons doing referral to the resources available to d.d. persons within the region. | |
| B. Unintended Public information tool regarding D.D. and the potential of d.d. persons. | |

IX. Verification Process for Determining Impact of Activity:

Number of times shown.

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

- 1) The director of the agency is committed to the work of the project.
- 2) The planner has a loose easy style that fits well with the environment of the region while at the same time is inovative in choosing his projects, making contacts with the right people, and keeping in mind the goals he has set for himself.
- 3) The Advisory Committee also seems strong - they understand their purpose and are comfortable with it.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

The only weakness is that of having a large and diverse area to work with - meaning a lot of time spent in travel.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

Positive. They have a good track record in everything they've sought to do.

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

None.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

As I evaluate Region 7E, I can only say that the grant money has been used well, that the work programs have been carried out exactly as they were planned, and that there has been an impact, a return, on the money invested in the increased visibility of the needs of the DD population.

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

I feel the greatest strength is involvement of enthusiastic persons - who seem to relate well to the DD planner. I was impressed by the fact that those interviewed spoke of DD - and were not specifically MR-oriented.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

- Because of the recent reorganization, they are still "feeling their way" (but this can also be positive!).
- Traditional DD planning not high priority by consumers.
- The differences in county services and structures creates its own problems-- coordination started and more is needed.
- Lack of documentation of what has been done.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

Both activities (PACER and the slide presentation and the Director) seem to have widespread positive impact.

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

Improve items under #2.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

My first evaluation was Region XI - Region 7E is vastly different--but its planner and programs are as appropriate for its area. I feel Phil has been greatly responsible for the enthusiasm here; there has been more advocacy here than formal planning.

There is a great need for the DD program here - I believe the new coordination and technical assistance goals would fit in well with their program.

1. What are the project's overall strengths?
 1. Those interviewed seemed very enthusiastic. The program fills a real need in a large rural area with few consumer groups.
 2. Efforts are being made at coordination; the D.D. Planner, HSA Planner for D.D. and the MR Coordinator hope to do a joint project next year.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?
 1. Large geographic area served.
 2. County Welfare departments need to be more involved in the program.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

In an area where there are few parent groups, the program gives parents a chance to interact. The PACER workshop was well received.

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

Increase involvement of county welfare departments.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

The smallest programs in terms of dollars received, seems to be moving in a positive direction. The people are very enthusiastic. The directory slide tape and PACER workshop have all been well received.

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

The project provides a focal point for referral of parents and consumers, as well as giving them a planning voice on the advisory committee. The sparse distribution of services in the region would contribute to the need for a coordinator who can at least try to make sure that the RDC considers specific human service needs. The inclusion of DD in the commissions plan was a start.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

At present the committee lacks a power base. Welfare funding is all important to some projects and can be very uncooperative. County commissioners also come with many different priorities and human services are seldom at the top.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

Overall, the project has provided a focal point for parents to relate to for information and referral and what services are available. The PACER Workshop educated some parents and started the process for more services in the schools.

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

I think strengthening the DD Committee can help in expanding the power base. Political clout is needed to change budgeting priorities, and education of local legislators and officials can be accomplished through a strong group.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

I think it has produced some very positive results. Parents have been brought onto the committee. Public information is under way through the development of the slide presentation, (which was excellent) and a good directory of services had been published. This with a half-time director is a good start to integrating planning and coordination in the RDC.

Date of Visit: June 5, 1980

Region No: 9

HOST AGENCY: Region Nine Development Commission
120 South Broad Street
Mankato, Minnesota 56001

Executive Director: Terence Stone

D.D. Staff: Kristin Juliar

Time Commitment: 100%

Budget: F.Y. 1980 (October 1, 1979 - September 30, 1980)

D.D. Funds: \$25,000

Local Match: \$ 8,334

Total: \$33,334

CASE STUDIES

1. Subject: Respite Care
 - a. Problem Statement: Brown County recognized a need for respite care so that parents would be able to be away from home on occasion, and thus relieve the stress involved in caring for a developmentally disabled family member.
 - b. Verification: A summary copy of the results of the evaluation survey of the project was provided.
 2. Subject: Comprehensive Vocational Training and Competitive Job Placement Program for Secondary Level Handicapped Youth
 - a. Problem Statement: In 1978, District 77 in Mankato and the Region Nine D.D. Planner developed a CETA proposal to fund vocational programs for handicapped youth in secondary schools. Prior to this time, the only available employment outlet was sheltered employment or DAC programming. With appropriate training the handicapped secondary students could enter competitive employment.
 - b. Verification: No additional information contained in site visit materials other than the case study form completed on the project.
- Domain Selection: No information was received.

Site Visit Team:

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Affiliation</u> |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| Mary Hinze | State Council Member |
| Ben Bryant | State Council Member |
| Marylee Fithian | State Staff |

Interviewees:

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Affiliation</u> |
|--------------------|--|
| Kristin Juliar | D.D. Planner |
| Terry Stone | Executive Director, Region 9 R.D.C. |
| Jeannette Barsness | Developmental Achievement Center |
| | DDPC Chairperson |
| Dottie Spencer | Council Member, Parent |
| Peggy Lynholm | Council Member, Consumer |
| Nancy Flatgard | Director, Developmental Achievement Center |
| Ginny Hanel | Council Member, Parent |
| Dave Munz | Developmental Achievement Center |
| Kathy Spinler | Director, Recreation Program |
| Carol Cole | Director, Special Education Cooperative |

TEAM FINDINGS

Program Strengths:

- 1) The program has provided some excellent technical assistance to organizations and agencies in the region.
- 2) The program has cosponsored a number of good conferences including a consumer forum which has been replicated in other parts of the state.
- 3) The program has received cooperation and support from most of the primary D.D. service providers in the region and many individuals.

Program Weaknesses:

- 1) Several persons indicated a need for assistance in areas where the program should be active e.g., information and referral.
- 2) Except for instances of specific technical assistance, persons interviewed knew little about the D.D. program. Communicating to and with the many publics served by the program is difficult even though there is a newsletter and other media are used as well.
- 3) Inability to bring additional monies into the region to meet identified needs is a problem.

