



ACTION:



INFORMATION:



STATE PLAN COMMITTEE MEETING NOTICE/AGENDA

Posted on www.scdd.ca.gov

THE PUBLIC MAY LISTEN IN BY CALLING:	1-800-839-9416
PARTICIPANT CODE:	8610332

DATE: July 10, 2017

TIME: 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

LOCATION: State Council on Developmental Disabilities
1507 21st Street, Suite 210
Sacramento, CA 95811

TELECONFERENCE LOCATION(S): See Next Page

Pursuant to Government code Sections 11123.1 and 11125(f), individuals with disabilities who require accessible alternative formats of the agenda and related meeting materials and/or auxiliary aids/services to participate in this meeting should contact Robin Maitino at (916) 322-8481 or email robin.maitino@scdd.ca.gov. Requests must be received by 5:00 pm, July 5, 2017.

- 1. CALL TO ORDER** S. Smith
- 2. ESTABLISH QUORUM** S. Smith
- 3. WELCOME/INTRODUCTIONS** S. Smith
- 4. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

*This item is for members of the public only to provide comments and/or present information to the Council on matters **not** on the agenda. Each person will be afforded up to three minutes to speak. Written requests, if any, will be considered first.*

For additional information regarding this agenda, please contact Robin Maitino, 1507 21st Street, Ste. 210, Sacramento, CA 95811, (916) 322-8481. Documents for an agenda item should be turned into SCDD no later than 12:00 p.m. the day before the meeting to give members time to review the material. The fax number is (916) 443-4957.



5. **APPROVAL OF APRIL 2017 MINUTES** S. Smith 3



6. **CYCLE-40 GRANTS** V. Smith

- a. Review scoring team recommendation(s) and send recommendation(s) to the July 25, 2017 Council meeting for funding approval.

7. **ADJOURN** S. Smith

TELECONFERENCE LOCATIONS:

Goebel Senior Adult Center
1385 E. Janss Road
Thousand Oaks, CA 91362

Visalia Adult Integrated Clinic
520 E. Tulare Ave
Visalia, CA 93292
(559) 623-0900

Escuela De La Raza Unida
137 N. Broadway
Blythe, CA 92225
(760) 922-2582



DRAFT

State Plan Committee (SPC) Meeting Minutes

February 13, 2017

Attending Members

Sandra Aldana (SA)
Rebecca Donabed (SA)
Janelle Lewis (FA)
Chair Sandra Smith (FA)
Carmela Garnica (FA)
Robin Hansen

Members Absent

Others Attending

Kristie Allensworth
Aaron Carruthers
Vicki Smith
Maria West

1. CALL TO ORDER

Committee Chair Sandra Smith called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m.

2. ESTABLISH QUORUM

A quorum was established.

3. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Members and others in attendance introduced themselves.

4. APPROVAL OF JANUARY 9, 2017 MINUTES

Motion 1 -- It was moved and seconded [Lewis (FA)/Donabed (SA)] to approve January 9, 2017 minutes. (See voting roll call list at the end of the minutes.)

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS

a. A letter from Carl Argila, PhD (FA) of Support Services for the Deaf was read into the public commentary. The commenter stated that

Legend

SA = Self-Advocate

FA = Family Advocate

regional centers do not serve deaf individuals and not one regional center employs a deaf service coordinator. The commenter went on to say that San Gabriel RC has refused to hire a deaf coordinator or anyone who is versed in American Sign Language. The individual appealed to the Council to “emphasize the need to recognize Deaf persons as members of a cultural/linguistic minority and promote the development of services tailored and adapted to the needs of [the] Deaf Community.” The letter also asked the Council to “facilitate the hiring of Deaf service coordinators” for regional centers to mentor vendors and be ambassadors to help the Deaf community “representing the promises of the Lanterman Act.”

- b. Another public comment was made by Pierre Landry. In reviewing the scoring proposal, Mr. Landry encouraged the committee to ask that people making the proposal are qualified to carry out their grant proposal. Mr. Landry recommended multi-voting on proposals to have scorers use dots to vote on what they believe is strongest, rather than arbitrarily giving 10 or 12 points to different categories on a 100 point scoring system.

6. COMMUNITY PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT GRANT CYCLE 40

- Executive Director Aaron Carruthers gave a short summary on the goals of grant cycle 40 to identify “new and innovative” practices. The dollars will be used in a way that takes risks. The Council can try out something new, then can filter it through the DDS and ARCA system to take it further if the Council identifies a system or practice that works. If DDS and ARCA give the Council input on grants at the front end, it will help create a new system that they can use if the grant project proves that the new or innovative method works. The Council can potentially invite the DDS and ARCA to meetings to get their input as the Council supports one or more grantee.
- a. Recommendation on adoption of proposed Scoring Criteria for Cycle 40 PDF Grant.

