The Leadership Challenge: Effective Communication and Collaboration for Achieving Systems Change Webinar

April 2009

[Robb Sewell] Good afternoon, my name is Robb Sewell and on behalf of the NTAR Leadership Center, I would like to welcome you to the third in our series of Virtual Leadership Institute Classes. The topic of today's class is *The Leadership Challenge, Effective Communication and Collaboration for Achieving Systems Change*. For those unfamiliar with this particular webinar format, the presentation slides will appear on the right side of your screen. A chat feature on the left portion of your screen will enable you to communicate with me should you have any questions or encounter any problems. Simply type your message and click send. You will also see an option for full screen on the left portion of your display. Clicking this will maximize the area where the presentation slides appear and will minimize your chat off so that it appears as a floating window. Throughout today's presentation, I encourage you to submit questions for our presenters. To do so, click the Raise Hand button in the lower left hand corner of your screen, or if you prefer, submit your questions by using the chat feature on the left side of your screen, simply type your question and click Send. Please note that this webinar is being recorded. A direct link to the webinar materials including audio and web content will be available on the NTAR Leadership Center Web site by 12 p.m. Eastern Time, Thursday April 9th. The NTAR Web site can be accessed at www.ntarcenter.org. That is W-W-W dot N-T-A-R-C-E-N-T-E-R dot O-R-G. And at this point, I like to turn things over to Nancy Weiss who is the Co-Director of the National Leadership Consortium on Developmental Disabilities of the University of Delaware. Nancy.

[Nancy Weiss] Okay, welcome everybody and welcome to this webinar. I'm sure you're going to find it very interesting. I wanted to tell you a little about the NTAR Project for those of you who might not be familiar. Let me introduce our speakers, which Linda Rolfe will be joining us first. She's the Director of the Division of Developmental Disabilities at Washington State Department of Social and Health Services, and the second speaker will be Kathryn Denhardt who's a professor at the Center for Community Research and Service at the University of Delaware. For those of you who are not familiar with the NTAR Leadership Center, we're established in September of 2007 for a grant from the U.S. Department of Labor's Office of Disability Employment Policy. The center is a collaboration of partners with expertise in a variety of areas including workforce in economic development, disability employment, financial education and asset building, and leadership development. The NTAR Leadership Center was created to build capacity and leadership at the federal, state, and local levels to enable change across workforce development and disability-specific systems that will increase employment for adults with disabilities. Our mission and efforts are grounded in a series of five principles that have been called from seven years of Office of Disability Employment Policy research. Specifically, these are increasing partnerships, collaboration among and across generic and disability-specific systems, increasing the use of self-direction in services, and integration of funding across and among systems, increasing economic self-sufficiency through leveraging work incentives, financial education, or other strategies that promote profitable employment and asset building, increasing the use of universal design in employment services and as a framework for employment policy, and increasing the use of customized and other forms of flexible work options for individuals with disabilities and others with barriers to employment. And with that, I'm going to turn it over to the speakers. On your screen now, you'll see a little bit of an agenda, we're going to hear from our speakers. And as Robb said, if you press your little button there for Raise Hand, it will let Robb know that you have a question and he will unmute your line so you can ask your question in person. Or if you'd rather, you can type your question in that chat box and send it and then Robb will let the speakers know that you have a question. So with that Robb, I think we can turn it over to Linda. Linda, are you on and unmuted?

[Linda Rolfe] Hi, this is Linda Rolfe.

[Nancy Weiss] Okay, so I'm going to turn it over to you Linda, and let's get started and then Robb will let us know if anybody has questions.