Recommendations:

- 1) Inservice and other programs designed to increase county commissioners' awareness of D.D. need to be continued and expanded.
- 2) The circulation of the newsletter should be increased. In addition, a service directory should be developed and distributed.
- 3) Developmental Disabilities Council meetings should be held throughout the region in order to provide greater exposure to the program and council activities.
- 4) Since consumer groups do not seem to be flourishing in the region, additional ways need to be developed to respond to the needs of parents. This is a service gap which the D.D. Program/Council might consider filling.
- 5) Interest in regional Developmental Disabilities programs would increase, if Request for Proposal (RFP) monies were occasionally available to meet specific needs which a region has identified.

Case Study Form

For Minnesota
(State)

I. Function (check all that apply):

☒ Planning ☒ Influencing ☐ Monitoring/Evaluating

II. Targets for Change (check all that apply):

☐ Legislation ☐ Increased Interagency Coordination ☒ Increased Services/Research

☐ Administrative Policies/Procedures ☐ Increased Awareness (Public Education/Information) ☐ Other: _____

III. Problem Statement:

Brown County recognized a need for respite care so that parents would be able to be away from home on occasion, and thus relieve the stress involved in caring for a developmentally disabled family member.

IV. Objective (Expected Outcomes) of Activity:

The provision of free respite care services to families who had never had that assistance before. A summer CETA employee would be hired to provide long-term (over night or longer) respite care in Brown County.

V. Target Group/Audience to Which Activity was Addressed:

Parents of a DD child in Brown County.

- A. DD Council chose respite care as a priority and searched for a target site for demonstration project.
- B. Brown Co. chosen as target site
- C. Earle Henslin, Brown Co. DD Coordinator and the Region Nine Planner formed respite care task force in Brown Co. with representatives from welfare, public health nursing, the ARC, DAC, school, parents, and other interested persons.
- D. Task Force decided to conduct an assessment.
- E. The DD Planner developed a needs assessment refined by Brown Co. Welfare Dept., which was mailed to parents.
- F. A summary of the findings was prepared showing summer to be the most appropriate time for a long-term respite care program.

| Resources/Funds Allocated (\$) | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|
| Council | Other by Sources |
| | |

VII. Concurrent Environmental Factors:

All interested persons were involved in the process.

VIII. Outcome(s) of Activity:

- A. Intended:
 1. A summer respite care program was developed.
 2. A CETA employee was hired.
 3. The program is currently in the 3rd year.
- B. Unintended:

As a result of developing a summer program, a framework for year long short-term respite care was developed and is being explored for region-wide implementation.

| New Resources/Funds Obtained | |
|------------------------------|--------------|
| Source | Amount (\$) |
| CETA | \$850/summer |

IX. Verification Process:

Contact Brown Co. Social Service
 Contact parents who participated in the program.
 See surveys and follow-up surveys on file at Region Nine.

Case Study Form
For Minnesota
(State)

I. Function (check all that apply):

☒ Planning ☒ Influencing ☐ Monitoring/Evaluating

II. Targets for Change (check all that apply):

☐ Legislation ☐ Increased Interagency Coordination ☒ Increased Services/Research

☐ Administrative Policies/Procedures ☐ Increased Awareness (Public Education/Information) ☐ Other: _____

III. Problem Statement:

In 1978, District 77 in Mankato and the Region Nine DD Planner developed a CETA proposal to fund vocational programs for handicapped youth in secondary schools. Prior to this time, the only available employment outlet had been sheltered employment or DAC programming. With appropriate training, the handicapped secondary students could enter competitive employment.

IV. Objective (Expected Outcomes) of Activity:

1. Participants would become competitively employed.
2. Less dependence on public sponsored employment programs.
3. Increased availability of unskilled and semi-skilled employees to local employers.

V. Target Group/Audience to Which Activity was Addressed:

Special education students in District 77 (Mankato School District).

- A. Development of model for vocational training and acquisition of YETP funding.
- B. Application made to Dept. of Economic Security
- C. Employment of school staff for the program.
- D. Training of the staff
- E. Recruitment of employment sites and assessment of skills to be taught for these jobs.
- F. Training of student participants
- G. Placement of students in job sites.

| Resources/Funds Allocated (\$) | |
|--------------------------------|------------------|
| Council | Other by Sources |
| X | X |

VII. Concurrent Environmental Factors:

Local employers lacked adequate numbers of unskilled and semi-skilled workers.

VIII. Outcome(s) of Activity:

A. Intended:

1. The project was funded
2. Students were enrolled in the training program.
3. The program is still in existence

B. Unintended:

| New Resources/Funds Obtained | |
|------------------------------|-------------|
| Source | Amount (\$) |
| Dept. of Economic Security | \$67,780 |

IX. Verification Process:

Proposal and related information (on file at Region Nine) Contact District #77.

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

- 1.) Has provided some excellent technical assistance to organizations and agencies in the region. Has co-sponsored some very good conferences including the Consumer Forum.
- 2.) The ability to coordinate activities with other planning areas of the Regional Development Commission.
- 3.) Responsive to the community.
- 4.) Newsletter is helpful.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

Except for instances of specific technical assistance, persons interviewed didn't know much about the DD program. Several persons indicated a need for assistance in areas where the program should be active, e.g. information and referral.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

DD plan has had a big effect on the development of services (especially residential). Technical assistance in grant writing has resulted in funding of some important projects e.g. respite care in Brown County, Voc. Ed. program in Mankato.

Public education improved and better coordinated.

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

- 1.) Broader circulation of Newsletter
- 2.) Increased public awareness of availability and services
(Several persons interviewed said they really didn't know anything about the DD program/Council.)
- 3.) Broad circulation of a service directory.
- 4.) Move DD Council meetings around the region in order to provide greater exposure to the program and Council activities.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

Has played a key role in the following:

- a.) Service plan for residential programs.
- b.) Public education in the form of conferences and a newsletter.
- c.) technical assistance in writing grants and obtaining resources for new programs.

Needs to do a better job of informing the public, etc. about its existence and what it has to offer on behalf of persons with developmental disabilities.

