Members Present: Chad Ludwig, Sharla Jones, Jeffrey Puterbaugh, Mark Hill, Penny Clifton, Donna Nicklin, CM Hall, William Drobkiewicz, Clark Anderson, Terry Blosser

Public Present: Steven Brown

Staff Present: Theresa Powell, Julie Jacobs, Kelsey Gleeson

Members Absent: Carol Mauser

Welcome Introductions – Chad Ludwig
The Panther Den is not equipped for land-line telephones yet; we will not be providing a conference line to this meeting.

Meeting called to order at 10:21am.

Review and Approval of 02/19/2016 Meeting Minutes
moved to approve the minutes. seconded the motion. Minutes were unanimously approved as read by the committee.

Public Comment
Steven Brown asks that if you are interested in joining Rules Advisory Committee please do consider it. They need your input; if interested email Steven.

The rules help clarify how to comply with intent and purpose of laws. Currently we have no OARS that effect ODHHS. The OARS are intermediary step between state laws and the committee bylaws. It is up to RAC to advising DHS’ director to run this program. In order to give this committee more “teeth” we will be developing OARS for ODHHS.

Mark clarifies that rules do not need to be specific, they can be general.

Announcements - All
Penny announces that there is a pizza fundraiser this evening from 4:00PM – 8:00PM for OAD in Kaizer. Presents flyer.
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CM notes that she work for Roundtable for several years and encourages all members to attend the fundraiser tonight.

**Community Needs Assessment Update**
Theresa announces that she and other DHS staff are currently waiting to receive a revised budget from Western Oregon University (WOU), at which time DHS may sign and legitimize the Community Needs Assessment contract. Should be ready to go by May 1st. She will also be speaking to Denise about the deliverables.

Chad announces that the Community Needs Assessment (CNA) will be renamed as the Community Advisory Board (CAB). This nomenclature will be used from here on out. The first CAB meeting will take place on Friday, May 6th beginning at 9:00AM. There are already around 42 people who have contacted the CAB group to become a part of their meetings. The first meeting will focus on training. Need to move quickly as results of the CAB will need to be submitted to the Institutional Review Board. The Institutional Review Board then takes 45 days to give their approval. We have already lost a lot of time in this process, and we cannot continue to delay.

Chad also states that a core team of CAB members will be selected who will remain intensely committed and a part of the needs assessment process. WOU wants to make sure this core team is diverse, neutral, and objective. Anyone can be involved with CAB (i.e. interpreters, D/deaf consumers, professionals, advocates, etc.) If you are interested in becoming a part of the CAB process please contact Denise Thew-Hackett at WOU.

Bill expresses interest in joining CAB. Inquires about regional representation.

Theresa confirms that Julie Jacobs (DHS/APD) will be signing the needs assessment contract with Denise Thew-Hackett.

*Sharla enters the meeting.

**New Members**
Chad confirms that the executive committee has received three applications for the open seats on ODHHS. Two have been accepted:
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Terry Blosser and Clark Anderson. DHS Director approval still pending, but assured.

Welcome Terry and Clark. Each gives a little personal background.

Bill asks about member renewal. Chad responds that membership is a three-year commitment and that more discussion around membership is scheduled for later in the meeting.

Goals – All
Theresa presents her and Kelsey’s three “umbrella” goals: exposure, education, and empowerment.

Exposure: DHS would like to create a three-fold ODHHS brochure. Theresa presents brochures created for Oregon Disability Commission (ODC) as an example. Suggests attending more tabling events (i.e. job fairs, community events). Suggests monthly workshops; Kelsey includes her idea of incorporating a nationally recognized “awareness” for the chosen month and exploring its intersection with deafness (i.e. April is Autism Awareness Month; could do workshop in April on autism and deafness).

Empowerment: A “meet and greet” with corporations and businesses to demonstrate the value of Deaf and Hard of Hearing employees. Need to get ourselves known within the corporate structure.

Education: workgroups, workshops on how to write a resume, interviewing skills, etc.

CM responds that these are all great ideas, however, this group of advisors has never followed through with the goal of becoming a “commission” rather than just a “committee.” This does ODHHS a disservice because the general public views a committee as weaker than a commission, therefor it is assumed that the ODHHS Advisory Committee does not have as much political power as other boards and commissions. Adds that it should remain an actively pursued goal for ODHHS Advisory Committee to become a commission.