[Linda Rolfe] Thanks. I am the Director of the Division of Developmental Disabilities in the state of Washington and I have an absolute belief in the rights of everyone to work including people with the most severe disabilities. So Robb, could you go to the next slide, please. And as a leader in the field, if you plan to help people with disabilities enter the workforce, I think you have to believe it to make that happen. That you have to believe it's possible and you also have to believe it's possible in order to lead it. Robb? You have to establish and communicate a vision of work for people. You have to value it and you have to expect it. In the state of Washington many years ago, we established county guidelines. In the state of Washington, our employment services are delivered through county agencies, and we establish county guidelines that made employment for our working-age adult as the expectation and our goal, and that was about 30 years ago. We have had about 30 years of working with citizens, working with families, working with self-advocates to work on everyone expecting employment for people with a developmental disability. In early 2002, 2003, we decided to make our expectation more effective and more of an absolute by saying that our day-program money, the money we spent on people with developmental disability to enable them to have some service during the day, would only be spent on employment for working-age people. Throughout all of the years that we'd had it as an expectation or as the only service, we have funded technical assistance and training and we have worked with self-advocates and families. And that's really, really important that for anyone whether or not you work with people with developmental disabilities, people with disabilities of all kinds have to expect employment as do their families. And you as a service provider or a leader in the field have to also expect that 'cause there's a lot of people out there that feel that you're being mean to people when you make them work. So, let's move to the next slide. In Washington State, we believe people with the most severe disabilities must have the opportunity to work, and that, by the most severe disabilities, I mean people with both a cognitive impairment and a physical disability. We have managed I think to figure out fairly effectively how to support people with cognitive disabilities and how to support people in work with physical disabilities. But when the person has both a cognitive impairment and a physical disability, we're not quite as good as that. But we still believe that it's very important for these people to have the opportunity to work and to contribute to the communities and into the workforce. So, we are working now on strategies that get people with very severe disabilities to work. In our day--in our employment programs, we've had a fair amount of success. We had 5,600 people last year. Well, actually in 2000 fiscal year 2--or calendar year 2007, earned $38 million, and we think that's pretty exciting. Next slide please. This is sort of an icon that we use to show what our vision is, what our values are. We believe that earning a living wage not only contributes to the community. It also helps the person assume a real role in his or her community and it helps the person achieve a certain amount of status and a certain amount of power and choice because with the money that they earn they get to choose what they do with it. Next slide please. In order to do it, however, you have to establish all the capacity to do it. You have to figure out how many employment agencies you need, how many employers need to participate in the vision. You have to have your whole system focus on assuming that employment is right for everyone and putting the resources behind that to develop an infrastructure for employment. You have to learn, relearn, unlearn. You have to do all of those things in order to push employment as the option for people with developmental disabilities because there will be a fair number of people who don't believe you can do it, and a few other people who believe you shouldn't do it. Next slide please. Again, this is sort of a graphic description of what we try to do in the state of Washington. We have a six-way approach to achieve integrated employment for people, for adults of working-age. And if you go from the top, 12 o'clock position, that is the system coordination position. So have you to identify everyone in the system who might help you achieve this goal. You need to look at your funding structure to see that you're accomplishing with the funding that you have what you want to accomplish. You need to invest in employment agencies or providers of employment services so that they know what you expect and when you expect it, and for whom you expect it. You have to also invest in a certain amount of technical assistance around marketing strategies. And I'm talking about marketing strategies that you would use with any person of working age who wants the job. I am not talking about marketing strategies that encourage people to employ people because of their disability or because it's a social benefit to society. I'm talking about marketing strategies that put the person's skills and abilities at the center of the employment opportunity where you're walking into employers and doing an analysis of what their needs are and saying I am the perfect person to fulfill this need. In some situations, I'm talking about developing a job of looking at an employer with the kind of opportunities that they have, the jobs that they can't fill, and making a job fit the person that you have. That's called customized employment and we often use that for people with a most severe disability. You also have to learn to disseminate your successes because nobody is going to believe that you can do this or some--at least some people aren't going to believe that you can do it. So you have to figure out a way to disseminate your successes. And you'll see in the attachments to this presentation that there are a couple of Web sites. At least one on Wikispace that shows you over a 100 people with a pretty severe disability who are effectively working in their community. And then you always have to constantly update your strategies because the workforce changes, the labor needs change. You have to always know what those jobs are that need people to do them and update your strategies around getting folks to work. Next slide please. In the state of Washington, we also think it's important to lead by example. And so our legislature passed a bill that made it possible for people with the most severe disability to work in state government or local governments and not have to count the FTE toward total FTE count. And sometimes that's, in state government, that's helpful and sometimes it's not. But if you can get your governor behind you to push employment in state agencies for people with the most severe disabilities, that's really helpful as well 'cause the governor can make a difference in asking her state agencies to make a commitment to employ people. This is carried out. We have some examples in King County and the City of Seattle who have also over 100 people employed. And actually, the City of Seattle and King County got kind of into a competition with each other which was kind of exciting for people with disabilities in terms of who can employ the most people. There are people in the state of Washington employed in library, sports, law enforcement, local schools, universities, and colleges. So getting people on government employment roles give them good jobs with good benefits, and it's a very good way to push your employment agenda. Next slide please. I think from my perspective, one of the most important things that you can do to push the employment agenda is to partner with anybody and everyone who can help you do that. And if you can't identify the partner who you need to partner with, this figures out who's in your way to getting everybody employed 'cause that's the partner that you need. You need people who are willing to push the employment agenda with you. One of the things I think can be the most successful is to not contribute to the unemployed workforce. Currently, in schools today, high schools have a responsibility for post school employment outcome. And you can leverage that to make sure that they are doing a curriculum that leads to employment for students. In the state of Washington, that would be at age 21. In some states, it's age 22 and in others, it's older than that. But if every school had a curriculum in their transition program that led people toward employment regardless of their disability. I'm talking about not just people with developmental disabilities but people with 504 plans. If they had those kinds of transition curricula that would lead people toward employment, we could solve the unemployment problem 'cause research shows that if people work while they're in high school, they're more likely be employed afterward, and it's just something that we have to focus on. Vocational rehabilitation can be a big help. There are universities with centers for excellence in many states that focus on employment as or transition programs as their expertise and you can get them to partner with you. Of course, the most important partners are the young adults themselves and their families and all of the employers that they know that might be willing to employ their son or daughter. In the state of Washington, we have a partnership project that works with all of those groups that's led by Jane Boone, and here e-mail address is there. She'd be glad to hear from you and let you know about what we're doing with respect to partnering with schools and DVR and workforce centers and employment security and families and employers and counties and employment agencies. So the next slide please.

[Nancy Weiss] Oh, actually Linda, we do have a question that I thought I'd read. One of our participants was wondering when would it not be helpful to not have to account the FTE?

[Linda Rolfe] If your governor is trying to avoid state workers once they get their FTE account, you can get a lot of really good jobs in state government not having to account the FTEs, and then help your governor that way. That's one way to do it. Or your county commissioner or whoever is trying to say that trying to ensure that they don't have a lot of state FTEs on that. It's somewhat of a political issue but that's one way. Sometimes in state budgets, you have money but all your FTEs are filled. You have money because you have turnover, and there's a couple of weeks where you don't have somebody in a position. So if you have like 3,500 FTEs like I do, then you may have some FTEs in your budget or you may have some money in your budget but all your FTEs are filed. So you can kind of bet on the come if your governor isn't worried about FTEs, well, you can bet on the come that you can support a person with a disability to do one of the jobs that you have to have done and not have to account the FTE. Does that give you a couple of examples? Did that answer the question?

[Nancy Weiss] At least so, thank you. Yeah, our participant said yes.

[Linda Rolfe] Right. So again, it's important to raise expectations, celebrate successes, and I always believe in a lot of celebration of success. So find those stories that you were really successful and put it out there. People then begin to expect that you will get it. Working with your state legislature is really important. But one of the problems with that is that state legislatures tend to turn over in their participants. And so you can have a leader one day and that leader goes away the next day. So it's always important to work with your state legislature. It's very important to work with your administration to make sure that they buy into the employment agenda. It's critical that families and stakeholders out there, families and people with disabilities also buy in and if you have to choose one, I'd choose those first because they can save you with both of your administration and your legislature. So you need to go to the media. We've had lots of stories in Washington about good employment outcomes. The People Working project is on the Wikispace that's referenced later in this presentation. If you get people who are working to go back to their high schools and talk to the transition students, here's the job that I'm doing, here's how much money I'm making. You can make a difference with what people expect. You can do employer roundtables. We have a video in the state of Washington called Great Hires, and it's Howard Schultz, the CEO of Starbucks, talking about how beneficial to his business bottom line, his workers with disabilities are. We do lots of conferences and again, a lot of technical assistance is really important. Next slide please. Also, it just so happens that there's a kind of a real effort on the part of the National Leadership in U.S. government at this point in all areas, the Disability Employment Policy folks, the Social Security folks, special education, people at OTAC, all those people are all interested in employing people with developmental disabilities and with all kinds of disabilities. So there are things that will help if you use them. Medicaid funding, employment networks, Ticket to Work. You have to learn how to weave those things together to try to figure out how to use the resources of the federal government in pushing your employment agenda. All of those are--again, it's very important to have the employment agenda and believe that it's possible to do that. Next slide please. This slide is very important. One of the things that is really critical is to have data about what you're doing. I don't know what the leadership center, they may have some resources. We use the Institute for Community Inclusion that the University of Massachusetts at Boston to help us figure out data collection issues and that sort of thing, and I think they'd be willing to help almost anybody. But it's important to compare, to analyze, to publish your data, that we also have a connection internally in our state with the unemployment. Our employment security department for the UI Data, so that we can compare through Social Security numbers who's earning money, which ones of our clients are earning money. And that's how we got the 5,600 people earning $38 million was out of our employment security office. Not just out of our own information system but out of the state information system that tracks every employee in the state of Washington that earns money. They track all of that, so we got that information out of there. But we do have our own case management information system where we collect data. And that's also one of the attachments to this or an explanation or a description of our case management information system is also an attachment to this presentation. So, next slide please. Here's where I come from. This is what our self advocate known as People First in the state of Washington. This is what they say. These are people with a developmental disability and this is where I come from. They believe and want jobs. They don't want to be poor. They want to have an opportunity to have a real substantial role in their community and they believe they can do this. One of the ways they can do this is by having a good job. Next slide, please. Now, the following is these three or four slides with various resources that you can go and look at if you're interested. And that completes my presentation.

