

**REPORT OF THE
JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE STUDYING**

**THE FUNDING
AND ADMINISTRATION
OF SHELTERED WORKSHOPS**

**TO THE GOVERNOR AND
THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF VIRGINIA**



House Document No. 29

**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
1984**

MEMBERS OF JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE

Members:

Delegate Owen B. Pickett, Chairman

Senator Clive L. DuVal, 2d, Vice-Chairman

Senator W. Onico Barker

Senator Evelyn M. Hailey

Delegate Dorothy S. McDiarmid

Delegate Phoebe M. Orebaugh

Delegate Julie L. Smith

Citizen Members:

Renee Fisher

Alexander H. Kyrus

C. W. Van Valkenburgh



STAFF

Legal and Research

Division of Legislative Services

Susan C. Ward, Staff Attorney

Joanne M. Fisher, Research Associate

Angela S. Cole, Secretary

Administrative and Clerical

Office of the Clerk, House of Delegates

**Report of the Joint Subcommittee Studying the Funding
and Administration of Sheltered Workshops
To
The Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia
Richmond, Virginia
December, 1983**

To: Honorable Charles S. Robb, Governor of Virginia
and
The General Assembly of Virginia

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The study was initiated in 1982 by House Joint Resolution No. 8, which directed the Joint Subcommittee to identify and develop solutions to problems related to the funding and the administration of sheltered workshops. The problems have resulted from decreases in federal funding and increased demand for workshop services. In addition, the existence of several funding sources for the workshops has caused instability and confusion in the administration of the workshops.

As an interim measure to meet funding shortages, the General Assembly in 1982 appropriated \$1.2 million to the Departments of Social Services and of Rehabilitative Services. The Secretary of Human Resources agreed to work toward the development of a long-range strategy for state support of sheltered workshops to stabilize funding and improve interagency coordination.

In 1983, the Joint Subcommittee reported its findings and recommendations to the Governor and the General Assembly. The report is contained in House Document No. 43.

The study was continued in 1983 by House Joint Resolution No. 48, in order to monitor the recommendations made by the Joint Subcommittee that year. In addition to this monitoring function, the Joint Subcommittee was also charged with studying further the number and service needs of the population currently awaiting workshop services in order to determine whether additional funding can serve this population within existing facilities and to assist the workshops in long-range planning by indicating the service needs of future workshop clients.

PROGRESS ON IMPLEMENTATION

OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Following is a discussion of the major problem areas identified by the Joint Subcommittee during 1982, the recommended solutions, and the progress made in the implementation of those recommendations, as reported by the state agencies participating in the program.

State Funding of the Workshops

The Joint Subcommittee in 1982 recommended that, generally, supplemental funding, indexed for inflation, should be appropriated in the same manner as for fiscal year 1983, when funds were included in the state agency budgets and designated for sheltered workshops.

Additionally, the Joint Subcommittee recommended that in fiscal year 1984, the supplemental funds should go to the Department of Social Services for provision of all types of employment services and to the Department of Rehabilitative Services for capacity building in workshops, expansion of services to both the mentally and the physically disabled, and for capitalization. Innovative projects, if undertaken, should be restricted to trial in existing workshops.

For the 1985-86 biennium, supplemental funds previously provided to the Department of Social Services should be added instead to the budget of the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation through the community services boards to serve the long-term clients

previously supported by the Department of Social Services.

In response to this recommendation, the General Assembly in 1983 appropriated \$1.2 million for these programs in fiscal 1984 (a decrease from \$1.231 million appropriated the previous year). However, these funds were placed solely in the budget of the Department of Rehabilitative Services in an effort to centralize the administration of the funds and to simplify data collection capabilities. The administration reports that the allocation plan that has been adopted by the Department of Rehabilitative Services conforms to the requirements in the legislation, the recommendations of the Joint Subcommittee and the information provided by other state and local agencies and organizations such as the Virginia Association of Rehabilitation Facilities.

The allocation plan for this year includes \$1 million targeted for long-term sheltered employment for the severely mentally and physically disabled. The Administration estimates that a minimum of 421 handicapped individuals will be supported in 44 workshops with these funds. The remaining \$200,000 is being directed toward capacity building and innovative projects in existing workshops. Eight proposals, totaling \$737,000, were submitted for developing innovative projects. Approximately three projects have been chosen for funding from among these applications. (Innovative projects are discussed in more detail later in this report.)