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

The project has several readily apparent strengths, which are listed below:

- a) The project is integrated with the Region Nine Development Commission.
- b) The project has strong support from Terry Stone, Regional Director.
- c) The project has a strong professional staff, even though the former coordinator is on maternity leave and may not return to the position.
- d) The project has good community support from both agencies and individuals.
- e) The project has sponsored some outstanding programs for staff people working in DD facilities and for parents.
- f) The organizational structure of DD as a part of the Region Nine Development Commission allows the DD coordinator to provide services to the community at minimal cost.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

The major weaknesses observed are listed below:

- a) Communicating to and with the many publics served by the DD coordinator is a problem even though there is a newsletter and other media used for informing people.
- b) Reaching people living in isolated areas with services seems to be a problem area that needs addressing.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

The project seems to have had a major impact on the region, especially in working with the public schools and with parent groups. It seems to have had impact on the governmental structure (Region Nine Development Commission) in that it has been accepted into the Human Resources Planning Department as a unit equal to sections on aging, criminal justice, medical services, etc. The project has helped to generate money for the region and has helped to generate dialogue among agencies providing DD services.

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

Areas of improvement are listed below:

- a) The level of support for DD by the various county commissioners and by the members of the Region Nine Development Commission could not be assessed accurately. However, it appears that efforts should be made to increase the level of support by these two levels of officialdom in order to give DD a higher priority in their budgeting process.
- b) The level of knowledge about DD held by county and region commissioners was difficult to determine. However, it appears that they need to know more about DD. In service and other programs designed to increase commissioners' awareness of DD need to be continued and expanded.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

Overall evaluation:

I was impressed by the knowledge and dedication of the professional staff. I liked the building housing the project.

Region Nine includes nine counties. It must be difficult for one person to cover such a large geographical area. However, one person is better than no person.

I do not understand fully what the creation of DD coordinator did to the role of MR coordinators who, I am led to believe, existed in the counties and the regions before DD coordinators. There must be a need, however, for both positions. I need more information about this situation before making a final evaluation; for if there was an MR person supported with local money who was replaced by a DD person supported with federal money, that is not a good development.

Personally, I like the idea of regional coordination.

I did not get the feeling that the Region Nine DD coordinator is much involved with the REM program. Perhaps REM is so well organized that much involvement would result in duplication and would detract from services needed in other parts of the region.

I am unclear as to how much the DD coordinator is involved with public school districts. I would suggest that the coordinator contact Larry Erie at the Minnesota Department of Education for a listing of community education coordinators working in the region. Community education needs to be reminded of its responsibility for serving all segments of the community, including the handicapped - - even those living in group homes. Mr. Erie's telephone number is 612-296-2587.

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

1. Surface parent needs not being met by existing services and programs.
2. Technical assistance offered in grant writing and program development.
3. Understanding of the unique characteristics of the area.
4. Cooperation and support from most of the primary providers of DD services in the region.
5. Recognized as a source of information on a wide variety of topics by both consumers and professionals.
6. Ability in several cases to identify funds to start programs.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

1. Inability to bring additional monies into the area to meet needs identified.
2. Project may be unable to continue if RDC feels sufficient funds are not provided to the program.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

The project has enabled the major DD-serving agencies and consumers in the region to meet and to share needs as well as information and expertise. Because there is staff available, research, data gathering, and technical assistance are available to document need and devise strategies for meeting needs. This capability is recognized and valued in the region.

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

1. Additional ways of responding to the needs which the parents expressed since consumer groups do not seem to be flourishing in the region. This is a gap which DD might consider filling.
2. Additional outreach and public information efforts to acquaint parents with the information services of the DD program.
3. RFPs from the state which are designed to encourage program providers to submit projects for funding. It would strengthen interest in the regional programs if some demonstration grant monies were occasionally available in an area to meet some of the needs identified.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

The project appears to be meeting a need in the region for coordination, need identification, technical assistance, and public information demonstrated by the case studies and the representatives with whom we spoke. There were no negative reports given. After 8 years of existence, the program seems to be well accepted by the DD extended community. It is also accepted by the RDC as an important part of their human service responsibility.

The project has recently cooperatively worked on some rather unique projects in the area. Cited could be the Consumer Forum, which has replicated elsewhere in the state; the Respite Care program; and the program to fund vocational programs for handicapped youth in secondary schools in Mankato. These programs have all directly benefitted DD persons, have involved coordination among a number of agencies, and have had strong technical assistance from the DD regional program. This visible evidence of the DD regional program should serve to gain further support from the community and increase visibility.

Date of Visit: June 12, 1980

Region No: 10

HOST AGENCY: Southeastern Minnesota Regional Development Commission
301 Marquette Bank Building
Rochester, Minnesota 55901

Executive Director: Mr. Donald Hann

D.D. Staff: Marilyn Bothun

Time Commitment: 65%

Budget: F.Y. 1980 (October 1, 1979 - September 30, 1980)

D.D. Funds: \$25,000

Local Match: \$16,525

Total: \$41,525

CASE STUDIES

1. Subject: Access Employment Conference
 - a. Problem Statement: The following needs were identified: 1) a need to bring together handicapped people and employers along with change agents like legislators and advocates, 2) a need to discuss changes in the law, and 3) a need to educate employers and consumers about programs which benefit the handicapped.
 - b. Verification: There was no information contained in the site visit materials other than the case study form completed on the project.
2. Subject: Elderly with Special Needs Conference
 - a. Problem Statement: There was a recognition that someone should address the needs of a population of the elderly, those with special needs, including the developmentally disabled and otherwise handicapped. Specific workshops needed to be designed to provide helpful insights and techniques that would enable participants to more effectively provide services and meet needs.
 - b. Verification: There was no additional information contained in the site visit materials other than the case study form completed on the project.

3. Subject: Semi-Independent Living Legislation
- a. Problem Statement: There was a need to expand the continuum of services to include a financial mechanism to support the actual provision of semi-independent living services.
- b. Verification: The site visit team was provided with copies of "1980 Legislative Issues" and "Influencing Human Services Legislation... A Regional Perspective".

Domain Selection: No information was received.

Site Visit Team:

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Affiliation</u> |
|-----------------|----------------------|
| Mary Hinze | State Council Member |
| Dona Caswell | State Council Member |
| Marylee Fithian | State Staff |

Interviewees:

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Affiliation</u> |
|-------------------------|---|
| Marilyn Bothun | D.D. Planner |
| Don Hann | Executive Director, Region 10 R.D.C. |
| Val Koster | Consumer representing Autism |
| | Member Region 10 D.D. Council |
| Pat Carlson | Department of Public Welfare |
| | Member Region 10 D.D. Council |
| Stan Goff | Steele County Social Services |
| Jon Wayne | Business Manager, Region 10 R.D.C. |
| Bob Johnson | United Cerebral Palsy of Minnesota |
| Senator Jerry Gunderson | Semi-Independent Living Legislation |
| Chuck Anderson | Local Advocate for Minnesota Epilepsy League |
| Carol Banister | Executive Director, Minnesota Epilepsy League |
| Lance Johnson | University of Rochester Center |

TEAM FINDINGS

Program Strengths:

- 1) The program has been able to coordinate with other regional programs such as aging, arts and criminal justice.
- 2) The program has established links with other agencies and has focused on more than one disability. Technical assistance has been provided to Minnesota Epilepsy League and United Cerebral Palsy.
- 3) A number of good conferences have been sponsored.