[Nancy Weiss] Great. Thank you, Linda. Kathy if you're on, you can just press star 7 and you'll be unmuted, so you can move on to your presentation.

[Kathy Denhardt] My role in this webinar is to talk about how to build the collaborations when they aren't already in existence, how to lead such collaborations, and how to achieve the kinds of goals that you want to achieve. But when you need to have people from lots of different sectors, lots of different stakeholders come together in order to agree on how to move forward. So, I would say that Linda was talking about how it really can work, how it has worked for her. And let's assume that it isn't working all that well in your organization or in your state and you are trying to develop the leadership capacities, the leadership strategies that are going to build the collaboration that's necessary. So, if you would go into collaborations for systems change? Thank you. The first thing that's important is that there needs to be good timing and a clear need. Just because you think this is a good idea, it does not mean that everyone is going to come on board and decide that now is the time to collaborate to help you bring this together. As I was listening to Linda Rolfe, I thought, for example, that the division of employment securities in some states might not be willing to share data all that readily. It isn't unusual for one state agency to not want to share data with another. So, persuading them that it would be important a partner is aided by selecting your timing well and making it clear what the need is and then bringing them on in such a way that they recognize that there is going to be some benefit to them. You do need to utilize your strong stakeholder group. It's good to have strong stakeholder groups as opposed to simply individuals who might work in a division or who might share your interest. When you have stakeholder groups who are involved and have a good strong representative, who can speak for the organization and who is known in the circles that have to come together on this, it really does help for the collaboration to grow. It is crucial to not think of this as simply, one, your agency's endeavor, your agency's obligation. Now of course, since you are a part of this webinar, it is your agency's obligation in all likelihood. But in order to build a collaboration that's successful, it is important to have multi-sector involvement assuming that it's going to take lots of sectors like the private employment sector to make the effort of success. So building that multi-sector collaboration, having it broad based is an important thing to do upfront. I can't emphasize enough how important the process is. The credibility and the openness of the process is crucial to a collaboration. Many times, what derails a collaboration is miscommunication. It is a sense that this is one person's agenda or this agency is out to reap benefits. The stories I'm hearing these days about they're just after the stimulus money is really quite sad and so, there is a lot of mistrust that is out there among and between agencies. Certainly, many of the nonprofit provider agencies that you might rely on to assist you and might contract with in the state, many of those are concerned about their own budgets and so, if there is a process that lacks openness or if there is any kind of credibility problem, then the collaboration falls apart, and you might not be able to achieve your goal. So, having a process that is open and credible where they can be sure everyone who is a part of it can be sure that everyone is going to benefit. That it isn't just something that is going to be a feather in the cap or achieve the agenda or goals of a single organization. That kind of process will lead to much better collaboration. And that requires a leader who is committed to credibility and openness. It is important to have the commitment of high-level, visible leaders that might be elected officials. They might not be. They might be secretaries of the cabinet level departments in states. But they don't have to be that either. They can be very credible and important people in the nonprofit sector, employment sector, just people that the media recognize, that other parties in the stakeholder process will recognize as an important person. It helps to have them on board and it helps to have their support in a visible way. This is not unlike the united way of selecting as the president or chair of their state campaign, someone who is high-level, visible leader who will go out and try to help them collect money. That's what the role of this visible leader is. It is certainly not the role of that person to be managing this collaboration day in and day out. That's not that person's role. It has to be a draw if you are trying to--an attention-getter. If you were trying to get media attention, if you are trying to bring people to the table, this person can help with that. But it is the behind-the-scenes work that you and your agencies are doing to build a good process, a good collaborative process that will be supporting that high-level, visible leader. The "established" authorities, whoever those might be. Sometimes they are governors, advisory board, or sometimes they are a subcommittee in a state legislature. Sometimes they are advocacy groups. Sometimes they are a nonprofit group that happens to have a lot of authority in the sense of what they say. It holds a lot of sway in what happens with employment or whatever it is you are working on in this particular collaboration. So, it's very important that those established authorities whoever they might be are brought on board or at least agree in advance that that they will acquiesce to whatever this effort is. The reason that's important is because if they are ignored and not brought on early on in the process and you don't get their agreement to participate or at least not disrupt the process, you run the risk of getting way down the line and then having the established authority come in and essentially serve as a veto power. They say that they weren't involved. They didn't know that this was going on and how could any such important effort to be going on without their participation. So it's very important to think about who those people are, who can disrupt the process or the collaborative decisions later. Get them involved upfront and get them to either say, "Sure, we're with you" or at least say, "We know what you're doing and we're not interested in it but we will acquiesce to whatever is going on." The process needs to be designed to overcome mistrust and skepticism. I'm sure that all of you are familiar with the mini stakeholder groups who have had bad experiences with one another in the past and probably have good reasons to have some mistrust and some skepticism about the success of various efforts. The school systems, for example, might not have had good experiences in the past and in collaborating either with the state or with the employment division or with parents. They might not have had that experiences, and so if they are to be a part or if they're an essential part of a successful outcome, the process is going to have to be one in which they are assured that they're not going to be the scapegoat. Everything that goes wrong or if it's not successful, it's because the schools didn't do what they needed to do. They need to be assured or reassured that they won't come out worse for having participated in this process. Family members and the individuals with disabilities themselves might be somewhat skeptical that this process will work. And so doing things that Linda Rolfe talked about earlier is showing them that, in fact, this kind of system can work, employment is possible. It's important that that be done in order to overcome their skepticism simply to get them to the table. The process needs strong leadership and we will be talking about that later. And it's important that the process be designed so that there are some interim successes. Sometimes you will hear this referred to as low-hanging fruit. You need to be able to show some interim successes without having to wait for this final, ultimate, grand scheme to be successful years down the road. People lose interest and drop away from the table when they start not to see some interim successes. And I have mentioned that in the beginning, you need to be getting people to the table by focusing to some extent on what their organization or what that stakeholder group will benefit from this process. But as they see that they are benefiting or at least not being harmed by their participation in the collaboration, it's important to then get beyond the self-interest of the various stakeholders as they are trying to work together around the table, and broaden the effort to include broader community interest, what's really in the best interest of the state that the broader community, the employer community of beyond, perhaps, the more narrow definition of what benefits you're seeking. Next slide please. One of the things that it helps to understand is how these collaborations emerge over time. They don't come together with everybody sharing some understanding from the very beginning. So we have looked a lot at collaborative processes and we know that they go through some fairly standard evolution. I'm referring to the work of Chrislip, the Collaborative Leadership Fieldbook, and he also has another book on collaborative leadership, which I highly recommend to all of you. I think that they are good, very practice-oriented, very practical guides on how to build a collaborative process. But in this particular slide, we're looking at the evolution of agreements that occur in a collaborative process. And the first agreement that is going to come among the people who come to the table is that there is a shared concern that exists and should be addressed. Now, that's not just automatically to be assumed. People may come to the table and say, "That might be your concern but it's not really mine and I'm not sure that we really need to be focusing on employment of person with disabilities right now. We have other problems that we are dealing with, too many other unemployed individuals, for example." So in order for the collaboration to go any further, there is going to have to be agreement among the people who are at the table that there is a shared concern and that it should be addressed. Now, what you do toward your asset is a decision for later. You are glad to get this agreement early in the process. The second agreement is that they agree to work together to address the concerns. This requires that they get past silo mentality, get passed some of the turf issues. Maybe it requires that you as a leader get passed the notion that it's the responsibility of my agency, and we should be able to this, why are people getting in our way. It's the nature of collaborations that people get in one another's way. It's the nature of government, so we as a nature of democracy, I suppose. So, it really is important that people actually make an agreement to work together to address the concerns. Then they have to agree on how to work together. Are we just dividing up the duties and you'll do this part and I'll do this part and we'll try to coordinate with one another? Or are we coming together to try to reach consensus about the best way to approach things? Are we doing this as a governmental activity or are we doing this as a true multi-sector activity? So agreeing on how you are going to work together is the next step in the process, and it needs to be articulated and be very clear to everyone involved. The fourth area is to agree on a shared understanding of the relevant information. There are data issues. There is information, not just values about what works, what doesn't work, what should be done. And so, there needs--at this point, you are getting past the point of just talking about what each group values, what each group concerns are, perhaps getting beyond ideologies and turf. And now, you have to decide what information the group really needs in order to make good decisions about the best way to proceed. So there needs to be some agreement or shared understanding of the relevant information and then an effort to bring that data to the table in a manner that is possible for everyone at the table and everyone as a part of this collaboration to understand. Finally, I mean not finally, but fifth, you are getting to the point of agreeing on the definition of the problem or the vision. It may surprise you that if you get to that point much later than you would think, you might expect that you would be able to define the problem or be able to agree on a vision earlier in the process. But in fact, you have to get past a lot of these other things to get people to the point where they can even discuss what the depth of the real problem is or what the vision is. You need to get people at the table willing to work together and understanding how to work together before they get into these really fundamental conversations. And one would hope that by this time, you will also have looked at real data and information and be making evidence-based decisions about the definition of the problem and the vision of where you want to go. Then you get to solutions to the problem and strategies for achieving the vision. If you, as a leader or someone who has been working in the field for a long time, believed that you have the perfect solutions and the strategies to solve a problem. If you believe that you know those going in, it's going to be important to suspend or be willing to compromise on those