

Data Entry

This report has been submitted to RSA. You may print a copy for your records if you wish.

OMB Control Number: 1820-0606

Expiration Date: May 31, 2008

Section 704 - Annual Performance Report for State Independent Living Services Program

(Title VII, Chapter 1, Part B of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended)

Part I INSTRUMENT - (To be completed by Designated State Units and Statewide Independent Living Councils)

Reporting Fiscal Year 2010

State Massachusetts

Subpart I - Administrative Data

1	Section A	Sources and Amounts of Funds and Resources	
2	Section B	Distribution of Title VII, Chapter 1, Part B Funds	
3	Section C	Grants or Contracts Used to Distribute Title VII, Chapter 1, Part B Funds	
4	Sections D,E,F	Other Grants or Contracts, Monitoring Title VII, Admin Support Services	
5	Section G Item 1	For Section 723 States ONLY	
6	Section G Items 2-4	For Section 723 States ONLY	

Subpart II - Number and Types of Individuals With Significant Disabilities Receiving Services

7	Sections A-H	Number of Types of Individuals with Significant Disabilities	
---	--------------	--	--

Subpart III - Individual Services and Achievements Funded through Title VII, Chapter 1, Part B Funds

8	Section A	Individual Services and Achievements	
9	Sections B, C	Increased Independence and Community Integration	

Subpart IV - Community Activities and Coordination			
10	Section A Item 1	Community Activities and Coordination	
11	Section A Item 2, Section B	Working Relationships Among Various Entities	
Subpart V - Statewide Independent Living Council (SILC)			
12	Section A Item 1	Current SILC Composition	
13	Section A Item 2, Sections B-D	SILC Membership Qualifications, Staffing, and Duties	
14	Section E	Training and Technical Assistance Needs	
Subpart VI - SPIL Comparison And Updates			
Subpart VII - Signatures			
15	Subsection VI	SPIL Comparison And Updates, Other Accomplishments And Challenges Of The Reporting Year	
16	Subsection VII	Signatures	
Screen 1 of 16			Massachusetts - 2010
Section 704 Part I - Subpart I - Administrative Data			
Section A - Sources and Amounts of Funds and Resources			
Indicate amount received by the DSU as per each funding source. Enter 0 for none.			
Item 1	All Federal Funds Received		
(A)	Title VII, Ch. 1, Part B		391418
(B)	Title VII, Ch. 1, Part C - For 723 states Only		3209046
(C)	Title VII, Ch. 2		1483250
(D)	Other Federal Funds		0
Item 2	Other Government Funds		
(E)	State Government Funds		5016361
(F)	Local Government Funds		0

Item 3	Private Resources	
(G)	Fees for Service (program income, etc.)	0
(H)	Other resources	0
Item 4	Total Income	
	Total income = (A)+(B)+(C)+(D)+(E)+(F)+(G)+(H)	10100075
Item 5	Pass-Through Funds	
	Amount of other government funds received as pass through funds to consumers (include funds, received on behalf of consumers, that are subsequently passed on to consumers, e.g., personal assistance services, representative payee funds, Medicaid funds, etc.)	77474
Item 6	Net Operating Resources	
	[Total Income (Section 4) amount paid out to Consumers (Section 5) = Net Operating Resources	9944819
Screen 2 of 16		Massachusetts - 2010
Section 704 Part I - Subpart I - Administrative Data Section B - Distribution of Title VII, Chapter 1, Part B Funds		
What Activities were Conducted with Part B Funds?	Expenditures of Part B Funds by DSU Staff	Expenditures for Services Rendered by Grant or Contract
(1) Provided resources to the SILC to carry out its functions	0	92411
(2) Provided IL services to individuals with significant disabilities	52282	142802
(3) Demonstrated ways to expand and improve IL services	0	0
(4) Supported the general operation of CILs that are in compliance with the standards and assurances set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 725 of the Act	0	0

(5) Supported activities to increase capacity to develop approaches or systems for providing IL services	0	59373
(6) Conducted studies and analyses, gathered information, developed model policies, and presented findings in order to enhance IL services	0	0
(7) Provided training regarding the IL philosophy	0	0
(8) Provided outreach to unserved or underserved populations, including minority groups and urban and rural populations	0	0

Screen 3 of 16

Massachusetts
2010

**Section 704 Part I - Subpart I - Administrative Data
Section C - Grants or Contracts Used to Distribute Title VII, Chapter 1, Part B Funds**

Enter the requested information for all DSU grants or contracts, funded at least in part by Part B funds, in the chart below. If a column is not applicable to a particular grant or contract, leave blank. If there were no non-Part B funds provided to this grantee or contractor for the purpose listed, enter 0 in that column. Add more rows as necessary.

Name of Grantee or Contractor	Use of Funds (based on the activities listed in Support 1, Section B)	Amount of Part B Funds	Amount of Non-Part B Funds	Consumer Eligibility Determined By DSU or Provider	CSRs Kept With DSU or Provider
Ad Lib	2	5869	0	Provider	Provider
Boston Center for Independent Living	2	8500	0	Provider	Provider
Cape Org. for the Rights of the Disabled	2	10524	0	Provider	Provider
Center for Living and Working	2	6800	0	Provider	Provider
Independence Associates	2	1584	0	Provider	Provider
ILC of the North Shore and Cape Ann	2	8083	0	Provider	Provider
MetroWest CIL	2	1233	0	Provider	Provider

Screen 4 of 16	Massachusetts - 2010
-----------------------	----------------------

Section 704 Part I - Subpart I - Administrative Data
Section D - Grants or Contracts for Purposes Other than Providing IL Services or For the General Operation of Centers

Describe the objectives, activities and results for each Part B grant or contract awarded for purposes other than IL services or the general operation of centers.

Mass. Commission for the Blind has an Interagency Service Agreement (ISA) with the Mass. Rehab. Commission, who in turn contracts with the MetroWest CIL on behalf of the Statewide Independent Living Council (SILC). The contract is to support the advancement of a structured Independent Living services system in the Commonwealth, which would include outreach efforts targeting unserved and underserved consumer populations in our state and to collaborate actively in the evaluation of IL services delivered in the Commonwealth.

Stavros CIL utilizes their Title VII Part B funds for a project entitled "Home Sweet Home?". The project maximizes the number of consumers who accomplish home modifications. This is done through holding informational workshops and by soliciting donated labor and/or materials for home modifications for consumers. In this way, by using the Title VII Part B funds for a portion of a staff person's salary, a greater number of consumers are served than could be served if the funds were utilized for direct purchase of home modifications and equipment. In FY 10 Stavros reports facilitating the building of over 60 ramps. Stavros also operates a durable medical equipment recycling program utilizing these funds. This project is supplemented by fundraising from foundations and events as well as funding through the state's Assistive Technology Act grant funds.