- 4) The program provides information and referral to consumers and professionals in the region.
- 5) The program has been effective in developing and supporting legislation at the state level.

Program Weaknesses:

- 1) Participation by the public education sector has been quite limited.
- 2) The Regional Development Commission as an entity is not supported by the region's most influential newspapers and this in turn affects, to some extent, the credibility and visibility of the D.D. Program.
- 3) Although persons interviewed were able to talk about impact regarding the particular projects they were involved in, community persons were able to say very little about the Council's activities, per se.

Recommendations:

- 1) An effort should be made to increase participation by education personnel.
- 2) Efforts to develop legislation should be continued and expanded.
- 3) In order to provide more public information and other services to consumers, closer cooperation with consumer organizations should be explored.

PROFILE OF COUNCIL ACTIVITIES

Region 10

Case Study Form

For Access-Employment
(State) (Conference)

Function (check all that apply):

☒ Planning ☒ Influencing ☐ Monitoring/Evaluating

I. Targets for Change (check all that apply):

☒ Legislation ☒ Increased Interagency
Coordination ☒ Increased
Services/Research

☒ Administrative ☒ Increased Awareness
Policies/Procedures (Public Education/
Information) ☒ Other: Increased input
via Consumers

II. Problem Statement:

The following needs were identified.

- a need to bring together handicapped people and employers, also including change agents (legislators) and advocates.
- a need to discuss changes in the law
- a need to educate employers and consumers about programs which benefit the handicapped.

IV. Objective (Expected Outcomes) of Activity:

- update and inform participants of current developments in the following areas:
Targeted Jobs Tax Credit, Section 504 of the Rehab. Act of 1973 and the Minnesota workers compensation law.
- Provide a way to identify and develop strategies for influencing future legislative and administrative change with emphasis on Section 504 and TJTC.
- Enhance the resource network capacity to respond to consumer needs.
- Provide a "feedback" report for participants, legislators and others.

V. Target Group/Audience to Which Activity was Addressed:

The conference will draw together people who have a vital interest in the employment of handicapped citizens.

Employment counselors, job interviewers, and their supervisors will contribute their experience. Handicapped job seekers, advocates for special groups, such as mentally retarded, persons with epilepsy, cerebral palsy, mental illness, the blind, and others will share their perception of the urgent needs of consumers. State level decision makers, legislators and administrators will work together with participants to identify strategies for change. Local officials will provide a view of special area problems.

I. Process (Activities/Steps Involved in Implementing Objective):

- A. Informal meetings with Consumers
- B. D.D. and E/T staff discussion
- C. Development of recommendations to Advisory Councils (D.D. and RETAC)
- D. Advisory Councils and RDC support for the Conference
- E. Planning meetings with U of M staff and invitations to Conference participants public mailing as well as news releases.
- F. Hold Conference

| Resources/Funds Allocated (\$) | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Council | Other by Sources |
| | Consumer attendance |
| | Staff |
| | Staff Work on Council Action |
| | RDC Staff U of M Staff-mailing |

II. Concurrent Environmental Factors:

Requests for follow-up information from Senator Brataas and Laufenburger
 Consideration of conference proceedings in relationship to 1980 Commission
 Legislative Issues.

III. Outcome(s) of Activity:

- A. **Intended:**
 - education of participants on specific areas see IV
 - enhanced resource network
 - outlined strategies for change
- B. **Unintended:** /Barrier
 Staff turnover and limited follow through on intended feedback.
 D.D. Council response to this is to continue with a work objective in 1981 related to Employment needs of handicapped people.

| New Resources/Funds Obtained | |
|------------------------------|-------------|
| Source | Amount (\$) |
| N/A | |

X. Verification Process:

1. Review of Conference file which includes:
 - 1) Conference Brochure
 - 2) News release
 - 3) Conference Budget
 - 4) Attendance Roster
 - 5) Evaluation sheet and tally
2. Review of Conference tapes-(all sessions are on tape)

For Elderly with Special Needs (Conference)
(State)

Function (check all that apply):

☒ Planning☒ Influencing☐ Monitoring/Evaluating

Targets for Change (check all that apply):

☐ Legislation☒ Increased Interagency
Coordination☒ Increased
Services/Research☒ Administrative
Policies/Procedures☒ Increased Awareness
(Public Education/
Information)☐ Other: _____

I. Problem Statement:

There was a recognition that someone should address the needs of a population of the elderly, those with special needs, including the Developmentally Disabled and otherwise handicapped. Specific Workshops needed to be designed to provide helpful insights and techniques that would enable participants to more effectively provide services and meet needs.

7. Objective (Expected Outcomes) of Activity:

To define the Aged Developmentally Disabled and Physically Handicapped.

To identify available services for the aged handicapped person.

To explore Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and its impact on health care services.

To identify new and proven insights and techniques in working with the elderly handicapped.

To identify alternative services for senior citizens.

Target Group/Audience to Which Activity was Addressed:

This program was intended to be of interest to all persons that work with and are concerned about our elderly. This included all helping professionals, persons in health occupations and social services, the clergy, and other concerned service providers.