things because you really need all the people at the table to agree on the solutions, to agree on the strategies. And it might not turn out to be exactly the strategy that you would have chosen but the reality is that the strategy you had in mind, the strategy that you chose if it requires a multi-stakeholder involvement or multi-sector involvement, the reality is that you wouldn't have been able to achieve your desired outcomes or your desired strategy without the help of all of these other people. So in pursuit of perfection, you might get nothing at all. So at this point, focusing on what can we come to agreement on, where can we make some movement forward might require that you sacrifice perfection. Agreement on the action steps and implementation plans for implementing the solutions and strategies is a final area of agreement. It is very sad and very common to go through all of this process. Up to this point, it had a wonderful plan on paper. Everyone congratulates themselves, has publicity campaign, and then no one took responsibility or people's attention moved elsewhere and the wonderful plans don't get implemented. So it is essential to have an agreement on what the actions steps are, who the people or responsible parties are for the implementation of the various strategies. So that there is follow through after all of the hoopla of rolling out this new program has taken place. Next slide please. Because of the nature of collaborations, and by this, I'm talking about big collaborations. I'm talking about big efforts that require that various state agencies be involved, that advocacy groups be involved, people who are going to be essential to achieving the desired outcome down the road. That's what I am calling a big collaboration. And if it is not something that is day to day but really you're working on a policy change, you're working on a significant step forward in terms of employment of persons with disabilities, for example. You want a significant change and that's what you're working on. It is my recommendation for those kinds of big collaborations that you have a project manager. That it'd be somebody's job to focus on this collaboration because collaborations are not just taking place at the meeting where you're bringing people together periodically. That's not when the collaboration takes place. What knits it together and the glue that keeps it together is what is going on between the meetings. And when it isn't anybody's job to be making that glue work or the collaboration work smoothly when it is just you 1 of 17 projects that you are juggling, those collaborations, those big collaborations tend to fail. They just get derailed by any number of things that can go wrong. But if you have someone whose job it is to manage the collaboration, it is a major project for them. It does not have to be the high-level leader. There just needs to be someone who is making sure that this collaboration stays on track, that meetings get called, that minutes go out, that when new information goes out or the media story that could cause confusion, or there is an election and key members weren't reelected, you have somebody whose job it is to say what impact is this going to have on the collaboration. Reach out, talk to people, try to keep the collaboration moving. That can be someone who works in your agency, you know, a key person that works for you. It could be you but it needs to be somebody for whom this collaboration is a significant project. It can also be an outside facilitator. And we will talk about the reason an outside facilitator might be chosen or somebody can manage the project from outside a given agency is because of the issue of neutrality and legitimacy. If there's significant history and particularly, significant lack of trust among the various parties, it is possible that anyone even who is doing all of the right things, if they are associated with a particular agency, they might not be viewed as neutral. And so when push comes to shove or when any doubts arise, a person affiliated with a particular agency might be viewed as working for the benefit of that agency and not necessarily for the benefit of all parties who are part of the collaboration. In those kinds of situations, it might be valuable to choose as a project manager or to choose as an outside neutral facilitator someone who doesn't carry that kind of baggage. It can be a consultant but we don't always have money for consultants. It might be someone who is simply a very good facilitator and who works for another agency. Sometimes those are in human resource department in states, for example, you got very good facilitators. It might be someone affiliated with the university center who would be willing to assist your program or the collaboration but they don't carry any bias or baggage from previous competitions, if you will. So in multi-stakeholder collaborations, someone needs to be managing the project and it needs to be done with legitimacy and neutrality not just following their own agenda. They need to be accountable to all of the people in the process, not just one agency. If you are beginning a collaboration, and there is never really a beginning to a collaboration, but if you're deciding that there is a big project, you have worked with all of these people before, so you might call that, you know, the collaboration having begun years, decades before. But what I'm referring to here is when you have a decision made that you want to, you really need to bring people together for a significant collaboration to really move your policy agenda or efforts forward. You have to begin by analyzing the context. Who are the stakeholders? And you need people to think about this very carefully because often, key stakeholders who have been kind of quiet for a while or have never been invited to the party, never been invited to the table, they are not considered key stakeholders. And so they aren't really considered and they might be real assets to a collaboration. So this is the point at which you need to think very carefully about who could stop things from happening in the future, who could prevent things from going forward, who isn't usually at the table but is a real stakeholder, and how could we include them. We need to identify the stakeholders and then assess what each has to gain by participating in the collaboration. If they have nothing to gain and everything to lose, if it was you, why would you be a party to that? If you have identified any way in which they have something to gain from the collaboration but you know they can prevent the collaboration from going forward, it may be not the time or the right strategy for this particular collaboration if you have such a group. Most of the time though, you can find a way in which they benefit this group that may have a lot of control, may have access to lots of resources, may have the ear of the right people in the legislature or elsewhere. You can usually find something that they could gain from being a party to the collaboration. But if you can't, that's a real stumbling block. It might give you pause for considering how this collaboration is going to work out. You have to also determine whether now is the time for other reasons. Is there a decision that has to be made? Is there a willingness to share control that it might not always have been the case in your agency but you have a new department head and there's willingness to share control? Or there has been a leadership transition in one of the other key organizations. Are stakeholders willing and able to participate in the collaboration now, maybe they weren't willing and able to before. So there has to be a decision about whether the context for this collaboration is one in which it's going to be successful. So thinking that out carefully upfront and involving the right stakeholders and not leaving anybody out who could really derail the whole process later is all part of just starting out on the right foot. Then you have to design a good process for convening all of those stakeholders once you have decided that it is the time, it is the place, and you've got the right people onboard. Next slide please. By good processes for a collaboration, I am focusing on a deliberative dialogue. And I'm assuming here that the collaboration really does require that you discuss and think carefully about what you value, what the policies have been in the past, what the policies could be in the future, what roles different groups have played in the past, how that might need to change. All of those things could be a part of a collaboration and all require deliberative dialogue. It is important in creating a process for such a deliberative dialogue that you encourage multiple forms of speech in communication. In other words, what I'm starting to talk about now is that you don't just have meeting after meeting after meeting with people, with talking heads at the front door. There is time here that we're really focused on developing some really good processes for communication that are different from what we have tried in the past. Certainly different from the public hearings that you and I have all been familiar with in the past in government. Certainly different from the presumed collaboration that really just brings people together and has the convening group take all the airtime and not really ask for meaningful input from other people. None of that is going to lead to a successful collaboration. So we're talking about different kinds of processes here. And what I mean by different forms of speech and communication is that you really not just be talking at one another or writing position papers. I'm talking about facilitated small group discussions around specific topics, small groups being 7 to 10 people facilitated, meaning you don't just put people at a table and say, "Here is a question, how is it we're going--you have 15 minutes to talk to one another and you will come back to the group later." I mean, instead of somebody who has some skills in facilitation who can be sure that everyone at the table participates in the conversation, that they stay very focused and on target and don't just get distracted by whatever the issue is of the day. So facilitated small group conversations are very important once that it emphasized listening to one another. Not just repeating the same positions that each group has brought to the table or the previous meetings that you've all been involved in. Sometimes it is important to get on to a different side of the brain. And it can really start to help people think about systems change differently if they actually aren't trying to talk about it or design it. They are simply sketching, drawing up on post-it notes on the wall and they are just trying to sketch what the current situation is or what a desired situation might be. It's a different form of communication. It sometimes really helps to break the ice and start to help people see a situation differently where there had been pretty much impact or at least a space or situation that hasn't changed in years. If that's what you want to change the way we talk about, think about it, we'll get it, and using different modes of communication can be helpful. Storytelling can be very powerful. I'm sure if you are working with parents and individuals with disabilities who have worked or have had successes or have had terrible tragedies, you know how powerful those stories can be. So can the stories of work and achievement that have worked in other states. So can the stories of frustration of the teachers who have been working with youth in schools and have not had good experience with transitioning them to work. The stories of lots of different groups can be important and so you can build them to meetings of some storytelling. It can't all be about storytelling. It can't all be about thinking in these--in very personal terms but it can be a very powerful way to begin a meeting, a very powerful way to change a--the dynamics in a meeting. And so think about using storytelling in appropriate times. Data and evidence are important as well. And they can't be thrown at people upfront and expect that everyone is going to make reasoned rational decisions based on good data. I'm sorry to say that we don't all think that way and we don't all function that way. So, that isn't going to be a necessarily stellar way to work on a collaboration but data and information is important. And as I mentioned in the agreement slides, it comes midway through this process. There's an agreement that we need information about certain things, that that would be valuable. And then the information not only has to be gathered but it has to be presented in a way that all of the stakeholders can find it accessible. That means all of the stakeholders. It means the parents who don't think in exactly the same way that people from the labor department or employment services do or the division of health and human service or developmental disabilities department. They don't all think the same way. So when you're collaborating, you need to think about the audience and how we present information and data and evidence that is acceptable to them and addresses their values to presenting data and it's about employment and that's important to you. It may be more important to talk about other kinds of outcomes that come from how the money is spent, for example. How the income is spent by individuals. That may be a more important and persuasive kind of data. So think about what data is important to you but won't necessarily speak to the other people in the collaboration. There need