Method of Payment for Workshop Services

The Joint Subcommittee recommended in 1982 that both the purchase-of-service and grant methods of payment should remain available. This necessitates the development of a purchase-of-service program by the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation. Rate-setting should be uniform among the three agencies purchasing workshop services.

The Administration reports that the common rate-setting and purchase-of-service system in use by both the Department of Social Services and the Department of Rehabilitative Services continues to operate. The Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation is currently studying this common system in an effort to develop its own purchase-of-service capability. A one-day workshop has been conducted by that Department, with assistance provided by the other two agencies and the Virginia Association of Rehabilitation Facilities, to examine the existing purchase-of-service model and to explore ways the system can be used on both the state and community services board levels for uniform rate-setting procedures. The Department is encouraging community services boards and workshops to develop purchase-of-service agreements, and approximately five workshops and localities have such agreements at the present time. The Department has set July 1, 1984, as the implementation date for this new system; but workshops, in concert with community services boards and other local funding sources, will still have the option to choose the grant or purchase-of-service method of payment for services.

Standardization of Reporting and Accounting Procedures

The Joint Subcommittee recommended that the Interagency Sheltered Workshop Committee should determine whether duplication now exists and, if it does, determine how procedures can be unified. The Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation has now studied these procedures in the process of developing purchase-of-service capability. As the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation develops the system, budget procedures should be unified.

Recapitalization

The Joint Subcommittee recommended that recapitalization, already included in the purchase-of-service payment mechanism, should be built into the grant funding structure. The Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation expects to solve this problem by July 1, 1984, with the development of its purchase-of-service system.

Interagency Communication

To improve interagency communication, the Joint Subcommittee recommended that an Interagency Sheltered Workshop Committee be established to continue evaluation of issues, review needs, facilitate planning and report recommendations to the Secretary of Human

Resources. The three state agencies and the Virginia Association of Rehabilitation Facilities should participate.

The Department of Rehabilitative Services should be designated the lead agency to coordinate interagency planning efforts and to disseminate information.

This recommendation has been implemented according to these specifications. The Subcommittee has met three times since its organization this year.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Several issues were specified for the attention of the Joint Subcommittee during 1983. These issues and the Joint Subcommittee's recommendations relative to them are discussed below.

Current Supplemental Funding

Supplemental funding has been provided from state funds in the amount of \$1.2 million to support workshop services in each of the last two years. The workshops, however, are handicapped in budget and program planning by uncertainty as to whether these funds will be continued.

For this reason, the Joint Subcommittee recommends that the supplemental funding be made permanent and increased each year to provide for inflation.

Estimate of Need for Workshop Services

The Joint Subcommittee recommended in 1982 that the agencies should develop a mechanism to collect figures on the numbers and geographic distribution of potential clients needing and desiring services but who cannot be accommodated by existing programs. The need for this information is twofold. First, the Joint Subcommittee needed such data in order to formulate funding recommendations to serve this population. Second, the workshops need this information to apprise them of the number and needs of individuals the workshops must serve in the future to facilitate long-range planning.

This request was addressed by an advisory group consisting of representatives of the agencies, by the Interagency Sheltered Workshop Committee, and also by the Virginia Association of Rehabilitation Facilities. The primary data sources were survey questionnaires completed by workshop directors, specialized studies completed at the national level, the 1968 study of the prevalence of disability in Virginia which was conducted for the Governor's Study Commission on Vocational Rehabilitation, Report of Handicapped Children Counted in Local School Divisions, Statistical Abstracts of the U.S., 1980, and budget applications and statistical data available to the state agencies.

The usefulness of the special reports and population estimates was somewhat limited because of their differences in methodologies; however, they provided estimates of the prevalence of severe work disabilities which, when compared with local survey findings, agency data and established statistical factors, could be used in formulating a range of estimated need. In examining this issue, the advisory group identified first the broad, potential universe of need, including all disabled individuals in or out of the existing service systems who could benefit from the workshop experience and, second, identified a narrower group of those needing service, based on historical data within the existing agency and workshop systems. The first estimate, as developed from a U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare Study, is 19,362 individuals, and the second and more conservative estimate, as developed from agency-based data, is approximately 11,000 individuals. Other methodologies explored resulted in estimates of 18,872 and 12,913. The reasonable figure appears to be somewhere at the center of these estimates, or 15,534 disabled individuals who are or potentially will be candidates for sheltered workshop services in the future. This figure represents a long-range projection affecting both the workshops and the state agencies over the next five to ten years.