In FY 10, through competitive procurement, two grants utilizing Part B ARRA funds were awarded. MWCIL received a contract to develop performance measures that will provide additional valuable information on the impact that ILCs have in consumers?

lives. These measures are a modification of the national measures currently in process through NCIL. FY 10 saw refinement of the measures, and the selection of 4 test sites. In FY 11, the test sites will evaluate the effectiveness and usability of the measures. They will then be adjusted and rolled out for use by all ILCs via training and the development of a manual for implementation in FY 12. Stavros received a contract to develop a new consumer database system. Not only will this system be compatible with the above-referenced performance measures, but it will be web based and will make improvements on difficulties encountered in the current Access based system. This too should be ready for implementation by FY 12.

Section E - Monitoring Title VII, Chapter 1, Part B Funds

Provide a summary of the program or fiscal review, evaluation and monitoring conducted by the state of any of the grantees/contractors receiving Part B funds during the reporting year.

One compliance review was conducted in FFY 10 at the Center for Living and Working. A final report and subsequent CAP were issued. In addition, MetroWest CIL and Ad Lib completed their CAPs. Regular telephone, email and written correspondence was maintained with all ILCs throughout the year.

The proposed SPIL for FFY 11-13, in accordance with findings of RSA's review of the DSU in FY 09, proposed a change in the operation of the Part B program from one in which the DSU still certified eligibility and authorized services for over half of the ILCs to one in which all ILCs would perform these functions internally. Under this proposed change, subsequently approved by RSA as part of the new SPIL, the DSU's role would consist entirely of providing technical assistance, fiscal management/bill paying and program monitoring. In preparation for this change, DSU staff prepared an updated Part B program manual and conducted inservice trainings with the ILCs.

Section F - Administrative Support Services and Staffing
Item 1 - Administrative Support Services

Describe any administrative support services, including staffing, provided by the DSU to the Part B Program.

The Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission currently utilizes several staff members to perform various aspects of operation and monitoring for the Title VII Part B program, although only one staff person is funded with Title VII Part B funds (approximately 60% of an FTE). This Part B-funded supervisor monitors and coordinates the Title VII Part B program. Two other staff spend a significantly smaller portion of time. One reviews applications, certified eligibility, conducts financial needs determinations directly with consumers and authorized the expenditure of Title VII Part B funds by ILCs. A portion of the Grants Manager's time (billed to Title VII Part B) is needed to process Title VII Part B invoices from ILCs and track expenses. Lastly, the Manager of IL Services and

Section 704 Part I - Subpart I - Administrative Data Section G - For Section 723 States ONLY Item 2 - Administrative Support Services
--

Describe the administrative support services used by the DSU to administer the Part C program.

MRC utilizes a combination of federal and state appropriated IL funds to administer the Part C program. A manager position (state funded) oversees the state and federal budgets for the ILCs, reviews and approves all Part C amendments, authorizes payments and is the liaison to the SILC. An IL Program supervisor (federal/state funded) reviews Part C program data for the annual 704 report, coordinates the consumer satisfaction surveys annually with the ILCs, coordinates the compliance review logistics and reports. A Grants Management Specialist (state funded) processes payments; troubleshoots problems and reconciles payments to the grant.

Item 3 - Monitoring and Onsite Compliance Reviews
--

Provide a summary of the monitoring activities involving Part C centers conducted by the state during the current reporting year, including the onsite reviews of at least 15% of centers receiving Part C funds under section 723. The summary should include, at least, the following:

- A) centers' level of compliance with the standards and assurances in Section 725 of the Act;
- B) any adverse actions taken against centers;
- C) any corrective action plans entered into with centers; and
- D) exemplary, replicable or model practices for centers.

One onsite compliance review was conducted during FY 10 at the Center for Living and Working. While it resulted in the development of a CAP, the areas of non-compliance did not diminish the quality of service delivery to consumers and did not seriously jeopardize the integrity of the federal standards and assurances. Areas of noncompliance were related to inventory control and strategic planning. Ad Lib and MWCIL completed all CAP items during FY 10. BCIL, during FY 10, accepted the DSU's findings from the FY

09 compliance review and completed most of the CAP items.

Item 4 - Updates or Issues

Provide any updates to the administration of the Part C program by the DSU, if any, including any significant changes in the amount of earmarked funds or any changes in the order of priorities in the distribution of Part C funds. Provide a description of any issues of concern addressed by the DSU in its administration of the Part C program.

MRC continues to closely monitor the Multicultural ILC of Boston. During most of FFY10 a management consultant continued to assist the Executive Director and the Board to improve the administrative, service delivery and oversight functions of the CIL.

Screen 7 of 16

Massachusetts - 2010

Section 704 Part I - Subpart II - Number And Types Of Individuals With Significant Disabilities Receiving Services

Section A - Number of Consumers Served During the Reporting Year

Include Consumer Service Records (CSRs) for all consumers served during the year.

		# of Consumers
(1)	Enter the number of active CSRs carried over from September 30 of the preceding reporting year	96
(2)	Enter the number of CSRs started since October 1 of the reporting year	104
(3)	Add lines (1) and (2) to get the <i>total number of consumers served</i>	200

Section B - Number of CSRs Closed by September 30 of the Reporting Year

Include the number of consumer records closed out of the active CSR files during the reporting year because the individual has:

		# of Consumers
(1)	Moved	0
(2)	Withdrawn	13

(4)	Completed all goals set	73
(5)	Other	5
(6)	Add lines (1) + (2) + (3) + (4) +(5) to get <i>total CSRs closed</i>	92
Section C - Number of CSRs Active on September 30 of the Reporting Year		
Indicate the number of CSRs active on September 30th of the reporting year.		
		# of Consumers
	Section A(3) [minus] Section (B)(6) = Section C	108
Section D - IL Plans and Waivers		
Indicate the number of consumers in each category below.		
		# of Consumers
(1)	Number of consumers who signed a waiver	0
(2)	Number of consumers with whom an ILP was developed	200
(3)	Total number of consumers served during the reporting year	200
Section E - Age		
Indicate the number of consumers in each category below.		
		# of Consumers
(1)	Under 5 years old	1
(2)	Ages 5 - 19	5
(3)	Ages 20 - 24	6
(4)	Ages 25 - 59	80
(5)	Age 60 and Older	102
(6)	Age unavailable	6

Section F - Sex

Indicate the number of consumers in each category below.

		# of Consumers
(1)	Number of Females served	127
(2)	Number of Males served	73

Section G - Race and Ethnicity

Indicate the number of consumers served in each category below. Each consumer may be counted under ONLY ONE of the following categories in the 704 Report, even if the consumer reported more than one race and/or Hispanic/Latino ethnicity).

		# of Consumers
(1)	American Indian or Alaska Native	0
(2)	Asian	4
(3)	Black or African American	19
(4)	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0
(5)	White	139
(6)	Hispanic/Latino of any race or Hispanic/Latino only	27
(7)	Two or more races	9
(8)	Race and ethnicity unknown	2

Section H - Disability

Indicate the number of consumers in each category below.

