

Agenda Item 10: Future TCDD Public Policy Collaboration Activities

During the February meetings, the Council directed TCDD staff to develop an Executive Summary for future TCDD Public Policy Collaboration activities based on the performance measures recommended by the ad hoc workgroup. The Council asked for proposals to be solicited through an open Request for Proposals (RFP) process for any future activities. The Council also agreed for the Executive Committee to review an initial draft of the Executive Summary at this mid-quarter meeting prior to final consideration by the Council during the May meeting.

A draft Executive Summary for TCDD Public Policy Collaboration Activities is attached for review and discussion by the Executive Committee. Please note that a few “considerations” are included on page 4-5 of this document. The Committee may wish to provide guidance on how to address these items. A revised Executive Summary will be presented to the Council for consideration during the May meetings.

We have also attached the recommendations from the Ad Hoc Workgroup for Outcome Measures and Related Considerations for future public policy collaboration activities.

Future Funding Proposal

Executive Summary

Public Policy Collaboration Activities

Background:

The Texas Council for Developmental Disabilities (TCDD) exists to create change so that all people with developmental disabilities are fully included in their communities and exercise control over their own lives. The Council develops a five year State Plan with goals and objectives that describe, broadly, strategies to achieve this goal, including: providing grants to demonstrate innovative approaches to promoting the full inclusion and authority of people with developmental disabilities over their own lives; providing seed money to develop new community-based programs; working directly and through grantees to improve existing services and supports and to make “generic” community supports more responsive to all people’s needs; funding leadership and advocacy training; disseminating information to the public and legislators; and collaborating with individual advocates and advocacy groups to address public policy issues. A significant portion of TCDD staff activities directly relate to state-level public policy activities: staff work with the Council in developing position statements on key issues that impact people with developmental disabilities, routinely participate and provide input to a number of different policy-related Texas health and human service (hhs), housing, transportation, education, and employment workgroups, as well as to legislators to ensure that they are aware of the impact proposed legislation may have on people with developmental disabilities; and TCDD has provided financial support for disability advocates to collaborate with others around specific issues.

Over the last year, the Council conducted a thorough review of its activities related to public policy collaboration and the collaboration efforts of other Councils and organizations. The Council renewed its commitment and desire to promote and participate in collaborative efforts, and chose to explore other models that promote public policy collaboration that would also be effective in Texas. Other options may include nationally recognized best practices as well as models of change that reflect the current landscape and dynamics in the creation of effective public policy. The Council’s priority is achieving positive outcomes related to its mission statement, and believes that on-going collaboration with others in the arena of public policy is a legitimate way of doing this. At this time, funds are available to support specific activities that collaborative groups might wish to implement (such as Capital rally days, events to provide training and organizing at grassroots and/or local levels, conferences, legislative symposiums, etc.); however, the Council hopes to facilitate collaborative efforts that are not dependent upon Council funds in order for collaboration to happen.

To implement this decision, the Council will issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) that will allow organizations to propose any sustainable model they believe will best address the Council’s objective and primary requirements, as outlined below.

State Plan Goal and Objective:

Goal 10: People with developmental disabilities and family members will have the supports and services they need to be able to participate actively in their communities.

Objective 2: Collaborate, each year of the State Plan, with other agencies and organizations on an ongoing basis to develop and promote concrete policy alternatives and best practices to ensure that individuals and families can access and maintain self-directed community-based services and supports of their choice.

Expected Outcome(s):

TCDD will expand sustainable collaborative efforts around public policy issues that impact Texans with developmental disabilities and that assure the involvement of a diverse group of key stakeholder organizations, including organizations that have not traditionally collaborated with disability advocacy groups, as well as individuals. “Key organizations” will be those identified by the Council’s Public Policy Committee as stakeholders who have missions and philosophies that are not in opposition to those of the Council. The collaborative(s) would determine the issues to be addressed and the manner in which advocacy on those issues would be conducted.

Project Description:

TCDD may fund multiple projects to reach the outcome described in this Executive Summary, depending on the quality of proposals received in response to the RFP and the funds available at that time. For the purposes of this RFP, “collaboration” shall be defined as “organizations and/or individuals working together in a formal, sustainable manner; demonstrating mutual respect, mutual learning, and mutual accountability; sharing risks, resources, responsibility, and rewards; with a common goal.