A. Application in Long-Range Planning

It appears that there is and will continue to be a substantial number of disabled individuals of every race, age, educational level and marital status, among other demographic variables, who are in need of and have the potential to benefit from rehabilitation services, including workshop services. The characteristics of this population may include a wider range of disabled individuals, particularly those with head trauma or those brain-injured, the learning disabled, the older disabled worker, the arthritic, the industrially-injured or industrially unemployed, disadvantaged and unemployed youth, and the higher functioning individual with emotional or other work impairment. Though the statistical trends project a broader population than is traditionally served in workshops, the common elements in this population will be limitations preventing successful competitive employment and ability to benefit from the unique training and employment services available from sheltered workshops.

The Department of Rehabilitative Services, with the assistance of state and local agencies and handicapped consumers, will be providing additional information regarding the future population needing rehabilitation, the particular needs of this population, and the workshops' potential role in helping to meet these needs.

This information will be provided to workshops through an updated Facilities State Plan that will be available late in 1984 and which can assist the workshops in their long-range program planning. The Joint Subcommittee supports this ongoing provision of available data to the workshops.

B. Application in Estimating Additional Funding Needs. The Joint Subcommittee also wished to compare the figures described above with the number of existing spaces available in workshop facilities but unfilled because of a lack of funding. With an estimate, then, of the cost of utilization of these spaces, the Joint Subcommittee could formulate its recommendations regarding increased state funding in excess of the \$1.2 million of supplemental funds.

The advisory group preparing the figures discussed here estimates that there is a minimum of 1,000 individuals currently identified who are in need of immediate support. (In addition, 400 individuals are in the workshops now without funding.) Based on present percent of utilization of the workshop's declared capacities as derived from current vendor applications and surveys, this advisory group estimates that at least 1,000 additional individuals can be served in the existing facilities if the programs are funded to full capacity. Based on the current annual cost of \$3,132 per client to provide extended sheltered employment in Virginia's workshops, an additional \$3.1 million would be required to support these individuals in the existing workshop facilities. (This figure does not include the 400 individuals now in the workshops who are not receiving public support at this time.)

The Joint Subcommittee recommends that funding in addition to the \$1.2 million per year in supplemental funding be provided to support an additional 500 individuals from the waiting list in each year of the biennium in existing workshop facilities. An additional \$1.5 million are needed each year, or a total of \$2.7 million annually, to meet this goal. The Joint Subcommittee recommends that this annual supplement continue beyond the biennium.

Uniform Rate-Setting

The Joint Subcommittee identified a potential problem in the implementation of its recommendation that rate-setting be uniform among the three agencies utilizing workshop services. The potential obstacle is the role of the State's community services boards in rate-setting for the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation in the unified purchase-of-service funding mechanism. The Department indicates that the community services boards' role will not defeat uniformity, although some members of the Joint Subcommittee disagreed.

Without making any more specific recommendation in this area, but realizing the vital importance of a single uniform rate-setting procedure to administrative efficiency and equity, the Joint Subcommittee reiterates its recommendation of last year that rate-setting procedures be uniform among the state agencies.

Codification of Program Policies

The Joint Subcommittee discussed development of legislation that establishes state policy concerning long-term sheltered employment. The proposed statute could codify such issues as eligibility requirements, fees, and levels of funding. It was determined that this standardization may be desirable but that it also creates an entitlement program, not recommended by the Joint Subcommittee at this time. Such legislation also subjects the State to potential legal liability.

For these reasons, the Joint Subcommittee recommends that the agencies and interest groups study this issue further for possible introduction of proposed legislation to the 1985 Session of the General Assembly.

Interagency Sheltered Workshop Committee

The Interagency Sheltered Workshop Committee, created in 1983 according to specifications of the Joint Subcommittee, provides a forum for continued discussion and resolution of issues facing the sheltered workshop program. The Joint Subcommittee recommends the continuation of the Committee, which should issue periodic reports of its activities and progress to the appropriate legislative committees.

Innovative Projects

The Joint Subcommittee received a status report on the innovative projects funded with a portion of the supplemental funds for FY 1984.