to be explicit efforts to build trust and create good working relationships. I really love Lani Guinier quote, "We come together to make change, not merely to make friends." Too often, we are working on--of meetings and we focus on some ways in which we think that people can make nice, we've got the coffee and we have the juice and the meals that we can come and have together, and we're trying to make this as smooth and nice as possible. All of that is wonderful unless all it does is keep old friends coming together and having the same conversations they've always had. Because that doesn't bring about systems change. It just perpetuates the system. It's nice and pleasant but it's not much good for change. So we need to explicitly build trust. We need to create good working relationships, and we need to do that with the focus on making change as well as being friends with one another. We also need to engage in a dialogue that leads to public judgment. And by that, I mean, that's more of the deliberative dialogue that I mentioned earlier. People are not going to really collaborate if they continue to simply reiterate the positions that they have reiterated so many times in the past. So, if people are on the same spiel and they are not and expecting the same opinion, then they are not really on the road to a real collaboration or any kind of systems change. What have to be changed in this process is that people is engaged in a true dialogue with one another so that they aren't just stating their own positions but really listening to one another and coming up with a public judgment about where our common ground is for taking some action. If, for example, you have union groups or public employee groups who have been resistant or employers who have been resistant to employing persons with disabilities and you really need to get them on board, they can't just be given the microphone as part of the panel and be told, you have 15 minutes to talk about this new policy that we have in mind. Because they will come to their 15 minutes and they will say exactly the same things that they have said in the past if they are resistant, and they will give the same reasons and it will be the same conversation you've had many times before. If on the other hand you designed a process which involves facilitated small group discussions, that resistant employee, employer, or employee union, a representative is part of a conversation that goes on with persons with disabilities, with employers who have successfully employed persons with disabilities, with parents, with people from your agencies, then they might be able to come to a public judgment. They might share in a public judgment and that is different from just stating the party line or the specific opinion that they have been stating for sometime before. On the next slide, you will see what public judgment really means. It is not just what you might hear in a public opinion survey or as I was mentioning before, the same things being said repeatedly by the same players. In making a public judgment about complex issue, the people who are part of a good process take into account the facts as they understand them so that process needs to really focus on what are the facts, what's the data, and how do each of the different groups understand them and you may discover where the problems in communication lie by focusing on the facts. But it also takes into consideration their personal goals and their moral values. And here, you are not just talking about their roles in the union, their role in the chamber of commerce, the role in a state agency. You are talking about that role yet but also, you bring to the table their moral values, and that becomes a part of the conversation when people come to a public judgment. You also, in public judgment get people to think about their sense of what is best for others as well as for themselves. In other words, you get passed self-interest and you get in the interest of others. But that only happens when people come to understand one another instead of just being a part of a play that has the same players and actions taking place repeatedly over time. Next slide please. Now, if you have a facilitator or the project manager, they are the key part of what they are doing. 90 percent of what they are going to be doing is engaging in communication. That is their job and it isn't communication just that meeting. As I mentioned, it's the glue that holds everything together and keeps people coming back to the table. Because it's often communication failures or simply misunderstandings or old levels of mistrust that will be enough to derail a collaborative effort. So the project manager or facilitator has to be keeping their finger on the pulse of everyone involved in this effort. Be on the lookout for things that might are being misconstrued, misunderstood, and then working to deal with those kinds of issues. The early parts of the communications for that facilitator or project manager are one-on-one conversations with stakeholders so that they really understand. This person really understands the perspectives, interests, concern of those individual stakeholders before they ever come to a collaboration. Then the facilitator can then determine whether there will be any benefit in participating in the collaboration. They'll be able to determine what areas of concern there are? What issues are high priority, where there is willingness to participate in a collaboration, where there is resistance, and what's the nature of that resistance, that comes from one-on-one conversations. It never comes in that first meeting, so don't call the first meeting before having these kinds of conversations. You don't even know how to design the process because you don't know what you have to overcome in order to really achieve a true collaboration until you know what comes out of these kinds of meetings. And the project manager or the facilitator can begin to help you design a collaborative process that will overcome some of these issues. Next slide please. During the collaboration, you've gotten the people at the table, you decided it was the right time, there is a need, you're starting to work on getting house meetings. It isn't all about meetings but meetings are probably important. But in the process of all of that the project manager or the facilitator has to do a variety of things. The first and foremost is that person has to be accountable to all participants. It can't be your executive assistant who everyone knows will be fired if it doesn't get the outcome that you want. It can't be that person because they are accountable to you first and foremost. So that's the reason for the importance of neutrality. This person has to be accountable to all parties in the group, and that will keep the collaboration moving along. This person will keep everyone informed between the meetings. This is the person who really will write up meeting summaries and get them out to people, not just as meeting minutes, five minutes before the next meeting takes place. I don't know about your staff meetings but that's what ours look like. That's not effective collaboration. The written meeting summary is needed to identify what decisions were made when we came together last week or yesterday. Where were areas of agreement? What are the issues that we're still working on? What action steps did we agreed to and who is responsible for taking those action steps? What is the timeline for getting this information, taking those action steps, or moving forward, or having our next meeting? So that form of communication has to be something that people who are part of the collaboration and busy working on 17 other project can read quickly, know where things are. It sort of put a stake in time. It's a stake where we got to at the last meeting. So you don't have to start that all over again at the next meeting. Another communication strategy or role of this project manager or facilitator is to keep players on board by smoothing ruffled feathers. It happens all the time. Someone gets offended, it says something that is misinterpreted and I don't mean just in meetings. These are, I heard that this meeting took place and I wasn't invited and what did it have to do? How could you make a decision about those without involving me? Many times, it is a misunderstanding. Many times, it's just not adequate information. But somebody has to be paying attention to it and that's the role of the facilitator, to smooth those things over, clear them up, or bring people together to try to work through it so that it doesn't derail the entire collaboration. It's important for this person to create visual and written communications that help people understand the whole picture, and visual is becoming increasingly important. Web pages are becoming increasingly important. Wikis can be used. There are a lot of ways in which to enhance communication but somebody has to take responsibility for making sure that it happens. That's the role of this project manager or facilitator. And it has to focus on not just all of the different pieces but somehow, how is this all coming together? Where is it going to achieve an outcome? What is the timeline or where are we trying to get to? It's easy to forget all of those and get lost in the trees when you're in the midst of the collaborations with all of those different stakeholders. So this kind of communication strategy is important for the project manager. The project manager is also the one point of contact for new issues, new possibilities, their questions about where things stand. Somebody needs to be the contact person. It's often, you know, if that person is too much of a high-level leader, they aren't available. You can't access them. So this project manager is the point of contact that has good information and is available for people to access. And the project manager is the one who assures that this process doesn't get put on the back burner because there's five other crises. This process moves forward, this is my responsibility, and they make sure that the other participants are taking the action steps for which they are responsible. Often there, it's just the prodding a little bit, making an inquiry. If nobody is doing that though, everyone can put this collaboration on the back burner and it never gets achieved. Next slide please. For purposes and this is the last one, for purposes of having a successful collaboration, having a successful systems change effort, I think there are some things that leaders need to consider. And these are not necessarily the project managers but these are leaders like yourself, I hope. What characteristics they have to have in order to be a successful participant or convener of the collaborative systems change effort. First of all, it requires a willingness to share control. If you're not willing to share control, if what you're trying to do is impose your agenda on other people, impose your solutions on others who don't necessarily share the same values, a collaboration is not going to be possible. Systems change might be possible if you can shove it down the throat of other people. But a real collaborative systems change effort is not going to be impossible without the willingness to share control. It requires being accountable to all the stakeholders, not just accountable to your own agency, not just accountable to the one professional group that you represent. It needs to be accountability to others as well, which requires honesty, integrity, willingness to be pretty transparent. You have to create, as a collaborative leader requires good processes for stakeholders to engage in deliberation and public judgment. And those processes are not like the ones that are the traditional processes for groups coming together in making decisions. In fact, we really often have to write a new game playbook for this kind of collaboration to be successful. It requires achieving agreements that are beneficial to all participants, not just beneficial to you or to your own agency. It requires follow through to assure that the agreements are clear, the action steps are taken, and that implementing is taking place. So, follow through is key. And if somebody doesn't have real ownership of that or a leader doesn't take ownership of it, it doesn't happen and all the good intentions and hard work goes down the drain as a plan or effort is collecting dust on the shelf. And finally, it requires giving the group credit for the good outcome and not expecting any recognition at all for all the hard work that you want to put into designing a good process. Keeping people together, really making this process work. If it works really well and you have done your job superbly, there a lot of people who will think, "Well, that was easy." And it's amazing how well we could work together if we just got together. You know what it took to get there but other people don't necessarily know what it took to get there and telling them isn't going to be productive. Just sharing credits, giving group credit for the good outcome, honoring all of those who took part in the effort, even those who resisted early on and were stumbling blocks but came on board at the end, it's important to give credit to all of those people. And many times, it means that the person who really held it all together, who really made it happen, gets no credit no at all but the credit lies in the successful systems change that comes out of this collaboration. And so, keep your eyes on that and it will be enough. Thanks very much. Are there any questions or comments? Linda, are you still here?