		# of Consumers
(1)	Cognitive	0
(2)	Mental/Emotional	0
(3)	Physical	0
(4)	Hearing	188

(5)	Vision	12
(6)	Multiple Disabilities	0
(7)	Other	0

Screen 8 of 16

Massachusetts - 2010

**Section 704 Part I - Subpart III - Individual Services and Achievements Funded through
Title VII, Chapter 1, Part B Funds
Section A - Individual Services and Achievements**

For the reporting year, indicate in the chart below how many consumers requested and received each of the following IL services. Include all consumers who were provided services during the reporting year through Part B funds, either directly by DSU staff or via grants or contracts with other providers. Do not include consumers who were served by any centers that received Part C funds during the reporting year.

Item	Services	Consumers Requesting Services	Consumers Receiving Services
(A)	Advocacy/Legal Services	0	0
(B)	Assistive Technology	118	118
(C)	Children's Services	2	2
(D)	Communication Services	101	101
(E)	Counseling and Related Services	0	0
(F)	Family Services	0	0
(G)	Housing, Home Modifications, and Shelter Services	118	118
(H)	IL Skills Training and Life Skills Training	0	0
(I)	Information and Referral Services	118	118
(J)	Mental Restoration Services	0	0
(K)	Mobility Training	0	0
(L)	Peer Counseling Services	0	0
(M)	Personal Assistance Services	0	0
(N)	Physical Restoration Services	0	0
(O)	Preventive Services	0	0

(P)	Prostheses, Orthotics, and Other Appliances	101	101
(Q)	Recreational Services	0	0
(R)	Rehabilitation Technology Services	0	0
(S)	Therapeutic Treatment	0	0
(T)	Transportation Services	0	0
(U)	Youth/Transition Services	0	0
(V)	Vocational Services	0	0
(W)	Other Services	0	0

Screen 9 of 16

Massachusetts - 2010

**Section 704 Part I - Subpart III - Individual Services and Achievements Funded through
Title VII, Chapter 1, Part B Funds
Section B - Increased Independence and Community Integration
Item 1 - Goals Related to Increased Independence in a Significant Life Area**

Indicate the number of consumers who set goals related to the following significant life areas, the number whose goals are still in progress, and the number who achieved their goals as a result of the provision of IL services.

Item	Significant Life Area	Goals Set	Goals Achieved	In Progress
(A)	Self-Advocacy/Self-Empowerment	0	0	0
(B)	Communication	101	43	45
(C)	Mobility/Transportation	12	12	0
(D)	Community-Based Living	106	30	66
(E)	Educational	0	0	0
(F)	Vocational	0	0	0
(G)	Self-care	0	0	0
(H)	Information Access/Technology	0	0	0
(I)	Personal Resource Management	0	0	0
(J)	Relocation from a Nursing Home or Institution to Community-Based Living	0	0	0
(K)	Community/Social Participation	101	43	45

(L)	Other	0	0	0
-----	-------	---	---	---

**Item 2 - Improved Access To Transportation, Health Care and Assistive Technology
(A) Table**

	Areas	# of Consumers Requiring Access	# of Consumers Achieving Access	# of Consumers Whose Access is in Progress
(A)	Transportation	12	12	0
(B)	Health Care Services	0	0	0
(C)	Assistive Technology	188	68	100

Note: For most IL services, a consumers access to previously unavailable transportation, health care and assistive technology is documented through his or her CSR. In some instances, consumers may achieve an outcome solely through information and referral (I&R) services. To document these instances as successful outcomes, providers are not required to create CSRs for these consumers but must be able to document that follow-up contacts with these consumers showed access to previously unavailable transportation, health care and assistive technology.

(B) I&R Information

To inform RSA how many service providers engage in I&R follow-up contacts regarding access to transportation, health care services or assistive technology, please indicate the following:

The service provider . . .

N

. . . engage in follow-up contacts with I&R recipients to document access gained to previously unavailable transportation, health care or assistive technology.

Section C - Additional Information Concerning Individual Services or Achievements

Please provide any additional description or explanation concerning individual services or achievements reported in subpart III, including outstanding success stories and/or

Item 2 - Description of Community Activities

For the community activities mentioned above, provide any additional details such as the role of the DSU, SILC, CIL, and/or consumers, names of any partner organizations and further descriptions of the specific activities, services and benefits.

-

Section B - Working Relationships Among Various Entities

Describe DSU and SILC activities to maximize the cooperation, coordination, and working relationships among the independent living program, the SILC, and CILs; and the DSU, other state agencies represented on the SILC, other councils that address the needs of specific disability populations and issues, and other public and private entities. Describe the expected or actual outcomes of these activities.

During F10 MRC maintained regular monthly meetings between the ILC Executive Directors, the Commissioner of MRC and other DSU staff. These meetings helped to identify areas of shared interest and future trends, including the effects of state budget cuts on ILCs.

Other issues have included identification of the need for upgrading of the software used by the ILCs in Massachusetts.

The Executive Office of Health and Human Services, the Office of Medicaid and MRC) continued to plan for the Acquired Brain Injury (ABI) waiver with MRC identified as the lead agency. This waiver was implemented in FY 10 with the assessment of 100 candidates through a lottery process for residential rehabilitation and non-residential rehabilitation services that will culminate in transitions from nursing facilities to the community. ILCs were key players in reaching out to their consumers who could potentially qualify for the waiver.

Staff of MRC have continued close involvement with the Executive Office of Elder Affairs in the development of the Aging and Disability Resource Consortia (ADRCs) in Massachusetts. As of the end of September 2010 ten of the 11 ILCs were partnered in ADRCs, working closely with the Aging Service Access Points (ASAPs) in their service areas. This effort has resulted from the continued close collaboration at the state level of staff of the DSU and the Executive Office of Elder Affairs. At the local level, ILCs have worked closely with their partners from local ASAPs to develop seamless working relationships. In August 2006, the Massachusetts legislature passed Chapter 211, AN ACT RELATIVE TO CHOICE OF LONG-TERM CARE. This act requires that individuals contemplating admission to long term care facilities receive counseling regarding services that may be available to

help them remain living in their communities. During FY10, MRC staff continued to work closely with representatives of the Executive Office of Elder Affairs, the Aging Service Access Points and ILCs to implement this new program. Towards the end of FFY10, state funds were appropriated for the expansion statewide of the Options Counseling program.

Through its standing membership on the SILC, the Massachusetts Commission for the Blind (MCB) provided consistent representation, financial and other blindness-related supports. The MCB representative to the SILC attended SILC quarterly meetings and served on the Executive and State Plan Committees of the SILC. MCB is pleased to have a member of the SILC on the MCB Rehabilitation Council. Such cross representation is invaluable, we believe, for all parties. MCB continues to participate in activities related to implementation of the Commonwealth's response to Olmstead.

In this reporting year, the State Plan Committee continued to monitor the implementation of the Three Year State Plan for Independent Living (SPIL) through participation in monthly meetings. In the second half of FFY10, the Committee worked extensively to develop the SPIL for FFY 11-13. This included 2 public hearings at which many individuals submitted oral and written testimony regarding key areas for inclusion in the new SPIL. The SPIL was completed and approved by RSA prior to the start of FFY 11.