Eight project proposals were submitted for approval. Two of the proposals received were submitted by organizations that were not sheltered workshops and that were therefore not eligible to receive supplemental funding that had been specified for workshop facilities. One other proposal was submitted under both the Request for Proposal for Innovative Projects and the Department of Rehabilitative Service's Request for Proposal for Program Expansion. The workshop and the review committee agreed that the project was more logically related to an expansion activity than to innovation and should be considered for regular agency grant support, not supplemental funding. Accordingly, these three applications from among the original eight were not a part of the pool of proposals.

From among the remaining five, the following two proposals were not funded:

The first proposal sought to organize a consortium composed of retired business persons, association representatives and volunteer groups to train and supervise clients, develop job opportunities, raise funds, work with planning and citizen advisory groups and develop an ongoing program of volunteerism. The project sought to utilize volunteers as client trainers in community job sites and as advisers to clients during nonworking hours.

The second proposed to explore the level of productivity necessary for a facility to employ nonsponsored severely disabled persons and determine the results which could be expected in different work settings. The review committee considered this proposal to be more of a research and demonstration project than an innovation project but recommended that the project be reworked for possible funding with agency grant dollars in the future.

The following three proposals were selected for funding:

1. Alexandria Sheltered Workshop

This project proposes to redesign the facility's program by introducing the training concepts and methodologies of two nationally known innovative systems—Specialized Training Program at the University of Oregon and Project Employability from Virginia Commonwealth University. The developers of these systems will be available as expert consultants to assist the workshop in implementing a trainer advocate/supportive work model that facilitates placement in competitive employment.

2. CHD Industries

This proposal, Project Readiness (Reaching Employability and Dignity in Normative-Experience Sites and Settings) seeks to establish with a Fortune 500, high-technology

industry which is highly automated and involved in federal defense contracts, a total-service janitorial system that will provide training and employment for the severely disabled. This program builds on the concept of another national model, Minnesota Diversified Industries, in St. Paul. It will introduce a variety of proven training methodologies that enhance the movement of handicapped persons from a workshop into a nonsheltered, normal, competitive work-life.

3. Bristol Regional Rehabilitation Center

This project builds upon a unique relationship between a newly formed, private, profit-making corporation, Tennessee Sound, the manufacturing division of Bristol Regional Rehabilitation Center, and a federally funded training program at the workshop known as Job Market. The project brings together many segments of the economic community, including the private profit-making corporation, the nonprofit corporation, the state agency, and federal programs. The project uses a combination of resources to manufacture within the Bristol facility a new type of stereo speaker that has been thoroughly researched by market analysts and that is expected to revolutionize the sound industry. The project will provide unsubsidized employment for severely disabled persons, especially the physically handicapped, and will combine both the handicapped and nonhandicapped in a typical productive manufacturing atmosphere.

These projects are innovative in that they utilize in an aggressive manner rehabilitation resources outside their own walls; emphasize the importance of developing business and economic linkages with the industrial community; utilize specialized training technologies to move clients into competitive work experiences and employment; and seek to provide unsubsidized, higher-paying work for severely disabled individuals.

A major indicator of the current status of these projects is whether the activities and reports required under the contracts (deliverables) are on schedule. All the deliverables required as of December 1, 1983, have been submitted and the respective programs are proceeding on schedule.

In an effort to share the products and experiences of these projects with other facilities, a one-day workshop will be held in March, 1984, at Woodrow Wilson Rehabilitation Center under the cosponsorship of the Department of Rehabilitative Services and Virginia Commonwealth University. This workshop will bring approximately 150 workshop staff, project directors and university instructors together to discuss progressive programming ideas. Each project manager will make presentations, provide copies of relevant project materials and answer questions regarding their specific project experiences.

A more systematic and final overview of these projects will be developed from the respective final reports which are due during July and August of 1984. The results and products of these current innovative projects will be made available at that time to all workshops and interested parties.

The Request for Proposal issued for this program and other information on the projects are included in the appendix to this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Owen B. Pickett, Chairman
Clive L. DuVal, 2d, Vice-Chairman
W. Onico Barker
Evelyn M. Hailey
Dorothy S. McDiarmid
Phoebe M. Orebaugh
Julie L. Smith
Renee Fisher
Alexander H. Kyrus
C. W. Van Valkenburgh

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 48

Continuing the Joint Subcommittee Studying the Funding and Administration of Sheltered Workshops in the Commonwealth.