[Robb Sewell] Yeah, thanks so much. Just to remind our participants that you can ask questions by--there are two ways. One, you can click the Raise Hand button on your screen, or you can just send me your question via the chat feature. But right now, we do have two questions that have come in via chat. So I'll just pass them along. The first one is, are there any communication tools and strategies that you or Linda has used to listen to team members or key team members engaged in and informed without having to physically meet together?

[Kathy Denhardt] Well, yes. We have used web based, you know, web pages that people can sign into or add, put their things on as they have made successful steps forward. They have just uploaded those on or sent them as attachments on to a web page. I would say that that hasn't yet become really successful in most groups. I would say one is the multi-stakeholder group. It's very successful within certain groups that have been accustomed to that kind of communication. But most of the time in multi-stakeholder groups, we are not yet at the generation that waits and it is probably generational. We are probably not yet there, so I'm not highly recommending that though it is possibility and you can think about it. A lower level version of that is to just have a distribution list in which the team continues to work and reports to one another on their work, the e-mails between meetings. That often will allow people to make decisions and to move forward without having to come together at a meeting. And you recognize it has kind of a self perpetuating, well, a peer pressure kind of thing. If someone does I obviously am required to take this step and now, I'm reporting on what the outcome was. Then the next person who said, "Ah, you know, I agree to do something as well. I better get that gun and then report." So the e-mail distribution list has worked pretty well also. Linda, have you worked out with other kinds of strategies that allow for a good communication without having people have to actually be in the room together?