Through their standing membership on the SILC, the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission (MRC) and the Massachusetts Commission for the Blind (MCB) provided consistent representation. Representatives to the SILC from both DSUs attended SILC quarterly meetings and served on the Executive (MRC & MCB), Finance (MRC), and State Plan Committees of the SILC (MRC & MCB). In this reporting year, the SILC's State Plan for Independent Living Committee continued to monitor the implementation of the Three Year State Plan for Independent Living (SPIL) by conducting monthly meetings.

In FY10 the SILC's State Plan for Independent Living Committee conducted hearings, compiled input, and successfully submitted its new State Plan for Independent Living for Federal Fiscal Years 2011 - 2013.

Anita Albright	A	Ex-officio state agency rep	N	06/01/2008	06/01/2011
Anita Amy Ashdon	N	Consumer Rep	V	10/25/2004	11/29/2012
Yoseph ?Joe? Bellil	N	Other service provider	V	11/29/2009	11/29/2012
Richard Berman	N	Consumer rep	V	11/27/2009	11/27/2012
Bernard Bonsra	N	Consumer rep	V	11/29/2007	11/29/2010
Coreen Brinckerhoff	C	Center rep	V	11/29/2008	06/09/2011
Kristen Britton	A	Ex-officio State agency rep	N	10/01/2010	10/01/2013
Karen Bureau	N	Consumer rep	V	11/29/2009	11/29/2012
Leo Canuel	N	Consumer rep	V	11/23/2008	11/23/2010
Sybil Feldman	N	Consumer rep	V	08/15/2006	08/15/2009
Merle Ferber	N	Consumer rep	V	11/29/2008	06/09/2011
Elizabeth ?Lisa? Franklin	N	Consumer rep	V	11/29/2009	11/29/2010
Nanette Goodwin	C	Center rep	V	04/13/2010	04/13/2013
Becca Gutman	N	Other service provider	V	11/29/2009	11/29/2012
Sharon Harrison	A	Ex-officio state agency	N	10/01/2010	10/01/2013

		rep			
Jacqueline Higgins	A	Ex-officio state agency rep	N	06/01/2010	06/01/2013
Carol Hilbinger	N	Other service provider	V	11/29/2009	06/09/2011
Steve Holochuck	A	Ex-officio state agency rep	N	10/01/2010	10/01/2013
Marilyn Howe	A	Ex-officio state agency rep	N	09/01/2001	06/01/2010
Bonnie Jones	N	Consumer rep	V	05/10/2010	05/10/2013
Michael Kennedy	C	Center rep	V	11/29/2009	11/29/2012
Betty J. King	N	Consumer rep	V	11/29/2009	11/29/2011
Richard Leland	A	Ex-officio state agency rep	N	12/01/2009	06/01/2010
Sharon Liberty	N	Consumer rep	V	06/29/2009	11/29/2012
Shawn McDuff	C	Center rep	V	05/04/2006	08/01/2010
Judy Rodger	N	Consumer rep	V	11/01/2006	11/01/2009
Nancy Rumbolt-Trzcinski	C	Center rep	V	11/29/2009	11/29/2012
Janet Shaw	C	Center rep	V	11/20/2009	11/29/2012
Ann Shor	A	Ex-officio state agency rep	N	05/01/2008	05/01/2011
Brian Smith	N	Consumer rep	V	06/29/2008	06/09/2011
Lorraine Teehan	A	Ex-officio state agency rep	N	09/14/2003	11/01/2009
James Tierney	C	Center rep	V	11/10/2004	06/01/2010
Joseph Tringali	C	Center rep	V	06/02/2004	11/02/2009
Filomena Tripp	C	Center rep	V	12/08/2009	11/29/2011

Mary Dennesen	C	Center rep	N	03/01/2011	03/01/2014
Haralambos Hios	N	Consumer rep	N	03/01/2011	03/01/2014
Keith Jones	N	Consumer rep	N	03/01/2011	03/01/2014
Carline Louizia	C	Center rep	N	03/01/2011	03/01/2014
Roseann Rash	N	Consumer rep	N	03/01/2011	03/01/2014
Donald Summerfield	N	Consumer rep	N	03/01/2011	03/01/2014
Courtland Townes III	C	Center rep	N	03/01/2011	03/01/2014
Maurice ?Tony? Williams	C	Center rep	N	03/01/2011	03/01/2014

Screen 13 of 16

Massachusetts
- 2010

**Section 704 Part I - Subpart V - Statewide Independent Living Council (SILC)
Section A - Composition and Appointment
Item 2 - SILC Composition Requirements**

Please provide the information requested in the chart below. Include any current vacancies in a particular appointment category.

SILC Composition		# of SILC members
(A)	How many members are on the SILC?	38
(B)	How many members of the SILC are individuals with disabilities not employed by a state agency or a center for independent living?	17
(C)	How many members of the SILC are voting members?	25
(D)	How many of the voting members of the SILC are individuals with disabilities not employed by a state agency or a center for independent living?	13

**Section B - SILC Membership Qualifications
Item 1 - Statewide Representation**

Describe how the SILC is composed of members who provide statewide representation.

During FFY 2010, the Massachusetts SILC had members & nominees from every region of our state including:
Seventeen (17) members/nominees from Metro Boston (includes DSU

members)
Two (2) members/nominees MetroWest
One (1) members/nominees Cape Cod & Islands
Six (6) members/nominees Northeast Mass
Four (4) members/nominees Southeast Mass
Four (4) members/nominees Central Mass
Four (4) members/nominees Western Mass

Item 2 - Broad Range of Individuals with Disabilities from Diverse Backgrounds

Describe how the SILC members represent a board range of individuals with disabilities from diverse backgrounds.

Nineteen (19) members/nominees have physical disabilities
Three (3) members/nominees are hard of hearing
Four (4) members/nominees have a cognitive disability
Three (3) members/nominees have visual disabilities
Five (5) members/nominees have multiple disabilities
Four (4) members/nominees have unknown or not reported disabilities

Item 3 - Knowledgeable about IL

Describe how SILC members are knowledgeable about centers for independent living and independent living services.

Many of the members of the SILC are either presently employed or have been employed at a Center for Independent Living at some time in their career. Others are currently employed in organizations which directly work with centers in our state such as Easter Seals, SEIU 1199 and PARI. The SILC continually seeks to educate its members on Independent Living philosophy.

The SILC has developed a training manual which is given to new members as a part of their orientation. At quarterly meetings the SILC regularly brings in guests to provide training to SILC members and centers. During September of 2010 the SILC sponsored a 1 and a half day training on the roles and responsibilities of SILC members. All SILC Members and Nominees as well as potential nominees were invited to participate in this training. A key piece of this training happened on day one, where the history of Independent Living in Massachusetts was presented and an overview of IL philosophy was given.

Section C - SILC Staffing and Support
Item 1 - SILC Staff

Please provide the name and contact information for the SILC executive director. Indicate the number and titles of any other SILC staff, if applicable. Also indicate whether any SILC staff is also a state agency employee.