CM adds that as far as education, exposure, and empowerment are concerned, yes corporations do play a role, however, there is also a need for government agencies to be educated on how to provide accommodations for their Deaf and Hard of Hearing employees/consumers; there are agencies that still don’t know how to...
request interpreters or CART. It would also behoove us to get the state more involved in educating their hearing employees about these issues. CM suggests that corporations should be “phase-two,” but the committee needs to consider approaching state agencies before any private entities.

Theresa agrees with CM about focusing on educating state agencies.

Kelsey suggests developing an educational pilot program that can be initially tested within the Advocacy & Development unit, its results measured and analyzed, and then we can determine if it would be feasible to offer that type of educational training to other agencies, units, and field offices around the state.

Terry adds that under ADA Title two, any agency with 50+ employees is required to have an ADA coordinator. It would be incumbent to those ADA coordinators to reach out to this committee to provide that type of education and awareness.

Jeff mentions that internal training providers for the state are interested in working with ODHHS as well as the Office of Equity and Multicultural Services (OEMS). DHS is in the process of hiring an ADA coordinator; whoever is selected will be an employee of OEMS. He adds that another piece of this puzzle is making sure people are aware of what kind of assistive technologies are available and how Deaf and Hard of Hearing individuals can express their technology preferences. Jeff also agrees that piloting training in the Advocacy & Development Unit would be a good place to start.

Mark agrees that more training needs to happen in all aspects. These trainings could center around federal ADA law.

Sharla shares concerns that a one-day training is not going to be enough to encompass everything about Deaf & Hard of Hearing communities; it takes an entire life-time to glean the information and experiences.

Bill responds that first rounds of training can be focused specifically on communication methods.
Clark asks about the limitations of ODHHS Advisory Committee’s effectiveness. Do we really only work with state agencies?

CM clarifies that the question is really about what the “capacity” of ODHHS Advisory Committee.

Chad responds that the committee’s first charge is to advise DHS. Beyond that there are multiple avenues to explore advocacy and our true capacity; encourages members to “dream big.”

CM brings up the idea of a ODHHS “PSA” (public service announcement) on local television or up on the DHS website.

Sharla agrees that the use of social media and websites to do some of the educating is preferred.

Chad mentions that he asked Mike McCormick about accessing the state-wide employee address-book in order to send communications to all state-employees. Mike seemed like this might be a possibility but then the idea lost some of its steam and has not been followed up on.

Kelsey mentions that an email blast to all state agencies should be possible and volunteers to follow-up.

Jeff suggests contacting PEBB (Public Employee Benefits Boards) to do an email blast might be a good idea. PEBB does not provide additional information in any of their promotional materials regarding state employees with disabilities. All state employees receive emails from PEBB.

Sharla agrees that going through PEBB is a great idea.

Penny suggests possibly SEIU (local union). Particularly union advocates.

**Action Item:** Chad, Theresa, and Kelsey will confer together to brainstorm about communications through PEBB.

Theresa asks the committee to take the goals they have up for consideration and think about which ones are “doable” in the upcoming
year. Mentions that resource brochures could be an easy and fast goal to complete.

Chad mentions that resources like ADRC (Aging & Disability Resource Connection) is ill equipped to provide any sort of resources or advocacy to Deaf individuals.

ADRC is a federally mandated program that is required by each state.

Suggestions of ADRC joining the pilot training program.

Theresa asks for a vote to decide which direction to focus on first.

Jeff asks to take time to think about how all of the goals relate to each other and table the decision to later in the day.

Time is running out quickly, we may not be able to stick to the agenda, if so, Mark is willing to postpone his leadership presentation.

Lunch Break

Budget - Theresa

Theresa announces that ODHHS currently has $3,680 left in its budget to be spent before June. With two months left, we need to figure out we want to spend that money before it is too late. How can we use this money to complete some of the goals the committee has come up with?

A point of clarification; in July the committee will be receiving its new budget of $4,000. The budget is not accumulative; it does not “roll-over.” If the committee does not spend what is left of the $3,700, they will lose it and only be allotted $4,000 in July for another fiscal year.

Chad mentions the brochure and also states that the public has expressed an interest in being provided “business cards” that would help consumers know who to contact at ODHHS and/or how to request accommodations.