Legend

SA = Self-Advocate

FA = Family Advocate

- i. The Council has earmarked \$260,000 for this grant(s). The Committee needed to specify if the Request for Proposal (RFP) would say “grant” or “grants.”
 - The Committee agreed to keep an “s” at the end of the word grant in the RFP, as this would not make the review process any more difficult.
- ii. The Committee worked on creating scoring criteria and on the weight of each scoring criteria.
 - A.) Deputy Director Vicki Smith specified that a proposal needs to meet a minimum score to receive a grant. The Council does not need to award the grant on the highest scorer if they do not meet the minimum score. The Committee agreed that each proposal should score at least 75% of each section to move on to the next level.
 - B.) Proposal Evaluation Scoring Sheet: The Committee discussed how to weigh each item in the criteria. All points add to a possible 100 points total.
 - 1.) State Plan: 36 points
 - a.) “The degree to which the proposal advances the state plan’s goals and/or objectives.” (12 points)
 - b.) “Measurable outcomes are clearly identified and specifically address the State Plan goals and/or objectives addressed by this proposal.” (12 points)
 - c.) “The degree to which this proposal identifies information dissemination and sustainability relative to the state.” (12 points)
 - 2.) Methodology: 36 points
 - a.) “The proposal uses sound methodology for achieving the stated outcomes.” (7 points)
 - b.) “The target audience is clearly delineated and is appropriate to the proposal.” (7 points)

- c.) "The proposal outlines how it will address impact underserved communities and cultural diversity." (7 points)
 - d.) "The proposal describes the types of deliverables to be provided." (7 points)
 - e.) "The proposal describes a sound, programmatic evaluation process as part of its quarterly reporting process with data collection and analysis." (8 points)
- 3.) Administration: 19 points
- a.) "The proposed budget is reasonable and appropriate for accomplishing the identified objectives and for reaching its stated outcome." (10 points)
 - b.) "The applicant has demonstrated experience, knowledge and potential to accomplish what is being proposed." (9 points)
- 4.) New and Innovative 9 points
- a.) "The proposal supports/promotes new and innovative approaches to service delivery." (9 points)

State law requires that civil servants score the proposals. The highest scoring proposal is the one that SCDD staff will recommend to the committee. Staff will recommend the top two proposals only if the total budget for both projects adds up to \$260,000 or less.

Motion 2 to adopt the proposed Scoring Criteria for Cycle 40 PDF Grant with amendments. [Donnabed(SA)/Lewis(FA)]

The motion carried with four "yes" votes. Two Committee members had left the meeting. (See voting roll call list at the end of the minutes.)

b. Recommendation on adoption of proposed RFP for Cycle 40 PDF Grant.

- Deputy Director Vicki Smith read the Cycle 40 RFP draft out loud for the committee's feedback.

- i. The Committee recommended wording changes for redundancy, clarification, and correct grammar.
- ii. In addition, the following clarifications were made:

A.) Change "new and innovative" to "new and/or innovative."

B.) Proposals must be complete and include measurable, identifiable outcomes to the RFP.

C.) Executive Director Carruthers recommended a formal process for asking questions: Submit all questions by email and responses will be general and will be posted on the State Council website on an ongoing basis.

D.) Use 14 point font with 1 inch margins

E.) On 15, no staples on proposals.

F.) On 16, a total of three copies of the proposal. One original proposal (with original signature on letters, etc) and two photo copies of the original proposal.

G.) On 22, any work that is done on a site that employs people with I/DD needs to be an integrated, ADA-compliant, work setting.

H.) Executive Director Carruthers recommended importing the language of 124(c)5 of the federal Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000 (42 USC 15042; PL 106-402).

Legend

SA = Self-Advocate

FA = Family Advocate

- I.) Completed applications must include the following elements:
 - 1. Cover Letter
 - 2. Project Data Sheet
- J.) Abstract section will include language of new scoring criteria approved by the Committee.

Motion 3 to adopt the RFP for grant cycle 40 PDF Grant with amendments. [Donabed (SA)/Lewis (FA)].

Three yes votes and one abstention. (See voting roll call list at the end of the minutes.)

Staff will make the Committee's amendments to the RFP, then submit the amended RFP to Committee Chair Sandra Smith by Tuesday, February 21st.

7. ADJOURN

ADJOURNED AT 3:20 p.m.

Voting Roll Call List for All Three Motions

Member Name	Motion 1	Motion 2	Motion 3
Sandra Aldana	For	For	Abstain
Rebecca Donabed	For	For	For
Carmela Garnica	For	Absent	Absent
Robin Hansen	Abstain	Absent	Absent
Janelle Lewis	For	For	For
Sandra Smith	For	For	For