

# Washington Assistive Technology Act Program Advisory Council Teleconference

Wednesday, March 9, 2014

## In attendance

Sue Ammeter, Vickie Gilleg, Debbie Cook, Naomi Namekata, John Bresko, Gaby de Jongh, Alan Knue, Sam Murphy, Maria Kelley, Curt Johnson, Meka White, and Jack Brummell.

## Agenda

1. State Plan Discussion- State Level Activities (see attached document)
  - a. Device Reuse – Alan went over the 4 options
    - i. Discussion/Comments
      1. John – maintaining relationships is important, losing and rebuilding is difficult, is in favor of Option 4
      2. Sue asked how much extra money did we receive (\$40k), when will we start using it (May 2014), and how are the current funds allocated (Sam’s salary). For the same cost we could either:
        - a. Increasing Sam’s FTE – Increase of .25 FTE
        - b. Hire a Vista Volunteer to manage the Coalition – increase of 1 FTE
      - ii. Decision – Continue to fund the three organizations we are currently funding and maintain relationships, use funding to potentially hire a volunteer to manage Coalition
    - b. Library Device Lending Program – Alan went over the 3 options
      - i. Discussion/Comments
        1. Sue asked what data do we need?
          - a. How satisfied are you with our program?
          - b. Will AT work for you?
        2. Sam brought up the possibility of training Library Staff to ask the data questions as patrons return devices
          - a. Olympia location is unsure if this is possible – high volume
        3. Debbie asked if there is a way to build those questions into the ‘check-in’ process rather than the ‘check-out?’ Possibly a required data filed they have to fill out at the time of check out.
        4. Sue asked if we can hold to make a decision in June when Sam finds out more information.
        5. Alan thinks this program is valuable and we should try to work with the current Library, or look into having this implemented at a different Library system.
      - ii. Decision – Continue this program, figure out how to capture the data, and revisit this in a year.
    - c. Statewide Demonstration – Alan went over the 4 options
      - i. Discussion/Comments
        1. Vicki asked about the possibility of doing Camtasia videos
          - a. Videos are not interactive and don’t count as a demo
      - ii. Decision – will discuss this at the next Advisory Council meeting in June

2. WATAP 20th Anniversary Event - March 2015
  - a. Focused on Providers and Partners rather than consumers
  - b. What will things look like down the road
  - c. Possibly having ATPN partners give short presentations
  - d. How would event look?
    - i. A brief history of WATAP
    - ii. The archeology of AT (old and new)
    - iii. What technology we currently have
    - iv. Emerging trends
    - v. Slideshow of folks using technology
3. WATAP Rebranding
  - a. We have been gaining more attention lately
  - b. Do we want to keep Washington Assistive Technology Act Program as a by-line?
  - c. What do people think about a name change?
  - d. Some states have monikers that don't include AT in their names; i.e. – Tools for Life (Georgia), AbleTech (Oklahoma)
  - e. Follow up:
    - i. We will send out some examples of other Tech Act programs and how they market themselves
    - ii. Will discuss more at the next meeting in June

## 2013 Activity Highlights

### Device Demonstrations

- 637 participants in demonstrations this year, a 23% increase from last year. 83% (531) are people with disabilities and their family.
  - This increase was due to continued collaboration with DVR. The creation of “go-kits” of common technology they demonstrate in the field decreases lag in service delivery to their clients.
  - Computers and related continues to account for over almost 50% of demonstrations (43%). Followed by mobility, seating, and ergonomics; and learning and cognition at 22% and 20% respectively.

### Device Lending

- 304 loans, up 21 from the previous year
  - 129 were through the Aids for Better Living Project at Timberland Regional Library System, we received only 8 responses for the performance measure back from consumers.
    - Note <the performance measure, besides indicating whether they have made a decision if AT is a solution for them through hands on trial, it is also how we demonstrate to the Feds that individuals were actually served. Without the data we lack proof.>
  - 17 were for accommodation which is up from 11 last year as more people are using the program as a stop gap while equipment is on order or being repaired.
    - Note <In the past there hasn't been a performance measure to capture this although it has always been a need of AT users.>
  - We saw an increase in loans to DVR clients after we completed the last three trainings with DVR counselors and partners last October.

### Training

- Reps of employment went up 41% due to trainings with DVR and their community partners.
- Reps of education went up 121% due to training we conducted with K-12 educators at the SW Special Ed conference and AT Regional educators meetings on tablet comparison and accessibility features.