Due to its position in state government the Massachusetts SILC does not have an Executive Director. The person who the SILC contracts with for the day to day operation of the SILC office and coordination of all SILC events is:

Steven S. Higgins, SILC Coordinator
280 Irving Street
Framingham, MA 01702

Mr. Higgins is an independent contractor who is contracted with the MetroWest Center for Independent Living, Inc. which acts as the fiscal agency & contractor for the SILC. The SILC office is also housed within the MetroWest CIL

Item 2 - SILC Support

Describe the administrative support services provided by the DSU, if any.

Administrative support for the SILC is provided by the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission (Title I and Title VII Part B and State funds) and Massachusetts Commission for the Blind (Title VII Part B) through a contract with the MetroWest Center for Independent Living, Inc.

Section D - SILC Duties **Item 1 - SILC Duties**

Provide a summary of SILC activities conducted during the reporting year related to the SILC's duties listed below:

(A) State Plan Development

Describe any activities related to the joint development of the state plan. Include any activities in preparation for developing the state plan, such as needs assessments, evaluations of consumer satisfaction, hearings and forums.

? Executive Meeting: On January 21, 2010, SILC met with the executive directors of the 11 Independent Living Centers in Massachusetts to receive their ideas and input in Marlborough.
? Public Hearings were held across the state (Interpreters and CART

available).

- o January 27 - Public Hearing in Pittsfield
- o February 3 - Public Hearing in Worcester
- o March 18 - Public Hearing in Natick

? Written testimony was accepted until March 25 via traditional mail or email.

? Testimony from the executive meeting, public hearings and written submissions is available upon request.

? SILC's State Plan for Independent Living Committee met regularly during the public input period to review input and to formulate the draft of our plan.

? The final draft of the SPIL was presented to the SILC body for review in May.

? Members of the SILC voted to accept of the final draft at the June 24 quarterly meeting of the SILC.

? Upon acceptance of the SPIL, the SILC Chair and the Commissioners of MRC & MCB signed the Draft for submission to RSA in Washington.

? All supporting documentation and materials were sent to RSA by June 30.

? RSA reviewed the SPIL and notified the SILC Chairperson and the Commissioners of acceptance in late August 2010.

Note: The SILC's State Plan for Independent Living Committee is composed of members of the SILC, Center Directors & Staff, MRC & MCB staff. All members of the committee are able to give input for inclusion on the final draft document.

Each year, the eleven Centers for Independent Living conduct consumer satisfaction surveys. The size of the center determines the number of surveys sent out to active consumers during the reporting year. All surveys are confidential, and no direct services staff is involved in the process of tabulating the results. Each center sends the results to the DSU (MRC) and the SILC for review. All centers use the same survey.

The survey uses a ?Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor, Don't Know and No? response to all questions. A total of eleven questions are asked, with a comment section for each question. In processing the surveys, the Very Good and Good are combined for the purpose of meeting state performance-based outcomes.

The SILC & DSU's use this information to review any trend and technical support issues that may need to be addresses in the future.

(B) Monitor, Review and Evaluate the Implementation of the State Plan

Describe any activities related to the monitoring, review and evaluation of the implementation of the state plan.

The SILC's State Plan for Independent Living Committee meets regularly throughout the year. The committee checks progress of goals established in the SPIL and looks how performance goals can be met.

During the year the SILC participated in an onsite review at the Center for Living & Working in Worcester. The SILC has been included as an equal partner with the DSUs in the review of centers in the Commonwealth.

MCB: MCB continues to be a regular participant in the SILC's ongoing evaluations and compliance reviews for CILs in our Commonwealth.

MRC also analyzed and provided to the SILC and CIL's aggregate reports on consumer satisfaction and 704 service activities.

(C) Coordination With Other Disability Councils

Describe the SILC's coordination of activities with the State Rehabilitation Council (SRC) established under section 105, if the state has such a Council, or the commission described in section 101(a)(21)(A), if the state has such a commission, and councils that address the needs of specific disability populations and issues under other Federal law. Please state whether the SILC has at least one representative serving as a member of the SRC and whether the SILC has any members serving on other councils, boards or commissions in the state.

The SILC is represented on the State Rehab Councils (SRCs) of both DSUs, the Massachusetts Rehabilitation Commission & the Commission for the Blind. SILC members regularly attend and participate in all activities of the boards.

MCB: Through its standing membership on the SILC, MCB provides consistent representation, financial and other blindness-related supports. The MCB representative to the SILC attended SILC quarterly meetings, and served on the Executive and State Plan Committees of the SILC. Midway through the year MCB changed its representative, with Susan Lavin taking the place of Richard Leland.

MCB is pleased to have a member of the SILC on the MCB-based Rehabilitation Council. Such cross representation is invaluable, we believe, for all parties.

MRC: MRC plays an active role in the SILC's various committees including the Executive Committee, Finance Committee and State Plan Committee. MRC participates in the monthly committee conference calls and quarterly meetings. MRC continued to support ILCs in the implementation of the IDMS software in all ILCs and upgrading technology as needed.

The SILC worked with the Disability Policy Consortium in development of its legislative advocacy campaign. This relationship brings members of our states disability community together at the same table that might not otherwise be working together.

The SILC regularly communicates with the Massachusetts Developmental Disabilities Council. The council has a member who serves on the SILC as one of our DSU Partners.

The SILC continues to participate in the Adult Onset Disabilities group which was formed in 2007. Members of this group include many of the smaller disability organizations from around our state such as the MS Society, Boston Home, Mass Spinal Cord Injury Association, Easter Seals, ALS foundation and others. The SILC has participated in this group since its inception and hopes to collaborate more in the future.

The SILC participates in activities of the Massachusetts Office on Disability (MOD), a gubernatorial appointed council within state government. MOD staff regularly participate in council meetings and activities of the SILC.

(D) Public Meeting Requirements

Describe how the SILC has ensured that all regularly scheduled meetings and other public hearings and forums hosted by the SILC are open to the public and sufficient advance notice is provided.

All meetings of the SILC are open to the public. Public meeting notices are placed in major & local papers 30 days prior to the meeting to give ample notice. The SILC also communicates with the Secretary of State's Office of Rules & Regulations & the Executive Office for Administration & Finance prior to every meeting of the council.

Massachusetts adopted in 1958 its first open meeting law applicable to governmental units at the state, county and municipal levels. St. 1958, c.626. In fact, there were three separate laws, one applicable to each level of government (state, county and municipal), but the substance of the three laws was the same. The first statute was fairly general in approach, and after a series of amendments over the years, the Open Meeting Law was substantially revamped in 1975, adding for each

level of government a set of definitions of terms used and making more specific the provisions governing closed meeting sessions and notices of meetings. There have been a number of amendments to the Law since 1975, but its general format and provisions have remained the same.

The purpose of the Open Meeting Law is to eliminate much of the secrecy surrounding the deliberations and decisions on which public policy is based. It accomplishes this purpose by requiring open discussion of governmental action at public meetings. The requirements of the Open Meeting Law grow out of the idea that the democratic process depends on the public having knowledge about the considerations underlying governmental action, for without that knowledge people are not able to judge the merits of action taken by their representatives. The overriding intent of the Open Meeting Law is therefore to foster and indeed require open discussion of governmental action at public meetings. Yet the Law does recognize that public officials might be "unduly hampered" if all discussions by public officials were required to be open. As a result, it specifies certain types of issues that may be discussed and decided in a closed session. These exceptions, however, are limited in number and narrow in scope.