Agreed to by the House of Delegates, February 11, 1983.

Agreed to by the Senate, February 23, 1983.

WHEREAS, House Joint Resolution No. 8, agreed to by the 1982 Session of the General Assembly, established the Joint Subcommittee to Study the Funding and Administration of Sheltered Workshops; and

WHEREAS, the Joint Subcommittee has identified many of the problems which have resulted from the number of funding sources and decrease in funding for sheltered workshop services; and

WHEREAS, the Joint Subcommittee has developed recommendations for stabilizing funding and integrating the administration of the sheltered workshops, but recognizes the need for legislative coordination and oversight of the efforts of the several participating agencies in implementing these recommendations; and

WHEREAS, the Joint Subcommittee recommends further study of the numbers and service needs of the population currently awaiting workshop services in order to determine whether additional funding can serve this population within existing facilities and to develop a long-range view of the service needs of future sheltered workshop clients; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED by the House of Delegates, the Senate concurring, That the Joint Subcommittee to Study the Funding and Administration of Sheltered Workshops is hereby continued. The membership of the Joint Subcommittee shall continue to serve. Any vacancies in the membership of the Joint Subcommittee shall be filled by the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections for Senate members and by the Speaker of the House of Delegates for House and citizen members from the respective committees designated in House Joint Resolution No. 8 of the 1982 Session of the General Assembly.

The joint subcommittee shall complete its work in time to make recommendations to the 1984 Session of the General Assembly.

The cost of this study shall not exceed \$3,200.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATIVE SERVICES

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

DATE OF ISSUE: June 27, 1983

ISSUED TO: Sheltered Workshops in Virginia

TYPE OF FUNDING: State Supplemental Funding for Innovative Projects in Sheltered Workshops

FUNDS AVAILABLE: State Supplemental Funds are available in the amount of \$200,000 for these projects. A local match is not required but may be desirable where project goals are very ambitious and where the ultimate success of the project is determined by an appropriate commitment of local funds. It is anticipated that either two or three projects will be funded with a maximum level of funding of \$100,000 per project. The actual number of projects funded will be determined by the practicality, potential impact, and replicability of proposed projects.

TITLE OF PROJECT: Expanding Options for the Severely Disabled Workshop Client

PROJECT PERIOD: Project will be for one year following date of contract; funding will be through June 30, 1984 only.

PROJECT GOAL: To demonstrate replicable service methodologies that enhance the capability of workshops to provide expanded and economically competitive work experiences resulting in an improvement in the competitive level employability and integration of severely disabled persons receiving vocational and employment services through sheltered workshops in Virginia.

RATIONALE: Sheltered employment is a primary service provided to many severely disabled persons by sheltered workshops. The demand for this service in Virginia exceeds both the current capacity of some workshops and the authorized funding needed for subsidizing

RATIONALE: (Cont.)

sheltered employment slots. As a result, many severely mentally and physically disabled persons cannot be served or are subjected to extensive delays before receiving employment services. This condition also results in a serious stoppage in the case management of human resources agencies.

Traditional sheltered workshop training and employment programs are too often not effective in preparing their clientele for competitive employment because of a "sheltered" orientation and a lack of integration with the competitive work world. This orientation away from competitive employment reinforces the reliance upon sheltered employment, results in a lack of movement of clients through the workshops, and increases the demands upon government to provide subsidies and public assistance to sheltered employees.

Alternative program models that foster more normal and less restricted work environments, increased earning capacities and greater self-sufficiency for clients are needed to demonstrate the capacities of the handicapped population and to enhance the economic viability of the workshops themselves. As the primary source of extended employment for the severely disabled, sheltered workshops can more nearly maximize their capabilities to create additional employment opportunities when efforts are focused upon improved human and engineering technologies and upon improved linkages and integration with industry. Without programmatic innovations of this type, sheltered workshops as a whole will not be able to build their capacities, and the handicapped individuals who are dependent upon them as a community resource will be left unserved.

Therefore, the purpose of the innovative projects to be supported through this grant program is to build in Virginia a greater capacity for sheltered workshops to prepare a larger percentage of their clients for competitive employment. There are a number of well-established service methodologies in use nationally and in Virginia that effectively prepare certain severely mentally or physically handicapped persons, who are now being served or are potentially served by sheltered workshops, for competitive employment. By supporting the demonstration of replicable, known or possibly new competitive-oriented service approaches, this grant program will build a foundation for a more progressive approach to sheltered workshop training and employment services in Virginia.