[Linda Rolfe] Oh, I was on mute, sorry. We've used videos a lot and I also think it's really important to be on message all the time. So you have to have a clear set of talking points that everybody in your organization uses all the time. You have to have, from my perspective, you have to have 30-second sound bytes to tell you the message that your working-age adults need to work, families of a long-term care system for people with developmental disabilities. I mean, the message you give, you need to be on message all the time. And so that people get--I'm a firm believer in repetition and so, when you can't meet together, you've got to make sure that your message is coordinated and cohesive and that everybody in your organization is saying the same thing or at least a variation of the same thing. And then as I said videos, we use videos a lot. We also use lots of conference calls. I find that conference calls of about an hour or two duration is about as much. Now, we have a travel ban in the state of Washington, so we're doing all of our meetings by conference, teleconferences, go to meeting, that sort of things. So if you have something up on screen that has your message, your agenda, and you don't take allotted time like an hour or two at the max, you can go over a lot of agenda items. And then again, I suggest you repeat it, so that you don't expect your message to get out over the first time.

[Robb Sewell] Okay, thank you so much. We do have a couple other questions. The next one is systems always talk about family involvement. What suggestions do you have to model this involvement from a top down perspective?

[Linda Rolfe] Well, I meet with families. We have several organizational groups. We have parent-to-parent, parent coalitions. We have fathers network. We have the Community Advocacy Coalitions in the state of Washington. There are places where parents gather, and I make myself available to those people. I always attend certain meetings and the leadership of those carry the message. That's why I make sure that my message is simple and short, and there's less chance for it to have a problem in the communication of it, so that I meet with families all the time. And also, in our organization in the state of Washington, I suggest to all of the people that report to me as well as all of the people who partnered with me that families are the most important piece of the agenda that we're trying to push because they're the ones that can go without a vested interest to their legislators and say "This is really important to me." So all of the people who report to me know how important from my perspective family involvement is. And I expect them to meet locally with families in their organizational framework. Not just in the course of their work, which they have to do anyway, but I mean in their organizations and carry, so that we're all on message all the time. It's not always just about employment but that's an important message in the state of Washington.

[Kathy Denhardt] Families are frequently important stakeholders in all kinds of systems whether it's education, community, youth violence, corrections. I work in a whole range of areas. And so, we are always having to deal with the question of "How do you involve families?" And there is some fundamental things that we have to start doing a little differently. First of all, everything can't be based on meetings in conference rooms. Family members are not always accessible, and so the only people who really get to be a part of those kinds of involvement are the advocacy leaders. Sometimes paid executive directors, they are the professionals. They aren't the real family members in some cases. So, we have to be working on ways in which we are getting true involvement, authentic involvement of family members. And that means taking the meetings to the neighborhood, taking meetings to where family members gather. It means not only making it possible for not only inviting family members to the table but making accommodations for them. There may be other children in the family, for example, and they might need to have childcare available. Or if you're talking about family members who have children or adults with disabilities and they need to have certain kinds of accommodations and you have a meeting in a location or the time and place where they can't use the facilities well or it's not family friendly. Then we haven't created a process that genuinely involves family. So I think it is important if we are serious about family involvement that we not leave it to these professional representatives of families, or even to the volunteer professional representatives of the family to the same spokesperson all the time. It's essential to really go to where families gather, go to where families are, or leaving out the realities and involve them at that location rather than it's the times and locations that are most common for the typical meetings, the professionals who do this as part of their living, as part of their profession. It's the people who are actually living and breathing and dying and working and crying and having a difficult time out there. We need to go where they are doing that and take the meeting there and take the process there in such a way that it authentically includes them.