- A. A planning committee was established to discuss the need for the conference.
- B. Obtained D.D. and Aging Council support
- C. Obtained RDC Board and Administrative support
- D. Planning committee developed final conference format.
- E. Invitation of conference participants and presentors.
- F. Hold conference

| Resources/Funds Allocated (\$) | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Council | Other by Sources |
| Council support | D.D. and Aging Staff U of M staff & others |
| | RDC support |
| | D.D., Aging, U of M staff |
| | Committee |
| | Facilities for the Conference and participants. |

I. Concurrent Environmental Factors:

II. Outcome(s) of Activity:

- A. **Intended:**
 - Provided educational discussions and technique
 - on 504
 - on current trends
 - on counseling older D.D. persons
 - on the hearing impaired and the visually impaired
- B. **Unintended:**

| New Resources/Funds Obtained | |
|------------------------------|-------------|
| Source | Amount (\$) |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Verification Process:

- 1) Interview with Planning Committee - Gil Wilkins - Lance Johnson
- 2) Review Conference file which includes:
 - tentative outline
 - planning notes
 - newsrelease
 - evaluation form and tally sheet
 - attendance roster

For Semi-Independent Living Legislation
(State)

Function (check all that apply):

☒ Planning ☒ Influencing ☐ Monitoring/Evaluating

Targets for Change (check all that apply):

☒ Legislation ☒ Increased Interagency
Coordination ☒ Increased
Services/Research

☒ Administrative ☐ Increased Awareness
Policies/Procedures (Public Education/
Information) ☐ Other: _____

II. Problem Statement:

There was a need to expand the continuum of services to include a financial mechanism to support the actual provision of independent living services.

V. Objective (Expected Outcomes) of Activity:

- 90/10 financial reimbursement to counties for semi-independent living services
- Independent living services could be available
- There would be a positive impact on the development of group homes

Target Group/Audience to Which Activity was Addressed:

The target was to introduce in the Minnesota Legislature and successfully pass a piece of legislation which would provide funding for semi-independent living programs.

A.D.D. Council and RDC support for legislative effort

B. Planning Committee developed draft/obtained

C. Garnered support for bill through numerous presentations state wide.

D. Bill was introduced
Positive testimony at hearings

E. Passed the Senate 1.2 million

F. Continued to monitor during the 2nd year of the biennium

| Resources/Funds Allocated (\$) | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Council | Other by Sources |
| Vote of Support | Staff support Planning Committee Legislative Support |
| | Staff/Agency support |
| | Staff/Legislative support |
| | Staff/Agency/Consumer support Staff/Legislative support |
| | Staff support |

I. Concurrent Environmental Factors:

Governor support was for the program but withheld endorsement of a new appropriation

II. Outcome(s) of Activity:

A. Intended:

- Bill was introduced
- There was much support for the bill

B. Unintended:

- Heightened awareness of D.D. program in the region and in the State
- Stronger relationship with service providers

| New Resources/Funds Obtained | |
|------------------------------|-------------|
| Source | Amount (\$) |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Verification Process:

Verify the following supporters:

- Metro Health Board
- ARRM
- Mn. ARC
- State Council for the Handicapped
- Sue Rockne Ch. Legislative Committee

- discussions with Ardo Wrobel
- discussions with the Governor and his office staff
- planning committee
 - * Nancy McCarthy
 - * Pat Carlson
 - * Roy Harley

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

- Project's attachment to RDC provides access to local elected officials who comprise the Commission. These officials make many decisions affecting human services.
- Technical assistance offered to representatives of consumer groups such as MEL and UCP.
- Information and referral capability for DD consumers and professionals in region.
- Ability to see needs of the entire region, thus assisting in developing a better continuum of services and avoid duplication.
- Effectiveness in developing and supporting legislation at the state level.
- Support for the program by the RDC.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

- Rather minimal participation from public education sector.
- RDC on a whole is not supported by the region's most influential newspapers and this affects to some extent the credibility and visibility of the DD program.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

Within the human service community and among consumers, the project is identified as a unique source for coordinating information about needs and service, as an articulate voice in making concerns known, and as an advocate in seeking support for consumers and their groups. The project is unique among the regional DD programs in its interest and capability to develop and promote needed legislation at the state level. It is also unique in its efforts to integrate the DD regional program with the State Planning Office with other human services regional programs (e.g. Aging, Arts, Criminal Justice).

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

- Continuing to build on capacity to develop legislation.
- Exploring closer cooperation with consumer organizations through joint mailings lists and newsletters in order to expand public information to consumers and in other ways.
- Explore ways of interacting with education, which would demonstrate mutual interest in improving services.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

The Region 10 DD program has established itself as a credible, articulate, caring force for voicing concerns and coordinating services for DD persons. It has some unique capabilities at the state level to impact on legislation and the Human Services Commission of the State Planning Office. These activities will benefit the other regional programs in the state.

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

- 1.) Ability to coordinate with other regional programs such as aging, arts, criminal justice.
- 2.) Availability of local officials through Regional Development Commission.
- 3.) Liaison with other agencies and concerns across more than one disability line.
- 4.) Has co-sponsored some good conferences.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

- 1.) Although persons interviewed were able to talk about impact regarding the particular projects they were involved in, community persons were able to say very little about the Council's activities, per se.
- 2.) Need more participation from the schools and other education facilities.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

Has had good impact in terms of clearinghouse for information and technical assistance.

Has had good support from its Commission in terms of promoting legislation at the state level.

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

a.) More participation by education.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

It appears to be a strong program in the area, enjoying support from the Regional Development Commission and consumers in the region. It is not apparent if it is a program strength or a personality strength since the staff person is very highly thought of and respected.

There does need to be more of an attempt to improve the tone of communication with persons at the state level. Further, there needs to be a more precise accounting of the staff time allotted to this project relative to both the grant work program and the grant budget.

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

Representation on council is broad and placement in RDC provides good coordination with related agencies. Marilyn Bothun is a strong coordinator and has worked to strengthen consumer agencies (Epilepsy-Autism UCP) as well as educating the community about DD.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

Lack of participation by special education and vocational education is a serious weakness. I suspect that the strength to the project of having a strong staff could also be a weakness because less involvement by council might be utilized. This is a variable that needs evaluation over time.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

The impact has been considerable on a legislative level because of the effort to push a bill to fund semi-independent living. This made DD visible in the capitol. The conferences which included one each on aging and employment encouraged collaboration of many agencies and consumers.

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

Lessening of tensions between funding agencies and clarifying roles of staff -
DD and RDC both -

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

Overall - a good job - feedback from consumers - parents and agencies was positive. The mother of an autistic child had been involved in developing services for the first time and a group had been formed. Epilepsy had had strong support via United Way presentation and CETA position to develop an outreach position.

UCP of MN. has had good support in developing a new board in S.E. Minnesota.

In the legislative area - legislators are recruited and informed about DD persons.

Technical assistance is provided where needed - council members take needs to community and follow-up is provided with TA which is meaningful to county governments.