PROJECT OBJECTIVES:

The following are examples of project objectives that are consistent with the intent of this Request for Proposals:

- To establish work adjustment and/or skill training programs operated by workshops within competitive industry.
- To establish transitional employment programs for sheltered workshop clients within industry.
- To establish enclaves in competitive industry that can be used for work experience and for extended sheltered employment.
- To assist industry to establish in-house rehabilitation programs for their injured workers under the supervision of a sheltered workshop.
- To expand workshop services to the more severely physically disabled and selectively hire the non-handicapped to diversify the labor force and contracting potential of the facility.
- To operate outside the workshop a separate business enterprise that can provide community-based training and employment opportunities beyond the workshop walls.
- To establish programs that provide specialized placement, training, and advocacy services within industry for severely disabled persons seeking permanent competitive employment.

These objectives are examples of activities and methodologies that are oriented toward experience in industry and preparation for competitive employment. An innovative project could incorporate a number of these or other similar objectives or could focus in depth upon a single one of the objectives.

DELIVERABLES:

The contractor(s) shall provide to DRS the following products as applicable to the particular project and according to a timetable mutually negotiated:

Deliverable 1: Client needs assessments/feasibility studies/market analyses, etc. used in initial planning and targeting the focus of the project.

DELIVERABLES: (Cont.)

- Deliverable 2: Client flow-chart that illustrates a plan for facilitating the movement of various client populations into, through, and out of a continuum of workshop and community employment options.
- Deliverable 3: Written contracts and agreements developed with industries specifying incentives, terms, and resources used and/or needed in developing such linkages.
- Deliverable 4: Implementation guidelines based on the workshop's own plan and outlining the phases of the project's development. These guidelines should be specific enough to operationalize the activity in other locations.
- Deliverable 5: Program curricula/training syllabi utilized for new technologies developed for client training, placement, advocacy, etc., or for rehabilitation programs in industry.
- Deliverable 6: Final report assessing the impact of the project and recommending useful strategies for integrating workshops and industry in the training/employment process available to severely disabled persons.

INHERENT REQUIREMENTS:

Sheltered workshops that are currently operating with service methodologies suggested as project activities and objectives in this RFP would not be considered eligible to submit a proposal under that pre-existing program design but would be expected to develop new approaches, in addition to those already operational, within the conceptual framework of the project's goal. No workshop, however, should adopt just any program directions without a thorough understanding of the objectives and technical requirements of the project. It is not the purpose of these projects merely to enable a few facilities to add some new programs (regardless of how innovative they might appear) or to acquire new staff just to capture some available funding.

More importantly, applicants must perceive the public and political context, the strategic impact, and the historical quality inherent in these projects.

**INHERENT REQUIREMENTS:
(Cont.)**

Recipients of these grant awards will be expected to demonstrate and document activities not only that respond convincingly to the Legislative and Executive branches of State government (both of which have supported innovation in workshops) but also that provide useful guidelines and models for the future development of other workshops in Virginia. Considering the uniqueness of State funding for innovation in workshops and what might be the last opportunity created by such an appropriation, applicants must approach these projects with a sense of purpose and accountability that focuses upon benefits and implications affecting other workshops throughout the State.

**CRITERIA FOR
EVALUATING PROPOSALS:**

Proposals shall be evaluated according to the weighted criteria that follow. Additional suggestions are provided under the Outline for Proposal Content.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES - 20 points

The objectives must be relevant to the RFP, specific, measurable, achievable, and integrated around a clearly identified project goal.

PROCEDURES FOR IMPLEMENTATION - 20 points

The procedures should explain exactly how the applicant proposes to accomplish the project objectives. The description should include the overall project design, innovativeness of methodologies to be used, how target populations will be involved, and a chronological plan for implementation.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES - 10 points

The evaluation plan should relate to the objectives, processes, and deliverables established. It should describe monitoring and data collection plans to be used for evaluating each objective and for producing quantifiable data.

REPLICABILITY - 15 points

The proposal should describe adequately how the deliverables of the project may be used to effect programmatic innovations in other sheltered workshops in Virginia.