The grant project(s) funded by TCDD will develop and support public policy collaboration activities that will be sustainable without TCDD funds within 5 years. Every collaboration(s) established or supported by TCDD must be “cross disability” and emphasize the inclusion of, representation by, and active participation of people with diverse developmental disabilities. In addition, the activities funded through this grant must address those things that are statewide issues and TCDD Public Policy Priorities.

All proposals must indicate how the outcome(s) of the project(s) would be measurable in a cost-effective manner. Examples of outcome measures TCDD believes would be measurable might include:

- The percentage of key organizations, including non-traditional and non-DD partners, which are part of particular state public policy collaboration.
- The percentage of identified hhs, transportation, housing, and education state policies, procedures, rules, or regulations that reflect Public Policy goals and identified needs, and/or the percentage that are changed to reflect input from the collaboration and/or TCDD.

- Of the key public policy-related documents (for example, legislative reports or bills) for which the public policy collaboration(s) draft formal recommendations, the percentage that reflect those recommendations.
- A demonstrated impact on existing or new policy programs and initiatives (for example, a change in hhs agency operations/policies, changes in state and local level policies and practices, etc.)
- An increase in the number of people with developmental disabilities and/or their families who receive information from, or provide information to, the collaboration(s); and/or the percent who
- have acted based on that information.
- Percentage of funds or resources needed to support the collaborative activities that are provided or generated by member organizations other than the DD Council.
- Number of organizations participating in public policy collaboration activities that represent people who are typically “unserved” or “underserved,” as defined in the DD Act Amendments of 2000.

Organizations submitting proposals must provide information regarding the strength and weakness of their proposed model. Although the Council is neither recommending nor expecting any one model in particular, the following examples are provided as “samples” of a few of the models that have been discussed thus far:

1. Forming collaborations on issue areas, a single issue or multiple, where none currently exist. (Note: In cases such as this when collaborative efforts are focuses on a single highly-specific issue, the collaborative would be considered “successful” and to have achieved sustainable change if the issues is resolved).
2. Forming a collaboration that addresses only a few key issues, as identified by the membership.
3. Establishing a means of providing core support for a state level disability coalition that is sustainable without DD Council funds and continues to be active when the grant is completed.
4. Creating a formal system or mechanism through which TCDD provides support to a number of advocates to work strategically as members of existing collaborative efforts that involve diverse groups who share an interest in a specific issue.
5. Creating opportunities for the “next generation” of disability advocates to “apprentice” so they may learn/apply/become engaged in public policy collaboration, training, and/or projects to gain hands on experience.

These four models are intended to serve as examples of possibilities only; TCDD neither encourages nor discourages organizations to use of any of these four in their proposals. Additionally, TCDD expects that a variety of different activities could be implemented through the use of any of these models. It will be up to the proposer and the collaboration(s) to develop suggested activities, with input from TCDD.

Proposed Funding Amount: TCDD could choose to budget a set amount or could request that applicants state the amount they would require to complete activities.

Proposed Duration: TCDD funding would be offered for up to five years.

Other Considerations for the Council’s Executive Committee:

1. In posting the RFP and application, the Council could include the question, “Would you accept a partial award?” and thus have the option to implement only parts of proposed projects.
2. Respondents should include an overview of the history of public policy change for people with disabilities that include lessons learned and what has been proven effective and why it may be applicable to Texas.
3. The Council may wish to consider having the proposers describe their activities (suggest perhaps “Advocacy Coordination” or “Advocacy Coalition”) and the associated rationale/expectations for such.
4. If the Council wishes to limit applicants to those with administrative offices in Texas, this would be best stated clearly in the RFP.
5. It would be easiest to compare “apples to apples” when grant proposals are received if TCDD states in the RFP how involved TCDD will be in the collaboration(s). The Council could choose one of several levels of engagement that may include the following:
 - a. The Council could plan to dictate the specific things for which collaborative efforts are supported.
 - b. The Council could choose to focus primarily on supporting people with developmental disabilities to collaborate with others and work on policy that interests/impacts them, with the requirement that they must advocate for things that are consistent with TCDD’s mission.
 - c. The Council could choose to go “all the way” towards self-determination and support collaboration/involvement as noted above, but without the constraint of “consistent with TCDD’s mission.”
 - d. The Council could choose to fund multiple types of activities. For example, TCDD could fund: one project that provides mentoring, TA, support, etc., to self-advocates and/or family members to collaborate with others on issues they choose; one project to provide supports for self-advocates and/or family members to participate in specific collaborative groups identified by the Council; one project to support and participate in a coalition of disability advocacy groups to work together to address issues identified by the coalition; and/or one project to support a specific coalition of many groups (including, *but not limited to*, disability advocates) to advocating for, a specific issue, such as affordable housing.
6. Organizations who respond to the RFP can submit recommendations about which organizations they believe would be “key organizations” and explain why. This might result in organizations with which we are not familiar and which may prove beneficial.
7. In keeping with the Council’s past desire that grants embrace technology and/or social media, the Council may wish to include a non-prescriptive prompt in the RFP, to this effect, such as, “*The Council is also interested in proposals that use new technology and media as part of a project strategy where appropriate.*”