Region No: 11

HOST AGENCY: Metropolitan Council
300 Metro Square Building
7th and Robert Streets
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101

Executive Director: Eugene Franchette

D.D. Staff: Toni Lippert, Joe Banda

Time Commitment: 100%; 100%

Budget: F.Y. 1980 (October 1, 1979 - September 30, 1980)

D.D. Funds: \$ 44,200

Local Match: \$ 68,100

Total: \$112,300

CASE STUDIES

1. Subject: D.D. Information Exchange/Newsletter
 - a. Problem Statement: There was no single mechanism for providing and sharing information on D.D. activities across the seven county region aimed at all disability groups and services. Many notices of new programs, services, funding opportunities, RFPs, studies, reports, publications etc. came to the Metro D.D. Program Office which could be utilized by a wider audience if there were a regular channel of communication among consumers and providers of the region.
 - b. Verification: The site visit team saw a copy of the computer print-out of the newsletter mailing list. The total distribution was approximately 645 copies. Copies of actual printing requests were not readily available. An example of how widely read the newsletter is can be seen by the response to an article on Shared-Ride Taxi Service. Letters requesting further information were received from: 1) United Cerebral Palsy of Alabama; 2) Association for Retarded Citizens - New York; 3) Mississippi, Arkansas, Tennessee Council of Governments as well as agencies in the states of 4) Kansas; 5) Arizona; 6) Virginia; 7) Illinois (2); and 8) Washington D.C.. Several subscribers to the newsletter were randomly selected and contacted by phone by a member of the site visit team. The response to the telephone contacts was very positive.

2. Subject: Developmental Disabilities Information System

a. Problem

Statement:

Until the D.D. Systems Analyst was employed, there was no data base developed by any agency which combined the professional expertise of a data systems analyst with experience and knowledge of the D.D. population and delivery system. Projections of client and service characteristics were based on "Key informant" information and prevalence estimates.

b. Verification:

The Trends Report has been used as a source of information for group home development (30 applications). It has been required reading in some University of Minnesota classes as well as at St. Mary's Junior College. Some consumer groups have also used the report to support the need for an expansion of the family subsidy program. Team members saw lists indicating which agencies were sent and which agencies returned survey forms, the contents of which have been used to establish the data base. The team also saw copies of documents needed to print Trends Report and Respite Care Report. The team saw letters from several sources requesting either the Trends Report or specific data.

Domain Selection:

A document, Region Site Visit Criteria lists: 1) Needs Assessment/Planning; 2) Coordination/Interagency linkages; 3) Public Information/Education and Training/Technical Assistance; 4) Legislation; 5) Review Activities; 6) Advocacy and 7) Information and Referral. An additional section of the document is Metro Region D.D. Program 1975-1980.

Site Visit Team:

Name

Affiliation

Dottie Spencer
Kris Juliar
Marilyn Bothun
Marylee Fithian
RoseAnn Faber

State Council Member
D.D. Planner
D.D. Planner
State Staff
State Staff

Interviewees:

Name

Affiliation

Toni Lippert
Joe Banda
Malcolm Mitchell
Evelyn Paul
Don Bump
Barney Hagen

D.D. Planner
D.D. Planner
Metropolitan Health Board
Hennepin County Welfare Department
Peoples Child Care Inc.
United Cerebral Palsy of Minnesota

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Affiliation</u> |
|-------------------|------------------------|
| Sharon Hardy | Consumer member |
| Charlotte Johnson | D.D. Task Force |
| | Consumer Vice-Chair |
| Roger Israel | D.D. Task Force |
| | Director Metro Council |
| Eugene Franchette | Human Resources Unit |
| | Executive Director |
| | Metropolitan Council |

TEAM FINDINGS

Program Strengths:

- 1) Data from needs assessment activities is being used.
- 2) There is good staff response and follow-through.
- 3) The monthly newsletter is well received.

Program Weaknesses:

- 1) There is too much emphasis placed on the needs of the mentally retarded population.
- 2) The program has more responsibility than authority.
- 3) There is a need to focus specifically on interagency linkages.
- 4) The staff is not able to act as rapidly as it would like because of the complex structure and process of the Metropolitan Council.

Recommendations:

- 1) More orientation and training should be provided for consumer members of the D.D. Task Force.
- 2) Efforts to increase interagency cooperation should continue.
- 3) More emphasis should be placed on the needs of the non-mentally retarded segment of the developmentally disabled population.

I. Function (check appropriate boxes):

☒ Influencing ☐ Planning ☐ Evaluation

II. Domain of Activity (check appropriate box/boxes):

☐ Needs Assessment/Planning ☒ Coordination/Interagency Linkages
☒ Public Awareness/Training/T.A. ☐ Legislation ☐ Review Activities
☐ Advocacy ☒ I & R ☐ Other _____

III. Problem Statement (historical events that precipitated Council action):

There was no single mechanism for providing and sharing information on DD activities across the seven-county region aimed at all disability groups and services. Many notices of new programs, services, funding opportunities, RFPs, studies, reports, publications, etc. came to the Metro DD Program Office which could be utilized by a wider audience if there were a regular channel of communication among consumers and providers of the region.

IV. Objective (Expected Outcomes) of Activity:

1. Increasing access by consumers and providers to services and information which would be useful to them.
2. Promoting a stable, continuing flow and sharing of information among providers, and users of services.
3. Providing a publication for DD individuals and organizations, and providers to make their needs known.
4. Improving the understanding and visibility of the Metro Region DD Program.

V. Target Group/Audience to Which Activity was Addressed:

1. Developmentally disabled individuals
2. Consumer organizations
3. DD service agencies (public and private)
4. Generic service agencies (public and private)
5. Concerned public who reside in Metro Area
6. National publications

VI. Process (activities/steps involved in implementing objectives):

| | Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| | | | Council | Other by Sources |
| A. - Developing format | Toni Lippert | | X | X |
| B. - Establish mailing list | Toni Lippert | | | |
| C. - Reviewing Sources of information | Toni Lippert | | | |
| D. - Editing items | Toni Lippert | | | |
| E. - Typing and layout | Wilma Raleigh | | | |
| F. - Editing | Toni Lippert PIO of Metro Council | | | |
| G. - Mailing | Wilma Raleigh | | | |
| H. - Maintaining current mailing list | Wilma Raleigh and Toni Lippert | | | |

| | Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ | |
|----|--------------------------|------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| | | | Council | Other by Sources |
| D. | | | | |
| E. | | | | |
| F. | | | | |

VII. Concurrent Environmental Factors Requests for additional information on published items have been requested by readers. Items are often reprinted in other agencies' newsletters within Minnesota and in other states. Recent item about "Shared-Ride Taxi Service" project reprinted in PCMR's "Newsbreak" brought 8 requests for further information. Circulation started with 325 and now has doubled to about 650.