Chad states that previously Jeff Brownson has provided an example of a “business cards” that the Office of Equity and Multicultural Services (OEMS) provides to non-English speaking individuals as a resource for
providers to know how to request accommodations. At that time Jeff Brownson had proposed that ODHHS work with OEMS to develop its own card however that action was never followed up on.

**Action Item:** Jeff Puterbaugh, Theresa, and Kelsey will contact Emese at OEMS to see about getting this resource business card.

Theresa also mentions that it is possible to pre-pay for trainers and presenters within the budget.

Chad mentions a Deaf social services trainer in Seattle that might be a good fit: Communication Works: Vicky Moseley.

**Action Item:** Chad will contact Vicky Moseley and find out about the possibility of contracting with her to provide some training opportunity.

As far as the cost of accommodations for a training session, interpreter costs would not come from ODHHS’ budget, however food or other items those costs would come from the ODHHS budget.

**Motion:** Bill moves to take our training proposal to Vicky Moseley. Penny and Sharla second the motion.

**Aye:** All

**Opposed:** None

The motion passes. With an amendment for more than one date.

Clark asks that these trainings become webinars and/or accessible via the internet.

**Interpreter Services – Julie Jacobs**

Julie gives background on interpreter stakeholder forum and some of the challenges that interpreting services has faced the past few months. Jeff Puterbaugh has become lead interpreter scheduler, Kelsey assists but interpreting services is not either of their primary job duties. DHS does not have the budget to expand Deaf and Hard of Hearing Services; all advocacy and interpreting services would continue to be managed by one state employer for the foreseeable future. DHS is currently exploring the idea of contracting scheduling services out through an RFP (request for proposal) process. DHS understands why the RFP for interpreting services This document can be obtained in an alternate format for individuals with disabilities upon request by contacting staff at 503-947-5104 or kelsey.gleeson@state.or.us. Available formats are: large print, Braille, audio tape recording, electronic format and oral presentation.
failed in 2013 and does not wish to repeat that process; DHS seeks to include community feedback and participation throughout the proposal and contracting process this time around.

Steven asks permission to ask a question. Permission granted. Steven asks about the future of ODHHS. If the RFP goes through, is ODHHS going to be able to give advice and oversee the services provided?

Julie responds that herself and Theresa would be contract administrators and would be responsible for oversight of whichever entity was awarded the contract. Grievances or any sort of feedback would be submitted to and analyzed by Julie.

Chad comments that there have been many changes since the RFP in 2013 and that he is open to the idea of contracting out interpreting services, however, there are a few things he would like to see addressed. Chad asks that DHS consider including in the RFP the opportunity for the awarded entity to expand its services overtime to become a “one-stop-shop” not only for interpreting services, but also for community advocacy and resources. He would also ask that preference be given to Oregon based businesses; to keep the money in our state.

CM expresses her belief that a new RFP this time will not work better than it did in 2013. CM notes that what is unique about this community is the cultural and disability aspect that diminishes its sociopolitical voice. If interpreting services contracts out the day to day oversight will be all but lost and Oregon Deaf and Hard of Hearing Services will fade out. What good then is the CNA/CAB? Or the brochures, or business cards, or trainings? There is no ground to be gained for Deaf Oregonians by contracting these services out. The quality assurances the Interpreter Subcommittee has been working on for over a year will be for naught. CM expresses great concern for the future use and importance of CDIs (certified Deaf interpreters). She stresses that the timing is inappropriate and should be postponed until after the legislature has seen the results of the CNA/CAB.

Julie responds with her perspective that as things stand right now DHS is not able to address quality nor sufficiently serve Deaf and Hard of Hearing communities as far as interpreting services are concerned. She expects
that to be able to get to an acceptable service level would take up to two-
years. Jeff and Kelsey are not permanent staff for Deaf and Hard of
Hearing Services. Julie believes that an outside interpreting agency who
has more knowledge and awareness of interpreting logistics and Deaf and
Hard of Hearing consumer needs will be more successful at providing
those services. Julie cannot guarantee any level of service if interpreting
coordination is not contracted out of the purview of DHS. She agrees that
CM makes good points about the timing not being the best in regards to the
research that is currently being conducted and assuming that after the
reports are delivered to the public there is an outcry for more and better
services, it will be incumbent upon the legislature to provide more funding,
or we will not be able to meet those requests; that is a fear of hers.