Item 2 - Other Activities

Describe any other SILC activities funded by non-Part B funds.

None

**Section 704 Part I - Subpart V - Statewide Independent Living Council (SILC)
Section E - Training and Technical Assistance Needs**

Please identify the SILC's training and technical assistance needs. The needs identified in this chart will guide the priorities set by RSA for the training and technical assistance provided to CILs and SILCs.

Training and Technical Assistance Needs

Choose up to 10
Priority Needs -
Rate items 1-10
with 1 being most
important

Advocacy/Leadship Development

General Overview

	Community/Grassroots Organizing	
	Individual Empowerment	
	Systems Advocacy	
	Legislative Process	
Applicable Laws		
	General overview and promulgation of various disability laws	
	Americans with Disabilities Act	
	Air-Carrier"s Access Act	
	Fair Housing Act	
	Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act	
	Medicaid/Medicare/PAS/waivers/long-term care	
	Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended	
	Social Security Act	
	Workforce Investment Act of 1998	
	Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999	
	Government Performance Results Act of 1993	
Assistive Technologies		
	General Overview	
Data Collecting and Reporting		
	General Overview	
	704 Reports	
	Performance Measures contained in 704 Report	
	Dual Reporting Requirements	
	Case Service Record Documentation	
Disability Awareness and Information		
	Specific Issues	

Evaluation		
	General Overview	
	CIL Standards and Indicators	
	Community Needs Assessment	
	Consumer Satisfaction Surveys	
	Focus Groups	
	Outcome Measures	
Financial: Grant Management		
	General Overview	
	Federal Regulations	
	Budgeting	
	Fund Accounting	
Financial: Resource Development		
	General Overview	
	Diversification of Funding Base	1
	Fee-for-Service Approaches	2
	For Profit Subsidiaries	3
	Fund-Raising Events of Statewide Campaigns	
	Grant Writing	
Independent Living Philosophy		
	General Overview	
Innovative Programs		
	Best Practices	
	Specific Examples	
Management Information Systems		
	Computer Skills	

	Software	
Marketing and Public Relations		
	General Overview	
	Presentation/Workshop Skills	8
	Community Awareness	
Network Strategies		
	General Overview	
	Electronic	
	Among CILs & SILCs	
	Community Partners	10
Program Planning		
	General Overview of Program Management and Staff Development	
	CIL Executive Directorship Skills Building	
	Conflict Management and Alternative Dispute Resolution	
	First-Line CIL Supervisor Skills Building	
	IL Skills Modules	
	Peer Mentoring	
	Program Design	
	Time Management	6
	Team Building	
Outreach to Unserved/Underserved Populations		
	General Overview	
	Disability	
	Minority	
	Institutionalized Potential Consumers	5
	Rural	

Urban		
SILC Roles/Relationship to CILs		
General Overview		
Development of State Plan for Independent Living		
Implementation (monitor & review) of SPIL		
Public Meetings		
Role and Responsibilities of Executive Board		
Role and Responsibilities of General Members		
Collaborations with In-State Stakeholders		
CIL Board of Directors		
General Overview		
Roles and Responsibilities		
Policy Development		7
Recruiting/Increasing Involvement		9
Volunteer Programs		
General Overview		4
Option Areas and/or Comments		
Independent Living Data Management System (Database) Recruitment of Staff Internship programs		
Screen 15 of 16		Massachusetts - 2010
Section 704 Part I - Subpart V - Statewide Independent Living Council (SILC)		
Section A - Comparison of Reporting Year Activities with the SPIL		
Item 1 - Progress in Achieving Objectives and Goals		
Describe progress made in achieving the objectives and goals outlined in the most recently approved SPIL. Discuss goals achieved and/or in progress as well as barriers encountered.		
Report from Chair of the State Plan for Independent Living Committee to SILC on Year 3 Status		
Objective - During year one of the plan the SILC, Centers, and DSUs will advocate for additional state funding to bring each of the centers in the Commonwealth up to a base		

funding level of \$450,000.

The SILC and the Centers advocated at the statehouse in April 2008 for additional funds for the centers in the state 09 budget. MRC and MCB did not include in their 09 budget requests additional funding for centers. The state legislature approved a budget which was signed by Governor Patrick for 09 which did not include additional funding for centers. In August 2008 the MRC was able to redirect funding received in the ?09 budget so that each center was able to receive a cost of living increase equal to 3%.

The SILC and the Centers advocated at the statehouse in April 2009 for additional funds for the centers in the state 10 budget. MRC and MCB did not include in their 10 budget requests any additional core funding for centers. The state legislature approved a budget which was signed by Governor Patrick for 10 which did not include additional core funding for centers. With the massive cuts due to the economy the centers received level funding for ?10.

During Year three the SILC and Centers also educated for maintenance of funding with our state legislators, at the statehouse in March 2010. Again in year three there was success for no cuts to funding for centers.

Objective - During year one the SILC & ILCs will advocate for an additional \$100,000 for growth and expansion of the SILC itself. This includes activities such as the annual conference and training needs to be included as a funded line item in our budget at the beginning of each year.

The SILC did not receive any increase during the first year of the 08-10 SPIL. Instead, the SILC received a decrease of approximately \$5000.

The SILC did not receive any increase during this second year of the 08-10 SPIL. The SILC remained at the \$5000 decrease in funds as in year one.

The SILC received cuts in year three so that the conference was cancelled for FY?10. No SILC expansion funds were received either.

Objective - During Year One the SILC will also form a committee to investigate the need of the addition of four new consultant positions at the SILC each focusing on statewide issues of systemic change including;

? Transportation

? Housing

? Long Term Care

? Communication & Networking

The SILC did not follow through during Year one on this task as focus was on keeping SILC funding.

The SILC did not follow through during Year two on this task as focus was on keeping SILC funding as it was in Year three as well.

Objective - During year one the SILC, Centers, and DSUs will advocate for an additional \$325,000 to \$340,000 dollars to address expansion of the IL network. This money would be used to fund a new Center/Satellite to be spun off into a free standing center within three years located to the northwest suburbs of Boston which have been identified as the most underserved areas of our commonwealth.

We did not advocate during year one for funding for an additional Center as we were more concerned about not having SILC and ILC cuts.

We did not advocate during year two for funding for an additional Center as we were more concerned about SILC and ILC total funding and the impact of the rules for the

distribution of ARRA funding. As it turned out, after much dialogue with MRC, MCB, the Centers, and the SILC there was a need to amend the SPIL to take out the priority for an additional center, and revise the distribution formula, in light to the ARRA funds as the current state of the existing network of centers and services.

During Year three the SPIL amendment allowed the ARRA funds to be distributed to the Centers, albeit a bit later than originally anticipated.