8. If the Council seeks sustainability, they may wish to require increasing match each year, provide funding with either a bell-shaped formula (ie., smaller amounts the first year(s), the largest amount the middle year(s), and smaller amounts in the last year(s)) or reduce funding each year of the grant. The likelihood of achieving sustainability will also be impacted by the degree to which the Council is actively involved in and/or directs the project(s) activities.
9. There were additional comments from Council members included in the Facilitator's final document, but that were not specifically addressed in this Executive Summary.

Individual members felt that TCDD should:

- a. be careful that any change in the model/approach ensures that positive components of the existing model/approach are maintained and no ground is lost
- b. take more of a leadership in stating its expectations up front, regardless of the model chosen
- c. continue to work with the same people to implement the new direction
- d. focus on trust, public awareness, and practicality

Addendum: Council-Approved Outcome Measures for Focus Areas 1, 2, and 3
(Focus Area 4 Measures more appropriate as measures for TCDD’s overall work)

Focus Area 1: Collaboration—Organizations	
<i>Result/Outcome Desired</i>	Effective/improved collaborations, coordination, and support involving key Council-identified organizations as well as non-traditional organizations
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of key Council-identified organizations, including non-traditional and non-DD partners, that are part of particular state public policy collaborations • Percentage of state agencies aligning their programs and services to PPC goals and identified needs • Percentage of key PPC issues and goals successfully addressed through legislation or other means (e.g. funding levels, employment programs, priority services, attendant care pay rates and turnover, transportation access, low/slow Medicaid reimbursement rates, etc.) • Percentage of legislative and executive branch, community, business, and other Council-identified collaboration leaders indicating an awareness of key information (e.g. existence of the Council, priority issues, specific goals and proposals, etc.)
Focus Area 2: Inclusion—Individuals	
<i>Result/Outcome Desired</i>	Effective/improved inclusion, representation, and active participation of people with disabilities
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of people/families with developmental disabilities surveyed indicating awareness of key information (e.g. existence of the Council, rights/responsibilities, local service providers, etc.) • Percent increase in the number of people/families with developmental disabilities that have interacted with Council, obtained information, and acted on it
Focus Area 2: Sustainability	
Result/Outcome Desired	Deploy and maintain a Public Policy Collaboration model that is sustainable
Outcome Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of collaborating organizations dedicating in-kind and other resources to PPC activities and/or • Dollar amount of in-kind and other resources dedicated by collaborating organizations to PPC activities

DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES ASSISTANCE AND BILL OF RIGHTS ACT

SUBTITLE B: (1) *ENGAGE IN ADVOCACY, CAPACITY BUILDING, AND SYSTEMIC CHANGE ACTIVITIES* (involving Public Policy collaboration)

- TO DEVELOP AND SUPPORT COALITIONS THAT SUPPORT THE POLICY AGENDA OF THE COUNCIL
- TO ELIMINATE BARRIERS TO ACCESS AND USE OF COMMUNITY SERVICES BY INDIVIDUALS WITH DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES, ENHANCE SYSTEMS DESIGN AND REDESIGN, AND ENHANCE CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

TCDD MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Texas Council for Developmental Disabilities is to create change so that all people with disabilities are fully included in their communities and exercise control over their own lives.