Bill considers that perhaps a short-term RFP would be possible. After the
public knows whether the legislature is going to support the creation of an
Office of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, could services be brought back to a
state agency?

Chad says that having the services come back into a state agency is much
less likely to happen once they have been contracted out.

CM recognizes that time is beginning to run out and that Julie is looking for
a decision today. She agrees with Bill, that if an RFP is to go out, it needs
to be short-term. Maybe one-year with a six-month review. If interpreting
services are contracted out the advisory committee needs to live with the
decision that is will never contract back in. Can the committee move
forward on that with confidence?

Sharla is not okay with interpreting services contracting out of state
agencies forever and expresses concerns about supplying interpreting
services to legally mandated student meetings through a third-party private
vendor who could “close up shop” or go away at any time.

Steven shares many of CM’s concerns. He states that it is a little
frightening and hard to let go of interpreting services. Steven is concerned
that is services are contracted out, the legislature will view that as an
opportunity to disregard Deaf and Hard of Hearing community needs.
ODHHS needs to educate state agencies about how to request and work
with interpreters; how do we educate them if we no longer provide those services?

Julie clarifies that the RFP contract would only address the coordination of interpreters. The training, education, exposure, advocacy would still come from the advisory committee and the Advocacy & Development unit.

CM asks if the advisory committee would be able to review the RFP.

Julie responds that the same process that the community needs assessment RFP experienced. There will be a steering committee, a review committee, and a scoring committee. DHS wants a member of this advisory committee and community stakeholders to be a part of these committees.

Julie leaves meeting

Chad mentions that the legislature will not meet until January of 2017, and their decision on the Office of the Deaf and Hard of Hearing legislative concept may not be finalized until July of 2017; furthermore, the state budget will not be decided upon until January of 2018. So that puts the option of contracting services back into a possible Office for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing more than a year and a half away.

CM is not willing to put out a long-term RFP. Would like in-depth metrics reported on and presented to the advisory committee.

Donna say that numbers are great, but will they be capturing service satisfaction with Deaf and Hard of Hearing consumers as well as interpreters themselves? It is important that all possible data that can be collected, is done so and reported to those responsible for oversight.

Jeff responds by describing how interpreter services are currently being tracked: excel spreadsheet.

Chad asks if the committee is ready to make a decision.

Majority responds negatively.

Chad reminds the committee that DHS is expecting a decision today.
Mark expresses that he feels like there is no choice at this point; that the interpreting services RFP is going forward regardless of committee members’ opposition. Mark adds that he has quite a bit of experience writing RFPs and would be interested in being involved in the process.

CM brings up the concern that was expressed in 2013 about rural communities. Would one agency be able to appropriately serve all of Oregon? Could there be multiple regional RFPs?

Chad comments that it seems the committee is okay with going the route of an RFP, but with provisions. One provision would be a short-term contract (one-year), another would be monthly data reports; a sunset clause, and a grievance process that is supervised by the state.

Steven expresses interest in being a part of this RFP process.

Bill also expresses interest, but is concerned about travel.

**Fifteen Minute Break**

**Rules Advisory Committee (RAC) Presentation – Steven Brown**

Steven presents his PowerPoint. (Please see meeting packet for print out).

Intent is to solidify Oregon Deaf and Hard of Hearing Services, to make ODHHS stronger, with more specific ruling language, and to accurately describe the desired membership (D/deaf and Hard of Hearing people making decisions for their community, not hearing people deciding for them).

There will be a hearing on July 18th, and if you wish to contest the statutes and rules that the RAC has decided upon, you can do so there and the process will start over.

Due to time constraints, Steven is not able to provide any detail or in-depth information to his presentation.

The committee would like to see more from Steven regarding the RAC at a future meeting.
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Final Thoughts/Comments – Chad Ludwig
Chad inquires as to whether becoming a commission requires a legislative concept.

Action Item: Theresa and Kelsey will follow up on becoming a commission.

Elections will take place at our next meeting. Community development is not a priority right now.

Add leadership presentation by Mark to next meeting.

Add RAC discussion to next meeting.

Next meeting: **May 20th 2017**

Adjourn
4:03pm