CRITERIA FOR
EVALUATING PROPOSALS:
(Cont.)

QUALIFICATIONS OF PROJECT STAFF - 20 points

The proposal should include the overall staffing plan for managing the project. The plan should include job descriptions with qualifications for the types of staff projected and the plan for recruiting such persons as required. The proposal should reference any consultants that will be used and the time commitments and successful experiences of key staff members in other innovative projects.

INDUSTRIAL LINKAGES AND RESOURCE UTILIZATION - 10 points

The proposal should identify exactly what linkages, cooperative efforts, contractual arrangements, and similar plans related to utilizing competitive resources outside the workshops' walls will support the project.

BUDGET - 5 points

The proposal should include an itemized budget that is reasonable and realistic in terms of the projected activities to be accomplished. Costs included should be considered in light of, but not be limited to, the feasibility for continuation following grant support and their replicability by other workshops.

PROCEDURES FOR
EVALUATING PROPOSALS:

A special Interagency and Peer Review Committee has been established for the purpose of making assessments and recommendations concerning these particular project proposals. This Committee shall be composed of seven (7) members including staff at the State and local levels from the Departments of Rehabilitative Services, Mental Health and Mental Retardation, and Social Services, and the Virginia Association of Rehabilitation Facilities. The proposals shall be evaluated and ranked in numerical order by each member of the Committee on the basis of the total scores assigned to each proposal. Ranking of proposals shall follow the pattern of one point for first place, two points for second place, three points for third place, etc. The points assigned by each member of the review committee for each proposal then shall be added, and the proposals with the lowest total scores will be recommended for funding in the order of their scores. These recommendations will be presented to the Secretary of Human Resources who will make the final decision regarding project awards.

OUTLINE FOR
PROPOSAL CONTENT:

Applicants must provide all the requested information and must use the following format in submitting proposals:

I. IDENTIFYING INFORMATION

- A. Name of applicant
- B. Address
- C. Chief executive officer
- D. Name of person who would direct project

II. PROJECT DESIGN AND IMPACT

- A. Identify which RFP objectives are supported by the project.
- B. Describe the nature and scope of proposed activities and how they are different from traditional approaches.
- C. Provide specific quantitative objectives established for meeting project goals. (Supply baseline data for each quantitative objective.)
- D. Indicate populations to be served and the number projected to participate. Note whether numbers represent a maintenance of effort or an expansion.
- E. Specify the implementation approach and methodologies to be used. Specify clearly the start-up time required for implementation and general sequence of planned activities with dates.
- F. Describe the criteria and procedures for evaluating the total project.
- G. Explain how the proposed project can benefit other workshops.
- H. Identify relevant factors that describe the experience, qualifications, or resources of the applicant that would impact the success of the project.

OUTLINE FOR
PROPOSAL CONTENT:
(Cont.)

III. BUDGET INFORMATION

Submit by budget item the expenditures projected for accomplishing the project's goals. Cost categories must reflect the project's design and must be justifiable. Project funds must be directed toward new and/or additional costs and are not to be substituted for already-budgeted funds. Questions regarding the allowability or feasibility of certain budget items should be directed to the Director of Facilities, DRS, prior to the submission of the proposal.

IV. ATTACHMENTS

- A. Proposed organizational chart showing which staff is presently employed and which would be new; plan for recruitment of staff; and job descriptions for project staff;
- B. Annual report/financial statement for most recent fiscal year;
- C. Board resolution signed by chairman indicating support for the proposed project;
- D. Letters of endorsement from local human resources agencies and from relevant industries potentially involved in the proposed project.

Since proposals will be subjected to a detailed review process, care should be taken to follow directions provided above and to respond to all requirements that are applicable to the proposed project. It should also be noted that projects that are ultimately awarded will be expected to conform to the proposals as initially submitted and approved.

MISSION OF PROPOSALS:

Sheltered workshops desiring to respond to this RFP must submit their proposals to the Department of Rehabilitative Services no later than July 22, 1983. No proposals will be received beyond this deadline.

Seven (7) copies of each proposal must be mailed to:

Virginia Department of Rehabilitative Services
Facilities Planning and Consultation
P. O. Box 11045, 4901 Fitzhugh Avenue
Richmond, Virginia 23230

PROJECT AWARDS:

Notice of the awarding of Supplemental Funds for Innovative Projects to the selected workshops and to others submitting proposals shall be made in writing no later than August 12, 1983. Contracts will be negotiated with facilities whose proposals have been approved in the period immediately following awards.