### Reuse

- Full years data for 2013. 510 devices redistributed with an overall cost savings of \$172,571
  - WATAP was able to leverage funding through DSB's Independent Living for Older Blind project to increase the inventory of CCTV's for lease through the Washington Access Fund. (12 devices)
  - HSDC saw more people being able to make a financial commitment to the purchase of their reused hearing equipment due to serving some of the highest need people through this program last year who had been waiting for assistance. (16 devices)

- Bridge Disability Ministries' increased capacity to redistribute equipment after purchasing the HubScrub lead to them using this year's funding to hire a part time administrative person. She assists in the Mobility Center with inventory management and client intakes. (494 devices)

### Financing

- 58 loans for \$151,816 (56 for \$190,650)
  - 65% had an income of less than \$30,000, 90% of people had an income under \$45,000
  - Although the highest number of loans were made for hearing 25 for \$66,826, the highest value per loan was for environmental adaptations with 2 loans for \$17,265: an average of \$8,632 per loan.
- 27 IDAs last year resulting in \$9,607 distributed in matched funding.

### Technical Assistance

- The majority of our technical assistance continues to be with community living related projects (80%)
  - These include the WSU aging program
  - Roads to Community Living
  - And the Evergreen Reuse Coalition
- The percentage of TA in education and employment has increased due to the creation of the AT Providers Network.

# Washington Assistive Technology Act Program (WATAP) State Plan

## Overview

The University of Washington Center for Technology and Disability Studies (UWCTDS) is both the Lead and Implementing Agency as designated by the Governor of Washington State. As such, the UWCTDS controls and administers the funds made available through the grant awarded to the state and carries out responsibilities under the Act. WATAP is located at the University within the University Center For Excellence in Developmental Disabilities (UCEDD) at the Center on Human Development and Disability (CHDD).

## Key Components of implementing the AT Act:

- The purpose and goal of the AT Act Program is to increase access to and the acquisition of AT across all ages & all disabilities in 4 functional areas of life: Education, Employment, Community Living, and Information Tech & Telecommunications
- Statewide: The program must geographically reach the entire state
- Comprehensive: The program must serve all disability types and AT needs
- WATAP must provide an assurance that the funds received through the grant will be used to supplement, and not supplant, funds available from other sources for technology related assistance, including the provision of assistive technology devices and assistive technology services.
- Funds cannot be used for direct payment of an AT device.
- Advisory Council: State AT Programs are required to establish an advisory Council to provide “consumer-responsive, consumer-driven advice” for the planning, implementation and evaluation of programs.
  - Specified Composition of Advisory Council:
    - individuals with disabilities that use assistive technology or the family members or guardians of the individuals;
    - a representative of the State Vocational Rehabilitation agency;
    - if separate, a representative of the State Blind Vocational Rehabilitation agency;
    - a representative of a State center for independent living
    - a representative of the State workforce investment board;
    - a representative of the State educational agency; and,
    - representatives of other State agencies, public agencies, or private organizations, as determined by the State.
  - A majority (51%) must individuals with disabilities that use assistive technology or the family members or guardians of the individuals
  - Individuals appointed to represent the above agencies cannot count towards the majority requirement.
  - The advisory council shall be geographically representative of the State and reflect the diversity of the State with respect to race, ethnicity, types of disabilities across the age span, and users of types of services that an individual with a disability may receive.

## Total Annual Budget

Total Annual Budget for FY2014: \$512,350. \$438,026 Grant from RSA, \$74,324 Program Income including DVR Contract. Of this, 465,772 is direct program costs.

- The University takes 10% of the total direct costs as facility and administration costs (indirect costs), roughly \$46,577.
- **Note:** Many of the activities required by the AT Act blend into one another as services are provided. The numbers indicated above are or best estimate of the time spent by staff and resources allocated to each activity but that there is some overlap.