[Robb Sewell] Awesome. We do have a couple additional questions that were e-mailed in. The first one is for Linda and our participant asks, as you know, so many state people are distracted today by travel bans, furloughs, and fears about layoffs. Do you have any advice on how to keep your stakeholders engaged in these tough times?

[Linda Rolfe] Well, from what I've tried to do here is make partnerships. I agree that you have to get with families, you have to understand families at the basic level. The family organizations elect their leaders for a reason. And if you can get your message to the leader of the organization, you can get it out to a lot more people. So I think it's really important to get that connection going and get that partnership going. Our families here in the state of Washington are now [inaudible]--for example, there's been a proposal in one of the budgets that they take huge administrative cuts in the division. And we've had several family organizations take that on and say, "We don't want you to make those kinds of administrative cuts at that level in the division of developmental disabilities because we don't think work can get done if you do that." So I think you have to have partnerships and you have to collaborate. That is, you push your agenda, and if they have reasonable reasons for not going there, you listen and you revise and you adjust and all of that sort of thing, so that it really truly is a partnership. And then I think people will support you in that. But the last thing I'd like to say about this is that this is a really unusual time. So you know, it's really difficult for everyone 'cause the reductions in the state of Washington take away about 40 percent of the human service budget and it's really awful. I think this is sort of an unusual kind of situation. And we just have to sort of--from at least from my perspective, get through it and get through it as best we can. And if everyone has all the information around it that they--and you're as transparent as possible about what this means and what it is and you're honest with people then they will help you get through it.

[Kathy Denhardt] I agree with all the things that Linda is saying that the partnerships with all of those groups are important and they need to be maintained throughout. In these unusual times and they are unusual, it's important I think to take this as an opportunity and people can really become even more engaged at such an opportunity and if you're interested in systems changed, it's easier to change systems right now than it is to change systems when everything is going just fine. Even in times when there are lots of resources available, even lots of new resources available, systems changes and always easy to get to, because everyone expects to continue going along as they have before and then maybe add a few new things along the way. The advantage of having a crisis as we do now is that it is a very good time to get everyone at the table thinking about what's really important and maybe we can't do everything that we've done in the past and what is it that we should be doing. And sometimes systems change can occur and people can be even more engaged in the heat of this kind of environment than they would be in times when everything that they're accustomed to having happen continues to happen. So, I think that rather than looking at this as a time when engagement wouldn't necessarily be at its peak that we actually could initiate more engagements.

[Linda Rolfe] We have data in the state of Washington that show an employment program, the person gets 12 hours of a job with 1 hour of support and we have other data that's showing a congregate environment, it takes 12 hours of support to get 12 hours of service. So, you can use that as an opportunity to point out the cost efficiency of a good employment program.

[Kathy Denhardt] Absolutely. Absolutely.

[Linda Rolfe] We have used that but also in good times, when we had good times in the state of Washington we use pilots as a way to start employing people and then celebrate those successes and you gathered information. So the point is that whatever situation you're in you have to figure out what the tool is that's going to get you to the place that you want to get and you have to always keep your eye on what you want and then be problem solver enough to figure out, okay, here are the barriers and here is what I want. How do I get pass the barriers.

[Kathy Denhardt] Well stated.

[Robb Sewell] Okay, we do have another question. In terms of data and evidence on using outcome measures, have either of you seen successful uses of scorecards or report cards on progress to keep people engaged in moving toward action?

[Linda Rolfe] What we publish in the state of Washington, we publish our data but I personally and maybe it's my energy field but I personally don't believe necessarily that a competition kind of environment is necessarily helpful to people with developmental disabilities. So, I--

[Kathy Denhardt] You know, I think that's a very good point. It depends on what outcomes you are focusing on. If the outcomes are we are employing more people, you know, it's that indicator, a social indicator of the number of adults with disabilities who are employed or the percentage of adults with disabilities who are employed. If that's what is on the scorecard, that is something that keeps people focused. I think--I'm not sure, how you would look at this, Linda, but you said earlier that, I think it was Seattle and King County sort of got into a competition with one another over who was employing the most persons with disabilities? Is that right?

[Linda Rolfe] Yeah, but that wasn't the result of a scorecard. It was--

[Kathy Denhardt] No but it could have been and I have seen that scorecards or outcome measures that are kind of keeping people abreast of what is happening with what is happening with whatever it is that you're concerned about. When that is out there, and certainly we know that when it is with social indicators, things like reduction or the number of people who are getting prenatal care, the number of women who are getting prenatal care or those kinds of indicators. When people know what it looks like and they know that the level is going up, it's remaining stable, we're putting a lot of emphasis and resources into this and nothing is changing, it does change the conversation. So the data, it depends on what the scorecard is and I'm not one that wants to keep the scorecard or those kinds of outcome measures at the agency level because I think agencies then try to make their own agency measures come out better. They have a vested interest in doing that. But if we keep it at the broader level, a social indicator that of different agencies are contributing to or failing to contribute to, I think those are the kinds of indicators, that kind of focus attention, keep people moving forward, and also lead to greater collaboration because there isn't a penalty within your own organization or an incentive to maximize just those goals that are within your own organization.

[Linda Rolfe] Yeah, I agree with that. I think you have to be careful about what you report as well because what you report can have consequences to people with very severe disability in the long run. So you have to be sure that the measure that you're reporting, I agree with them, reporting in the measures and I think that's why they got into a competition because we just reported the measure of how many people were employed. But that can become toxic to people with very severe disabilities by people only employing people who are relatively easy to employ. So your measure has to be robust enough to make sure that you don't end up harming the people that you're trying to employ the most of or the measure that you're trying to get at, the goal that you're trying to get at. So you have to be really careful with scorecards, I think.

[Robb Sewell] Thank you so much. It looks like we've already come to the end of our allotted time today. So what I wanted to mention is that if our participants do have any additional questions, feel free to e-mail them to us here at the NTAR Center. It's N-T-A-R at R-U-T-G-E-R-S dot edu and then I'll be happy to pass those questions along to Linda and Kathy. But on behalf of the NTAR Center, I want to thank both--and Kathy for their wonderful presentation today and for the excellent questions. As I mentioned earlier, we will be posting the audio and web portions of today's class on the NTAR Web site by tomorrow. And I just want to remind everyone that our next class will be on Wednesday, June 10th and the topic will be Leveraging Cross-Systems Collaboration to Drive Innovation. And also, I just want to mention too in closing that when you log off the web portion of today's class, you'll be eventually taken to a survey page and we just ask you to take a minute or two to complete that and give us feedback about what worked today and your impressions or any suggestions for how we can improve these classes. So again, on behalf of the NTAR Leadership Center, I want to thank everyone for participating today.