VIII. Outcome(s) of Activity:

| | New Resources/Funds Obtained (\$) (Identify Source) |
|--|--|
| A. Intended All expected outcomes listed in IV have been realized. | |
| B. Unintended 1. Heightened awareness of program across the state and national agencies. 2. Rate of increase in circulation | |

IX. Verification Process for Determining Impact of Activity:

1. Continuing increase in circulation
2. Requests for additional information on reported items
3. Requests for Metro Region publications listed in Information Exchange.
4. Increase in I & R as a consequence of receiving newsletter.
5. Reprint of Information Exchange items in other newsletters of local and out-state Minnesota agencies and national newsletters.
6. Increase in scope of information regarding other disability groups.
7. Increase in items submitted for publication.

Function (check appropriate boxes):

☐ Influencing ☒ Planning ☐ Evaluation

I. Domain of Activity (check appropriate box/boxes):

☒ Needs Assessment/Planning ☒ Coordination/Interagency Linkages
☐ Public Awareness/Training/T.A. ☐ Legislation ☒ Review Activities
☐ Advocacy ☐ I & R ☐ Other _____

II. Problem Statement (historical events that precipitated Council action):

Until the DD Systems Analyst was employed, there was no data base developed by any agency which combined the professional expertise of a data systems analyst with the experience and knowledge of the DD population and delivery system. Projections of client and service characteristics were based on "key informant" information and prevalence estimates.

IV. Objective (Expected Outcomes) of Activity:

1. To develop a data base for planning and development of services,
2. To use a systems approach to data collection, analysis and reporting of the client and service system in the Metro Area,
3. To provide the State Council and DD regional programs with technical assistance in developing their regional information systems,
4. To provide a data base for the Metropolitan Health Board to use in 1122/CON reviews of ICF/MRs,
5. To integrate DD data with the Health Systems Data,
6. To integrate DD data with the Metropolitan Council Data,
7. To provide data to generic agencies and the general public.

V. Target Group/Audience to Which Activity Was Addressed:

The products of this activity were directed to:

1. the DD population to better identify their needs for services,
2. the DD service delivery system to identify barriers to service and weaknesses in the system which could be improved,
3. the State Council and other DD Regional Programs to assist them in their needs assessment responsibilities,
4. the Metropolitan Health Board for determining need in the region for community-based facilities for DD individuals,
5. for fulfilling the MHB's need for data in the DD component of their Health Systems Plan, and
6. the Metropolitan Council to assist them in their responsibility to the Legislature "to provide for the orderly and economic development of the Metropolitan Area."

VI. Process (activities/steps involved in implementing objectives):

| | Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ | |
|--|---------------------------------|------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| | | | Council | Other by Sources |
| A. Developing a job description and hiring a data systems analyst. | Malcolm Mitchell & Toni Lippert | | X | X |
| B. Providing orientation and continuing education for staff. | Toni Lippert | | | |
| C. Developing format for Client (consumer) Profile and Service Profile | Joe Banda and Toni Lippert | | | |

VI. Continued

| | Responsible Person(s) | Date | Resource/Funds Allocated \$ | |
|---|---------------------------|------|-----------------------------|------------------|
| | | | Council | Other by Sources |
| D. Developing survey instruments and providing TA to survey respondents | Joe Banda | | | |
| E. Collating, coding, programming, analysis of data | Joe Banda | | | |
| F. Reporting, publishing and dissemination of findings. | Joe Banda Toni Lippert | | | |

VII. Concurrent Environmental Factors

VIII. Outcome(s) of Activity:

| | New Resources/Funds Obtained (\$) (Identify Source) |
|---|--|
| A. Intended All objectives listed in IV have been accomplished. | Health Planning funds have augmented the DD funds in publication of all data reports because demand for publications have exceeded the DD resources. |
| B. Unintended. Program awareness by other local, state and national organizations has increased. Original printing estimates have fallen short of demand. Data reports published have increased in variety and scope. | |

IX. Verification Process for Determining Impact of Activity:

1. Original DD Trends Report (1977) has been identified as pioneer professional effort to collect data on DD population and service system in Minnesota by local providers of services and the Human Resources Dept. of the Metropolitan Council.
2. Survey response rate was 95% for 1977 and the 1979 update of this data. This is an unusually high response rate for a detailed questionnaire sent to over 120 agencies and requesting data for the over 300 programs they administer.
3. Continuing requests by county and other local providers for data reflect the credibility of the data products from the Metro DD Program.
4. Requests from other DD Regional Planners for TA.
5. Request from the State Council Program Office for assistance in programming state DD data for dissemination to the regions.
6. The process has provided opportunity for increasing scope of data collected and published as in the case of the Respite Care Report. Other data-based publications anticipated in the next quarter (April-June, 1980) are Volume II of the DD Trends series and the study on DD Comprehensive Diagnostic and Evaluation Services in the Metropolitan Area.
7. Each data-based publication has had to be reprinted because the demand has exceeded the supply.

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

- 1) Data from the information system is definitely being used.
- 2) The newsletter is widely distributed and read.
- 3) Technical Assistance especially as it relates to 11.22 Reviews is appreciated.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

- 1) Too much emphasis on MR
- 2) Consumer members feel more training about the program is needed.
- 3) The number of agencies in the area make establishment of inter-agency linkages difficult.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

It's trends report and other data have been used by a number of agencies as a resource in planning programs.

The newsletter has provided information on a variety of topics to many people.

The program services as an information clearinghouse.

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

Need for better training of consumers on task force.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

This project is doing a very good job. As is evidenced by the verification activities and interviews. The data base is being used as is the newsletter.