INNOVATIVE PROJECT GRANTS

Source of Funds: State supplemental funding for sheltered workshops

Level of Funding: \$200,000

Procedures Established by DRS Governing Innovative Projects:

<u>Action</u>	<u>Date</u>
1. RFP issued to workshops	6/27/83
2. Interagency & Peer Review Committee Established	7/1/83
3. Proposals submitted	7/22/83
4. Proposals, directions & materials provided to Review Committee	7/27/83
5. Meeting of Review Committee	8/5/83
6. Committee Recommendations presented to Dr. Fisher	8/8/83
7. Budget modifications negotiated between DRS & workshops	8/8-10/83
8. Award &/or notification letters forwarded to all applicants by DRS	8/11-12/83
9. Contracts developed by DRS in consultation with grantees	8/15-25/83
10. Contracts approved by Office of the Attorney General	8/26-30/83
11. Signed contracts mailed to workshops	8/31/83
12. Half-day briefing sessions held on-site between DRS and grantees	9/7-14/83

Interagency & Peer Review Committee Members:

Lanny Harris, DRS, Region I Resource Specialist
 Jerry Johnson, Executive Director, Central Virginia MH/MR Services Board
 Cecil McFarland, VaARF Representative (appointed but did not participate)
 Grant Revell, DRS Planning Specialist
 Carol Singer-Metz, State DMH/MR
 Peggy Smith, State Department of Social Services
 George Pugh, DRS

Criteria Applied by Committee in Ranking Proposals:

Goals and Objectives - 20 points
 Procedures for Implementation - 20 points
 Evaluation Procedures - 10 points
 Replicability - 15 points
 Qualification of Project Staff - 20 points
 Industrial Linkages and Resource Utilization - 10 points
 Budget - 5 points

Name and Location of Applicants:

Alexandria Workshop
 838 North Henry Street
 Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Bristol Regional Rehabilitation Center

P. O. Box 353
714 State Street
Bristol, TN-VA 37620

CHD Industries

4215 Melrose Avenue, N.W.
Roanoke, Virginia 24017

Chesterfield Vocational Services

7531 White Pine Road
Richmond, Virginia 23234

Rappahannock Rehabilitation Facility

1414 Caroline Street
Fredericksburg, Virginia 22414

Workshop V, Inc.

604 Henry Avenue
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901

(Holston Mental Health Center)

Sullivan County
1570 Waverly Road
Kingsport, Tennessee 37664/ 410 Spruce Street, Appalachia, VA 24216

(Mental Health Association of Northern Virginia)

100 N. Washington Street, Suite 232
Falls Church, Virginia 22046

Findings and Results:

Number of proposals submitted: 8

Number of proposals reviewed by committee: 8

Number of proposals ranked as eligible for funding: 6

(Holston Mental Health Center and the Mental Health Association of Northern Virginia are not sheltered workshops and did not receive State Supplemental dollars in FY '83. Accordingly, their proposals could not be considered for funding with the sheltered workshop dollars; however, the committee did recommend that the department consider providing support for the Holston Mental Health Center proposal as federal funds would allow).

Number of proposals ultimately funded: 3

Committee Dispositions/Recommendations to Dr. Fisher

<u>Rank</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Code/Explanation</u>	<u>Original Request</u>	<u>Final Av</u>
1	Alexandria WS	B Fund with budgetary adjustments agreed to by applicant	\$ 99,978	\$ 75,000
2	Workshop V	A Fund as is with '83 DRS/Fed. grant funds and <u>not</u> State supplemental funds	100,000	0
3	CHD	B Fund with budgetary adjustments agreed to by applicant	98,468	75,000
4	Bristol	B Fund with budgetary adjustments agreed to by applicant	78,062	50,000
5	Rappahannock	F Send back for re-work and fund with '84 DRS/Fed. grant funds after 10/1/83 and <u>not</u> State supplemental dollars	66,351	0
6	Chesterfield	D Not recommended for funding	94,600	0
			<u>\$ 537,459</u>	<u>\$ 200,000</u>
0	Holston MH Center	0 Has merit for future consideration by DRS if funds are available		0
0	MH Assoc. of No. Virginia	0 Should be funded by DRS Special Project Funds if available		0