Objective - During year one and continuing through year three the SILC, DSUs & Centers will continue to advocate for support of the Massachusetts Network of Information Providers, which is the disability community-driven fully accessible web based database for finding services and supports, including housing, by persons with disabilities and service providers. SILC will work on this goal through a combination of legislator education days, information to SILC and ILC and other IL supporters and advocates through MILAN, a web based list serve for notification of legislation and events, writing of letters of support for legislation and funding on the above issues, and provision of forums and workshops, when feasible and appropriate on above items.

The SILC did write numerous letters of support for NE Index and NE Index was able to secure funding to continue in '09 as well as develop more linkages through their work on MADIL.

The SILC did write letters of support for NE Index and NE Index was able to secure funding to continue in '10. Representatives from NE Index were more active in their participation at SILC meetings and committees in year two.

NE Index was still a priority in Year three.

Objective - During years two and three the SILC, CILs, & DSUs would continue to advocate and educate both State and Federal officials as to the unmet needs the centers face both locally and nationally, seeking additional funding to close any gaps in services to these populations, and to address the expansion of the SILC & CIL network in the Commonwealth.

Members of the SILC and others participated in the NCIL Annual Conference, SILC Congress and NCIL and SILC Congress committees during year two and year three. The NCIL Region 1 Board Representative is Chair of the SILC SPIL Committee as well as Chair of the NCIL ADRC Taskforce. The SILC Coordinator serves as the Secretary for the national SILC Congress as well as participates with other SILC members on the NCIL Rehab Committee and NCIL Outcome Measures Taskforce. Both of these individuals represented MA SILC and Region 1 CILs and SILCs at the NCIL Public Policy Briefing in March 2009 as well as February 2010 in Washington, DC. Through this participation reports to SILC Committees and Executive Committee have served as methods for MA SILC to communicate on the Federal level, sometimes with Congress members and sometimes with other national advocacy groups, as well as at times with

RSA, on the needs to the MA SILC and the network of IL centers and services.

Regarding the State level, SILC members and CILs communicate with local legislators, disability commissions, municipal leaders and other social justice groups on the needs of those seeking independent living services and supports. In addition, many of the CIL Executive Directors are at the table with state government administrators on a variety of Olmstead/Community First endeavors.

Also during Year 3 with the variety of ADA 20th anniversary celebrations in MA as well as DC many from the MA SILC membership and CILs participated in a variety of events

with local, state, and federal officials and policy makers (including President Obama and Governor Patrick).

Objective - During years Two & Three the SILC, CILs & DSUs will advocate for the additional state funds needed to focus on expansion of the SILC & statewide issues of systemic change.

With the onset of the national/global economic crisis during the beginning of Year two, expansion was not a priority, and maintenance became the theme. This continued through Year three.

Objective - During year two the SILC, Centers, & DSU's will advocate for additional state dollars needed to raise the base level funding for existing centers in the network to \$625,000 each.

As stated above, expansion of the base was not the priority in Year two, maintenance became the priority with the economic shift.

Objective - Years One through Three, the SILC will advocate for the following housing goals;

? Home Modification Loan Program (HMLP) - to expand the definition of those to be served from ?those who are blind and have severe physical disabilities? to ?those who are blind and have significant disabilities?. Removing the requirement of having a ?physical? disability will allow individuals with other disabilities, such as autism, Alzheimer's and other emotional/behavioral disabilities to access funding to provide safety related modifications to enable such individual to live at home.

The SILC and Centers did advocate for the language change and was unsuccessful.

During Year two and Year three this was not a priority for the SILC.

? Community Based Housing (CBH) - maintain emphasis on providing funding for the development of housing in ?integrated? settings in the community and do not require this housing to offer supportive services.

The SILC and Centers did advocate for increased funding for CBH and this funding was increased for ?09.

During Year two members of the SILC participated in the Systems Transformation (ST) Housing Group, a group made up of participants working on housing issues throughout the Commonwealth. On October 29, 2009 this group hosted its first housing summit bringing in stakeholders together for a one day training focused solely on the housing crisis in our state.

During Year three SILC and Centers were educating for maintenance funding for housing.

? Facility Consolidation Fund (FCF) - advocate for requirements that provide more consumer choice and control of their housing. Expand the models to be funded beyond group homes for DMR eligible individuals.

The SILC did not advocate for FCF requirement to provide more consumer choice and control of their housing as well as expansion of the models to be funded beyond group homes for DMR eligible individuals.

During Year two the SILC did not advocate for FCF requirement to provide more consumer choice and control of their housing as well as expansion the models to be funded beyond group homes for DMR eligible individuals. Nor did this occur in Year three.

Objective - The SILC will also join with other organizations to advocate for more subsidy

and voucher programs on the state and federal levels that individuals can use to acquire housing in the private market.

The SILC and Centers did join with the following organizations to advocate for more subsidy and voucher programs: DPC; Mass Home Care Association; although the results are still to be determined.

During Year two, as mentioned above, members of the SILC participated in the Systems Transformation (ST) Housing Group. On October 29, 2009 this group hosted its first housing summit bringing in stakeholders together for a one day training focused solely on the housing crisis in our state.

In Year three some centers advocated for expansion of housing subsidies in light of the NOFA put forth by HUD to expand subsidized housing. MRC and some centers worked collaboratively on an applications from the Commonwealth on this NOFA.

Objective - The SILC Public Information/Education Committee (formerly known as the Advocacy Committee) will invite representatives from CHAPA and United to its meetings to coordinate and collaborate on housing related advocacy. This advocacy to include but not be limited to; letter writing and meetings with state officials to educate them on the housing needs of people with disabilities, participate in reviewing regulations governing operation of programs and make recommendations, provide testimony on the value of visitability and universal design to give options for individuals to age in place.

The SILC Public Information/Education Committee did invite representatives from CHAPA and United to its meetings. These organizations did not attend during the first or second year of this SPIL.

Objective - During years one through three the SILC & DSUs will work on establishing ties with the RCEPS located at University of Massachusetts in Boston and Assumption College in Worcester to develop trainings for teachers, ILC Staff and future leaders in the independent living community and also within higher learning academia

The SILC did communicate to both RCEPs and the results were unsuccessful since the federal model for funding RCEPS ended September 30 2008. The RCEP from UMass was a presenter at the FFY'08 SILC IL conference.

RSA discontinued the RCEP model so this goal was unattainable. RSA has not adequately provided options for SILCs and Centers under its new model which is centralized.

Objective - During years One through Three full implementation of the rights and options defined in Olmstead, which must include a full commitment to funding and consumer direction and control of a Community First array of services and supports for citizens with disabilities; Commonwealth of Massachusetts Application, crafted by representatives of the disability and independent living community, and subsequent implementation of Money Follows the Person, if the federal government so opens up this option again; revision of the 1115 waiver application to include commitment to consumer control and the ADRC collaborative process; continued support for full implementation of the PCA WorkForce Council and increased wages and benefits for PCAs.