## Reporting

### State Level and State Leadership Data to be collected and reported

- State Level Data - State Financing, Reuse, Device Loan, and Device Demonstration
- State Leadership Data – Training, Technical Assistance, Public Awareness and Information, State Improvement Outcomes, and Additional and Levering Funds

### Performance Measures

- A. Access Goals (for Device Demonstration and Device Loan):** An increase in the percentage of appropriate targeted individuals and entities who accessed device demonstration programs and/or device loan programs and made a decision about an AT device or service for the **(1) educational, (2) employment, (3) community living, and (4) IT/telecommunication** (this will be removed in FY2015) purposes as a result of the assistance they received.
- a. Based on the answers to this question: What kind of decision about AT devices or services were you (or someone you represent) able to make after your device demonstration or device loan?
    - (1) Decided that an AT device or service will meet my needs (or the needs of someone I represent).
    - (2) Decided that an AT device or service will not meet my needs (or the needs of someone I represent). (or)
    - (3) Have not made a decision.
- B. Acquisition Goals (for Device Reuse and State Financing):** An increase in the percentage of appropriate targeted individuals and entities who obtained devices or services from state financing activities or reutilization programs for **(1) educational, (2) employment, and (3) community living** purposes who would not have obtained the AT device or service.
- a. Based on the answers to this question: Why did you chose to obtain an AT device/service from our program?
    - (1) I could only afford the AT through this program. (I could not afford it through other programs.)
    - (2) The AT was only available to me through this program. (I am not eligible or don't qualify for other programs, the AT is not covered by other funding sources or the specific device I needed is not provided by other programs.)
    - (3) The AT was available to me through other programs, but the system was too complex or the wait time was too long.
    - (4) None of the above
  - b. Additionally starting in FY2015, we will be collecting performance data on device loans that were not for decision purposes (providing loaner equipment during device repair or while waiting for funding and for providing an accommodation for a time-limited event). The data collected will be based on the answers to this question: Why did you chose to borrow an AT device/service from our program?

- (1) I could only afford to borrow the AT through this program. (I could not afford to rent or borrow it through other programs.)
- (2) The AT was only available to me through this program. (I am not eligible or don't qualify for other rental or device loan programs or the specific device I needed is not provided by other programs.)
- (3) The AT was available to borrow from other programs, but the system was too complex or the wait time was too long.
- (4) None of the above

**C. Starting FY2015, an IT/Telecommunications Training Performance Measure:**

- a. Based on the answers to the question: What do you anticipate will be the primary outcome of your participation in this training on Information Technology/ Telecommunications Access?:
  - (1) Website and/or software development policies, procedures, or practices will be improved or better implemented to ensure accessibility.
  - (2) Training will be developed/implemented to ensure accessibility of websites, software and other IT and telecommunications.
  - (3) IT and Telecommunications procurement policies, procedures, or practices will be improved or better implemented to ensure accessibility.
  - (4) Unknown outcome at this time

## **WATAP Program Activities**

### **State Level Activities:**

All are required although subject to Comparability and Flexibility. These activities are:

- Acquisition:
  - State finance systems (includes alternative finance programs)
  - Device reutilization (reuse) programs
- Access
  - Device loan (lending) programs
  - Device demonstrations

### **Comparability**

- The act allows states not to fund a state-level activity if that activity is supported comparably with nonfederal funds. There are two conditions:
  - Financial support is provided from state or other non-federal resources or entities for that category of activities; and
  - The amount of the financial support is comparable to, or greater than, the amount of the portion of the funds made available through the grant that the State would have to expend to conduct that category of activities.
- Additionally the State Level Activity being conducted/provided by an entity other than the AT Act Program must also be comprehensive across age, disability, and geographic areas of the state.
- WATAP could not claim Comparability for any of the State level activities because there are no comparable programs supported by non-federal funds in WA for any of these activities.

### **Flexibility**

- States do not have to conduct all of the state level activities. However that decision to limit the number of state level activities then carries budget limitations on state leadership activities that the state conducts. The act provides states with the “Flexibility” to carry out only two or three of the state-level activities. However, states that carry out only two or three of the state-level activities are only allowed to use up to 30 percent of their funds for state leadership activities.
- Things to think about when contemplating Flexibility:
  1. If we flex out of providing one State Level Activity will we have sufficient data to report?
  2. If we elect to flex out of two activities under the same category, either “Access” or “Acquisition,” what data will we have to report?
  3. Our annual report to RSA is compiled into an Annual Report to Congress – what will happen if year after year the report shows WATAP’s performance measures as “Not Met?”

### **Budgeting**

We must spend no less than 60% of grant on these activities.

We budget about \$310,550 or 68% of total direct costs. Actual spending in FY2013 is 72.7% of total direct costs on State Level activities. Note: The decrease in the budget ratio for State Level Activities vs State Leadership activities this year is due to the DVR contract which contains a provision for 15 trainings to be conducted by WATAP which will increase the amount we would typically spend on training activities.