TCDD GUIDING PRINCIPALS

All Council activities should be in alignment with the Council's mission statement and demonstrate:

- commitment to self-determination for individuals with disabilities and their families;
- effort to ensure that there is appropriate representation in all activities by people from diverse cultures and disabilities;
- best practices in the development and provision of services and supports, including an emphasis on measurable goals; and
- collaboration between the Council, grantees, advocacy organizations and other groups, including non-traditional partners, in activities that are consistent with the Council's mission.

TCDD STATE PLAN GOAL 10

People with developmental disabilities and family members will have the supports and services they need to be able to participate actively in their communities.

TCDD STATE PLAN OBJECTIVE 2

Collaborate, each year of the State Plan, with other agencies and organizations on an ongoing basis to develop and promote concrete policy alternatives and best practices to ensure that individuals and families can access and maintain self-directed community-based services and supports of their choice.

Focus Areas

1. **Collaboration—Organizations**
2. **Inclusion—Individuals**
3. **Sustainability**
4. **Cross-cutting Outcomes**

The tables on the following pages are organized around these focus areas, derived from enabling statutes, the Council’s State Plan, and discussions of goals/objectives, values, issues, and specific recommendations from the November 12, 2010 Committee of the Whole meeting. The first three focus areas are directly related to Public Policy Collaboration (PPC) activities while the “Cross-cutting Outcomes” area relates to various Council programs, including PPC. The primary focus of the PPC ad hoc workgroup is on the desired results/outcomes and related outcome measures described below. “Secondary” information from Council-generated ideas is also provided for context in facilitating the interpretation and discussion of outcome measures.

Primary Information

Result/Outcome Desired reflects more specific subsets of the Council’s State Plan Objective #2. These statements can be made even more specific by including outcome measure performance targets and timeframes.

Outcome Measures for these 3 primary PPC-related and 1 cross-cutting focus areas are written as percentages and reflect the desired results/outcomes.

Secondary Information

Other Measures, such as output measures (number of units of activities/services provided or number of people served), efficiency measures (dollar cost per activity/service or organization/individual served), and demand/explanatory measures (i.e. the universe to be collaborated with or served, or other relevant information) are intended to complement the outcome measures and are not intended to represent a comprehensive set of all program measures that might be used.

Qualitative Measures and Considerations include key assumptions, quality considerations, and other factors relevant to understanding a balanced view of the focus areas.

Activities and Services include activities and services specifically mentioned and emphasized by Council members. Some may be existing activities/services while others may represent new ones. The activities/services noted here are not intended to represent a comprehensive set of all activities/services that are currently being or that might be employed/provided.

Focus Area 1: Collaboration—Organizations	
<i>Result/Outcome Desired</i>	Effective/improved collaborations, coordination, and support involving key Council-identified organizations as well as non-traditional organizations
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of key Council-identified organizations, including non-traditional and non-DD partners, that are part of particular state public policy collaborations • Percentage of state agencies aligning their programs and services to PPC goals and identified needs • Percentage of key PPC issues and goals successfully addressed through legislation or other means (e.g. funding levels, employment programs, priority services, attendant care pay rates and turnover, transportation access, low/slow Medicaid reimbursement rates, etc.) • Percentage of legislative and executive branch, community, business, and other Council-identified collaboration leaders indicating an awareness of key information (e.g. existence of the Council, priority issues, specific goals and proposals, etc.)
<i>Other Measures (output, demand, efficiency, explanatory)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of meetings, briefings, testimonies, events, training sessions provided/conducted (output)* • Number of people attending meetings, briefings, testimonies, events, training sessions (output)* • Number of key Council-identified organizations that are targeted to be part of the PPC (demand/explanatory) <p>*Note: These two output measures could be disaggregated to count each of the different types of activities/services should that detail be necessary.</p>
<i>Qualitative Measures and Considerations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meetings – review documentation (minutes, attendance, etc.), discussion, consensus recommendations, public comments, identified activities evaluated/completed; provide information/reports; achieve goals (i.e., influence, etc.) • Identification of ALL organizations that need to be at the table, assure appropriate representation, avoid duplication or exclusion, create a space so people will come • Include self-advocates and promote self-advocacy • Improve communication within the Council and with external stakeholders to promote awareness and understanding