During Year One the chair of the SILC Public Information/Education Committee (formerly know as the Advocacy Committee) along with many Center Executive Directors and the SILC Coordinator participated in many Commonwealth of Massachusetts sessions on Community First, Olmstead Planning, and Long Term Care Options Program. The dialogue consistently stated by the SILC, ILC EDs, and SILC

Coordinator was to educate and shift the focus from Medicaid funded medical model services to an IL paradigm which fundamentally expects consumer control, autonomy, dignity of risk and self-determination.

During early Year two Governor Patrick did release the Massachusetts Olmstead Plan. This historic document was to be the foundation for Massachusetts to truly implement Community First. Then the economic downturn occurred nationally and globally. In the midst of this the Long Term Care Options program test began, the Commonwealth continued on its path with refusing to apply for Money Follow the Person, and then eventually scratched the 1115 Medicaid waiver. All of this occurred with continued active and vocal participation by SILC members and ILC EDs in various arenas to obtain full rights and options as defined in Olmstead decision, but to no full avail.

During Year three numerous attempts were made by the SILC and Centers to keep Olmstead on the front burner, despite the economic downturn.

Despite the SILC, many ILCs and other disability rights and service organizations vocal advocacy, the Commonwealth refused to submit any application for Money Follow the Person. This disappointment to the IL and disability rights community is still being felt each day.

During year two the Commonwealth did not listen to the SILC on applying for Money Follows the Person, which was again reopened by CMS for additional applications. This was and continues to be of great dismay for the SILC and IL community and is another example of the Commonwealth not listening to the SILC as the voice for those living with disabilities, and knowing the most what we need.

During the end of Year three a new opportunity for MFP was released by CMS and with education and communication from SILC and Centers, the Commonwealth has submitted a letter of intent to file for MFP.

Revision of the 1115 waiver application to include commitment to consumer control and the ADRC collaborative process

As stated above, the 1115 waiver application, now renamed Community First 1115 waiver, is still in process. The ADRC model is still being implemented statewide, albeit with minimal to no funding.

The 1115 waiver seems to have been slowed during year two by cost neutrality issues and then apparently scrapped by the Commonwealth.

During Year three the 1115 waiver has not been re-raised, with focus on expansion of the ADRC network, funding expansion statewide of the Options Counseling program under the ADRCs, and crafting a Strategic Plan for ADRCs. Consumer control, consumer initiation of services, full accessibility of communication and data systems are still major challenges to be addressed in the ADRC development.

Continued support for full implementation of the PCA WorkForce Council and increased wages and benefits for PCAs.

The SILC was given updates at each quarterly meeting during Year One as to the progress of the newly formed PCA Workforce Development Council. The election by all PCAs in October 2008 resulted in a vote for unionization and 1199 SEIU has been in negotiation with the PCA Workforce Development Council and the Administration since the election.

During Year two the SILC had the presence of the PCA Quality Workforce Development Council key staff at our meetings. Members of the SILC have been appointed to and

regularly participate on the Council, representing the SILC SPIL priorities for full implementation of the Council and increased wages and benefits for PCAs. On July 1 2009, despite the economic downturn and massive budget cuts, the PCAs received a pay increase to \$12.00 per hour. During the late summer and early fall the PCA recruitment web page was enhanced and released. Also voluntary training of PCAs in CPR was initiated in year two by the Council and planning for additional training opportunities for PCAs continued.

With the budget deficits protection of the PCA program was a major activity for the SILC and Centers during Year three.

Lastly, the development of the 2011-2013 SPIL took up major time of the SPIL committee during year three. RSA implemented a new data and outcomes system for SPILs, and the collaboration among SILC members, Centers, MRC, MCB resulted in a positive new SPIL, despite the increased challenges from the new expectations. The SILC Coordinator needs to be acknowledged along with the SPIL Committee members, for their great work on this new SPIL, which was approved by RSA in September 2010. The Commission for the Blind is on target with the priority established in the SPIL for ?service provision that will enable people to remain in their homes, enhancing capacity for independent living and community participation.?

This year?s increase in funding was valuable in enabling us to serve more consumers.

Item 2 - SPIL Information Updates

If applicable, describe any changes to the information contained in the SPIL that occurred during the reporting year, including the placement, legal status, membership or autonomy of the SILC; the SILC resource plan, the design of the statewide network of centers; and the DSU administration of the SILS program.

N/a

Section B - Significant Activities and Accomplishments

If applicable, describe any significant activities and accomplishments achieved by the DSU and SILC not included elsewhere in the report, e.g. brief summaries of innovative practices, improved service delivery to consumers, etc.

The use of the flexible funding option has increased MCB's ability to provide appropriate community-based services to our consumers.

Under the flexible funding plan outlined in the SPIL, MCB puts the Part B funds for purchased services in a line item called ?flexible family support.? MCB works with a non-profit vendor. When a consumer needs a service, the third party non-profit can issue a check to a vendor or consumer. This non-profit vendor charges 5% for this service. This arrangement allows maximum flexibility in the use of the funds. It enabled the

Commission to make a partial payment in order to spread the funds to benefit more consumers. For example, if a consumer wants a \$12,000 van modification, MCB may agree to pay \$2,000. MCB collects the specifications and writes an Independent Living Plan (ILP). A check for \$2,100 is issued to the non-profit vendor, who can write a check to the vendor of his or her own choice.

Section C - Substantial Challenges

If applicable, describe any substantial problems encountered by the DSU and SILC, not included elsewhere in this report, and discuss resolutions/attempted resolutions, e.g., difficulty in outreach efforts; disagreements between the SILC and the DSU; complications recruiting SILC members; complications working with other state agencies or organizations within the state.

During FY10 the major significant challenge has been the state of the economy and its impact on the state budget.

Although CILs themselves have not been impacted greatly by this in the form of their budgets being cut, many programs that directly impact the lives of people with disabilities in the Commonwealth have not fared as well, leading to an increase in people with limited options turning to the CILs as their only option. This has also resulted in significant delays to the implementation of new programs which had been planned prior to the change in the economy.

One difficulty is the on-going lack of continuity in funding through continuing resolution, stemming from Congressional inaction on the budget. Receiving the money in a piecemeal fashion makes it difficult for us to provide services in a timely manner.

Section D - Additional Information

Include any additional information, suggestions, comments or explanations not included elsewhere in the report.

n/a

**Section 704 Part I - Subpart V - Statewide Independent Living Council (SILC)
Subpart VI - Signatures**

Please type the names and titles of the DSU directors(s) and SILC chairperson and indicate whether the form has been signed by each of them. Retain the signed copy for your records.

	Name and Title	Signed	Date Signed (mm/dd/yyyy)
SILC Chairperson	Nancy Rumbolt-Trzcinski	Y	01/27/2011
DSU Director	Charles Carr	Y	01/31/2011
DSU Director (Blind Program)	Janet LaBreck	Y	01/28/2011

OMB Notice

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number of this information collection is 1820-0606. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 35 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data sources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202-4537. If you have any comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Thomas Kelley, IL Unit Supervisor, Rehabilitation Service Administration, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave, SW, Washington, DC 20202-2800.