I. **State Financing** (~36,200 or 11.7% of State Level)

A. Contract to the Washington Access Fund (FY2013- 31,438.21 total (27,438.21 for State Financing); FY2014- 33,000 (29,000 for State Financing)). Funds support administration of the state financing activities. The WA Access Fund implements all of the State Financing activities reported by WATAP. These are:

- i. Assistive Technology Revolving Loan Fund
- ii. AT Individualized Development Accounts (IDAs)

**Note:** Although the Washington Access Fund recently received ~\$1.2 million in new funding, nearly all of this is for loan capital and cannot be used for the administrative costs of running the AT Revolving Loan Fund and AT IDAs. WATAP is one of the Access Fund's few sources of support for its administrative costs. Thus, it is not in the State's interest for WATAP to claim flexibility on this activity.

B. Staff support: WATAP Director is a member of the WA Access Fund's Board of Directors. The Program & Community Relations Manager implements the contract and provides assistance and insures compliance of data reporting. Total FTE estimated at ~7,200.

II. **Device Reuse** (~39,500 or 12.7% of State Level)

**Note:** WATAP supports small contracts to community organizations to increase the capacity and hopefully the sustainability of these unique reuse programs. In the case of the CCTV Leasing Program and the Free Refurbished Hearing Aid Program, these programs would serve far fewer individuals or not exist without continued support from WATAP. For Bridge Mobility, the support provided by WATAP increases their capacity to serve more individuals. WATAP could take flexibility in Device Reuse, but at the expense of these important programs. We would still provide technical assistance to the Reuse Coalition, but would not have data to report in Device Reuse.

A. Contract to Washington Access Fund (FY2013- 4,000; FY2014- 4,000). Funds provided to the WA Access Fund supports the CCTV Leasing Program (long term device loan).

B. Hearing Speech and Deafness Center (FY2013- 9,500; FY2014- 9,500). HSDC provides the free refurbished hearing aid program.

C. Bridge Mobility Center (FY2013- 9,500; FY2014- 9,500). Bridge Mobility provides free or low cost reused durable medical equipment.

D. Staff support: Includes roughly a quarter of the Program & Community Relations Manager's time which is used to support the Evergreen Reuse Coalition. Total FTE estimated at ~16,500.

III. **Device Demonstration and Device Short-Term Loan** (~234,850 or 75.6% of State Level).

**Note:** WATAP's Device Demonstration and Lending Library is unique in the state. WATAP is strategic about implementing the device demonstration and device short-term loan activities including back-filling the lending activities of Special Education Technology Center (SETC) and managing, under contract, a large collection of devices for DVR clients. Lastly, we have placed a collection of devices within the Timberland Regional Library (TRL) System, which allows patrons to check out devices to try through their local library branch. We would like to expand this last program to other library systems, but there is a start-up cost (~\$7-10,000) and some data-collection challenges that affect our performance in device lending and thus hamper our ability or willingness to expand this program.

- A. Contract to Easter Seals WA (FY2013- 8,400; FY2014- 0). Sadly, WATAP's Demonstration center in Spokane that was supported under contract from WATAP closed in January after the resignation of the staff person who was providing the demonstration services. Currently we have no plan B. Options include (1) finding a similar community partner with qualified staff; (2) ramping up our capabilities to conduct demonstrations using video and web services; (3) conducting a "road show" where we have a schedule of dates where WATAP staff will be at various communities around the state to provide devices demonstrations by appointment; or (4) a combination of all 3. We actually state in our current state plan that we would do options 2 and 3 - our first attempts at option 2 were met with a lack of need from the community partner; and we have limited funds for option 3. However we could consider using the funds that would have supported Easter Seals to pilot option 3.
- B. Demonstration and Device Lending Library; this is our largest expense as we need to cover all staffing, equipment, and administration of this library. Particular costs:
  - a. FTE support is estimated at ~162,667, including administrative support for the TRL and DVR arrangements. We also provide some staff development funds for staff to attend classes and conferences (~3000).
  - b. Equipment purchase, maintenance, shipment (for lending program), and insurance is estimated at ~43,000; note that the majority of the funds in the budget this year for purchasing AT will come through the contract from DVR.
  - c. Rent for the Chase Bank location plus IT, telecommunications, security is ~24,783.
  - d. Local travel to conduct demonstrations off-site is estimated at ~1500.