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional comments/ideas from board members regarding the collaboration model: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Uses a contracted entity to provide core support for a coalition with multiple organizations (including TDDC) taking specific other roles (e.g. social and civic engagement and advocacy) and specific issue advocacy. TCDD should consider its role as a participant vs. convener ○ Joins other collaborative efforts that already exist via other funding ○ Considers paring things down and focusing more on a few specific areas/activities, and if we have a collaboration, one group can take the lead on multiple campaigns ○ Is careful that any change in the PPC model/approach ensures that positive components of the existing model/approach are maintained and that we do not lose ground ○ Regardless of the model, involves the Council in taking more leadership in stating its expectations ○ Continues to work with the same people to implement the new direction ○ Focuses on trust, public awareness, and practicality
<p><i>Activities and Services</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer to peer training and support • Youth activities and services, including leadership activities

Focus Area 2: Inclusion—Individuals	
<i>Result/Outcome Desired</i>	Effective/improved inclusion, representation, and active participation of people with disabilities in public policy collaboration activities
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of people/families with developmental disabilities surveyed indicating awareness of key information (e.g. existence of the Council, rights/responsibilities, local service providers, etc.) • Percent increase in the number of people/families with developmental disabilities that have interacted with Council, obtained information, and acted on it
<i>Other Measures (output, demand, efficiency, explanatory)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of people with developmental disabilities participating in/impacted by PPC activities/services
<i>Qualitative Measures and Considerations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication issue(s) related to services/supports for people with disabilities and their families • Maintain and analyze demographic data (possible source: a diverse group of providers) • Access to the internet
<i>Activities and Services</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scholarships • Youth activities/services

Focus Area 3: Sustainability	
Result/Outcome Desired	Deploy and maintain a public policy collaboration model that is sustainable
Outcome Measures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of collaborating organizations dedicating in-kind and/or other resources to PPC activities <li style="text-align: center;">And/Or- • Dollar amount of in-kind and other resources dedicated by collaborating organizations to PPC activities
Other Measures (output, demand, efficiency, explanatory)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost per disability organization collaborated with (efficiency) (global measure: number of organizations involved in PPC activities divided by total PPC costs)
Qualitative Measures and Considerations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficient and effective use of resources • Identification of new resources
Activities and Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See other focus areas

Focus Area 4: Cross-cutting Outcomes	
<i>Result/Outcome Desired</i>	Effective/improved systemic strategies that improve the lives of people with developmental disabilities, allows them to live independently, and improves access to and opportunities for quality services that are self directed, community-based, and reflective of best practices
<i>Outcome Measures</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percentage of people with developmental disabilities able to live independently and have an active social life • Percentage of people/families with developmental disabilities who have “access” to comprehensive, cutting edge, and effective services, health care, transportation, employment, education, etc. (this can be determined through periodic surveys, census, or focus groups) • Funding per capita • Rankings/ratings • Mortality/morbidity rates • Education levels • Workforce/employment levels • Income levels
<i>Other Measures (output, demand, efficiency, explanatory)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of people with developmental disabilities served in various non-profit, private sector, and government (i.e. local, state, and federal) programs (output) • Number of people with developmental disabilities (demand) • Number of developmental disability-related organizations (demand/explanatory)
<i>Qualitative Measures and Considerations</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Elimination of barriers • Self-directed/self-determination (education, choice, and control) • Best practices and enhanced system design, generic and specialized services • Community-based (local access and best practices) • See other focus areas
<i>Activities and Services</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-specific disability, cross-disability, and functional service/support focus versus disability-specific services • See other focus areas

Facilitator Findings and Recommendations

1. In considering the PPC model/approach, the Council should baseline/benchmark outcome measures (where possible) for the new model/approach against current outcome levels to determine if the new model/approach is working. And, careful attention should be paid to the selection, wording, and definition of any outcome measures the Council chooses to use.
2. In considering changes to the mix of activities/services, determine if current activities/services:
 - a. are addressing a priority need issue, and/or customer demand;
 - b. reflect best practices and are delivered effectively/professionally;
 - c. are achieving their intended results;
 - d. are an efficient use of resources (i.e. produce highest results for the lowest possible cost when weighed against other available options); and
 - e. should be maintained in light of the above considerations and new activities/services that are being considered.
3. Before deploying specific outcome measures, CDD will need to develop detailed definitions of the measures (i.e. narrative description, definition of terms, calculation methodology/formula, source/reliability of the underlying data, limitations on the interpretation and use of reporting figures, etc.) to ensure accurate and consistent data collection and reporting over time.