

**Commission on Community-Based Alternatives for Persons with Disabilities
Direct Workforce Subcommittee**

September 12, 2006
9:30 AM – 1:30 pm
Center for Disabilities Studies, University of Delaware
461 Wyoming Ave., Newark, DE

Meeting Minutes

I. Introductions

In attendance: Penny Chelucci - DSAMH, Theodore Gregory – Consumer, Renee Bean - CDS, Jamie Wolfe - CDS, Tony Horstman – State Council/CAC, Eve Austin - Elwyn, Michelle Hess - CDS, Doyle Dobbins -DelARF, Ginger Nobles – Easter Seals

The meeting began with Renee Bean thanking everyone for attending the meeting and expressing Committee Chair Michael Gamel-McCormick’s regrets for his inability to attend the meeting.

II. Robert Woods Johnson Foundation presentation by Renee Bean

Renee Bean presented a synopsis of the grant proposal submitted to the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation that the Center for Disabilities Studies (CDS) unfortunately did not receive. Even though the program was not funded Michael thought that some portions of the process outlined in the proposal could be utilized for future statewide DSP curriculum implementation..

Renee described the proposed process to implement a direct support professional credentialing curriculum across divisions within the State of Delaware. The plan was thorough and included many inventive approaches to the development of the proposed system by the Center for Disabilities Studies to include the following ideas:

- a. the implementation of the CCBA’s work place learning model
- b. a statewide credentialing system
- c. a peer leadership program
- d. train the trainer opportunities to enhance management capacity
- e. a statewide career lattice to promote career development
- f. an advisory body comprised of representatives from all stakeholders including DSPs
- g. a readiness assessment that will include a baseline survey and complete an evaluation to measure project success

- h. the synergy to promote a statewide/regional professional organization for DSPs, and
- i. project sustainability through orchestrating a structure based on stakeholder buy-in and shared leadership.

Renee also pointed out the significant development by the National Association of Direct Service Professionals (NADSP) that creates a national credentialing system. This allows DSPs to get training and receive certification.

III. Direct Support Workforce Strategic Planning rubric

Renee opened this session with the presentation of a PowerPoint and discussion of four main categories to facilitate the committee's discussion and goals development. The categories included:

- a. Professionalism/ Career Development
- b. Consumer/ Service Provider Agencies
- c. Consumer Direction/Control/Discretion
- d. Systems Change

Professionalism/ Career Development

Up until this point the main goal that has continually been voiced by committee members is the need for pay and benefit equity for Direct Support Professionals (DSPs). Throughout this meeting that idea continued to linger along with many new considerations to be put under the professionalism/career development category.

Doyle Dobbins suggested the use of the Employment Cost Index as a benchmark in consideration of the pay scales across the nation related to the types of positions. The scale should be used accordingly in order to continue to keep pay scales on track.

There was also discussion of the present New York legislation.¹ There was talk and requests that a copy of the legislation would be present at the next meeting if possible.

¹ 1 According to a research report by the Institute of Community Integration at the University of Minnesota, "The New York legislature has, over the past eight years, incorporated Medicaid "trend factors" (adjustments to rates that reflect trends in health care industry costs) into the state budget appropriations for DSP wage increases beyond the cost of living: 5.0% for FY2000, 3.52% for FY2001, and 3.69% for FY2002." (<http://ici.umn.edu/products/prb/142/default.html>)

Consumer/Service Provider Agencies

Many of the ideas brought up during conversation surrounding this category focused upon issues consumers and providers can grasp. A few ideas listed in Renee's PowerPoint included the following:

- *Quality control/Assessments* – this is where the value of provider services are looked at from the consumer standpoint
- *Adequate fiscal resources* – this idea is in response to funding and monetary needs of programs provided for the consumer. Doyle pointed out during the meeting that this issue needs to be looked at closer with minute detail and attention.
- *Regulatory issues* – by this it is meant “how will these updated programs to provide a better relationship between consumers and providers be controlled?” Who will be the body to ensure the success of the relationship?
- *Management training/licensing requirements* – these two can almost fall together. Many members noted that not only DSP training is needed but management teams should be trained as well. One issue brought up related to this is whether or not this training should be a part of the DSP licensing requirements.
- *Compensation/Wages* – this continues to be the major concern of the members. Wage parity is a priority of the committee and this idea stayed firm during the committee. It was agreed upon that this should be something the committee continues to work on.

Consumer Direction/Protection

It was discussed by the committee members that the term “discretion” needs to be included so that consumers have the capacity to voice their opinions and be able to have choice in their providers. One of the main issues brought up by the group as a whole was the fact that an increase in training and requirements for the supervisor of DSPs should be included in the rubric. If the DSPs are being trained to carry-out their responsibilities while working with the consumers, then management should be able to ensure the DSPs are following through.

A second issue surrounding this category was the need for and proper allocation of resources for both the provider and consumer. After lengthy discussion, the group could not come to a clear and concise suggestion for where resources should be allocated or where these resources come from. This is something that needs to be looked at further by the group.

Jamie Wolfe, with support of others, encouraged the inclusion of the Money Follows the Person initiative to be mentioned as an objective. This service will greatly impact the ability for consumers to be discrete in choosing

providers and supports for services. Jamie included that in order for the grant to move forward after and if the state receives approval, the State must allocate a match of necessary funding. This is still in process.

Ginger Nobles of Easter Seals was nominated, accepted, and approved to be the DSW Committee's co-chair.

IV. Full Commission update

Michelle Hess reminded everyone that the Full Commission Meeting will be held Thursday, September 21, 2006 at the Goodwill Industries Goodwill Center 300 E. Lea Blvd. in Wilmington, Delaware from 9:00am – 11:00am. Michelle encouraged everyone to attend if possible so that they may see for themselves where the other committees are on their work.

V. Next Meeting

The next Workforce Subcommittee meeting will take place on Tuesday, October 10th, 2006, at the new CDS offices at 461 Wyoming Ave. from 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM.

Future Meetings: November 14, 2006 at CDS 10:00am – 12:00pm
December 12, 2006 at CDS 10:00am – 12:00pm

VI. Next Steps

The next few meetings are crucial for the finalization of the Workforce Committee goals. We will need to finalize our plan to be turned in to the Commission in January. Please continue to work hard until this takes place. Your continual efforts are much appreciated.

Respectfully Submitted by:
Michelle Hess, Center for Disabilities Studies