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

The same strengths were repeated by several we interviewed:

- a. The data collection and the use of this information.
- b. Information of several kinds: newsletters, other publications (Respite Care Report), TA, calls, referrals.
- c. Inter-agency influence (especially health board)

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

Again--the same weaknesses were repeated by several persons:

- a. Program is too MR oriented, not DD emphasis.
- b. Necessity for more and stronger inter-agency linkages.
- d. More consumer training needed.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

In a program such as this, I am sure that actual impact is neither measurable or known -- however, it is positive:

- a. Data - needs assessment - it is apparent from several interview's that this information has provided justification for needed programs.
- b. The information provided has been widely dessiminated and used - especially the newsletter and Respite Care Report

The comments about relationship to health board (by all three metro inter-viewers) showed a positive impact on their programs by Region XI-DD

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

- a. Focus on non-MR populations (and needs and services).
- b. Continue and improve (expand) inter-agency cooperation.
- c. Increase consumer orientation and training.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

Personnel: Toni and Joe are both excellent staff. Their long tenure has provided continuity in the program. They are very knowledgeable and willing to find out what they do not know.

2 Programs:

- a. Data Collection - most of those interviewed offered information on how they benefitted by the data. I have seen in our region how important such specific information can be to program development. Region XI appears to be using it well.
- b. Newsletter - I am impressed with the information on this publication. It has been valuable - (1) increase in number of readers; (2) interest shown by readers; both by letters and our random calls. Especially interesting is the number who are reprinting parts of it.

The weaknesses have been mentioned - and they are all common to other regions, state and national DD.

Several comments from representatives of the host agency were important: "The regional planning program is necessary." "Should it be continued in view of diminishing funds?"..."Yes."

1. What are the project's overall strengths?
 - a.) Data from the needs assessment really being used.
 - b.) Good staff response and follow-through as well as technical assistance.
 - c.) Health Systems plan aided by DD process.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?
 - a.) Too MR-oriented although are trying to respond to total DD definition.
 - b.) Responsibility not commensurate with authority - i.e. more responsibility than has authority to undertake.
 - c.) Need to focus specifically on inter-agency linkages.
 - d.) Difficulty in being both an advocate and a planner.
 - e.) Not able to work as rapidly as it would like because of Metro's hierarchal structure and process. Also differing philosophies between Metro Health Board and DD program often a barrier.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

Excellent resource to the community in terms of public education, data collection and sharing.

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

a.) Need for better training of consumers on task force.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

Excellent program because it is seen and used as a resource to the community. The Newsletter is viewed as an especially good product.

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

- 1) Good combination of staff - Toni provided the expertise on DD as well as good community contacts while Joe is very proficient at data gathering and analysis.
- 2) Those interviewed stated that the DD program is an accurate and quick source of information
- 3) Dedicated staff - well versed in aspects of DD and knowledgeable of their region. Praised by supervisors for being willing to take on just about anything.
- 4) Good cross section of representation on task force
- 5) Placement with health board has positive influence on health board activities regarding DD.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

- 1) Too much emphasis on MR
- 2) Deals with a large population - perhaps hard to establish interagency linkages and be on top of everything.
- 3) Task Force members expressed desire for more training on their function.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

- 1) Public awareness, through newsletter and publications, has been increased.
- 2) Have had influence on how legislation is written.
- 3) Have been a source of information and technical assistance to a variety of consumer groups and services.
- 4) Have provided informal linkages, coordination and promoted cooperation between services
- 5) Has served as a clearing house of information

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

- 1) More staff so that the program would have more opportunities for close involvement with the many programs in the region.
- 2) More emphasis on non-MR DD.
- 3) Better orientation for task force members.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Be specific and give justifications.)

A good program. Joe Banda has been a source of technical assistance for Region Nine in the area of data gathering and analysis. Toni Lippert is a wealth of information on many areas of DD.

All services providers expressed satisfaction with the information and technical assistance they requested and received from Region 11.

As with all DD programs, Region 11 lacks enforcement power and must rely on persuasion. I have been impressed with Toni's power of persuasion. It was noted in some interviews that Toni is the one to call when inappropriate programs in the works need to be blocked or changed, or when people need to be convinced of a need for new programs.

That the materials published through the DD Task Force are widely read, and required reading at the University of Minnesota is a tribute to the excellent work done by Joe Banda. The promotion of meetings between DD coordinators in the region by the Region 11 is also a strong point.

Overall, I am very impressed with the Region 11 DD Program.

1. What are the project's overall strengths?

- a) D.D. Information System has been utilized to enhance the quality and quantity of services for the developmentally disabled.
- b) The staff of the task force has earned the reputation of being able to provide assistance or making very appropriate referrals.
- c) Affiliation with the Metro Council and the Health Board has increased the awareness of local decision makers on the needs of the developmentally disabled.
- d) Monthly newsletter - is well recieved and is an extremely valuable service.

2. What are the project's overall weaknesses?

The vast number of D.D. related agencies in the Metro Area is a deterrent to producing a coordinated delivery system.

There is need to more clearly focus on the non-mentally retarded populations, and to include those populations in the planning process.

3. What has the project's overall impact been?

The overall impact of the project has been very positive.

- The project is an acknowledged information bank on D.D. concerns.
- There has been increased awareness of the needs of the Developmentally Disabled, normalization principles, and other D.D. related philosophies.

4. What suggestions would you have for improving the project?

- Increase planning, coordination and needs assessment in other than MR areas.
- Continue to strengthen relationships with other agencies (this is on going and ever changing).
- With the enactment of the Community Social Services legislation there may be ways to forge a mutually reinforcing planning process with the counties. They need much data.
- Incorporate the D.D. data into the Metro Councils Data System.

5. What is your overall evaluation of the project? (Ba specific and give justifications.)

This project is without a doubt one of the best projects in the Country. I am sure that its' being housed with the Metropolitan Council has increased the visibility of the project. It is not my intention to diminish the credibility of the staff, as the Metro Council's D.D. staff are very capable and intelligent individuals who have a strong committment to their work. The interviews of the individuals the day of the site assessment certainly demonstrate that Mrs. Lippert and Mr. Banda are respected members of the Council staff.

The program is recognized for the follow-through that both the staff and task force have to their plans and work programs.

The cooperative effort of the staff and task force is exemplified in the recently published Respite Care Study.

Other documents published by the task force have been utilized in determining need or new program justifications.

In the area of Legislative Issues the efforts and support of the Metro Council has been helpful.

The D.D. staff have also participated in training and staff development activities which have assisted in increasing the knowledge of D.D. in the Community.