



March 2022 Service Delivery Committee

Minutes

March 1st 2022

1:00-2:00 p.m. EST

1. Opening

Ms. Janet Good called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. ET. A quorum was established.

Members Present: Ms. Janet Good, Ms. Betsy Burgos, Ms. Lesa Kretschmer, Mr. Eddie Hall

Staff Present: Ms. Whitney Doyle, Ms. Hannah Brock

Members of the Public: None

2. Approval of Agenda

No members of the public commented. No modifications were made to the agenda. No comments were made. Ms. Betsy Burgos made the motion to approve the agenda. Mr. Eddie Hall seconded the motion. The agenda was approved as presented by acclamation without any objection.

3. Approval of Minutes

The January 2022 Service Delivery Committee meeting minutes were approved as presented by acclamation without objection. Ms. Burgos made the motion to accept the January 2022 Service Delivery Minutes. Mr. Hall seconded the motion.

4. Regional Reuse Center Overview | Whitney Doyle

Ms. Whitney Doyle explains that she sent 6 years' worth of FAAST data to the committee before this meeting. She would like to use this time to brainstorm with the committee. She reviews the reuse and exchange procedure and data from other states with the committee.

Ms. Betsy Burgos recommends FAAST consider not participating in refurbishment due to liability.



Ms. Doyle explains that with state funds we can not give the item to a person. FAAST can donate it to an organization or sell it. Another state does their AT classifieds as a Facebook page. FAAST classifieds will be part of the resource directory. Ms. Burgos recommends FAAST to get the AT classifieds up on the resource directory to start small.

5. Action Items

The Committee is on track with the 2020 Strategic Plan.

6. Closing

Next Meeting- March 29, 2022, at 1:00 PM. No public comment was made. The meeting was adjourned at 1:54 PM.



Florida Reuse Service Delivery Options

Goal for reuse service delivery model: FAAST serves all Floridians through a quality and equitable level of service.

Question to answer: How can FAAST expand its capacity to reach all Floridians while maintaining a quality and equitable level of service?

Current Model – 5 \$10,000 RRC Contracts

Strengths:

Has greatest impact in local community of all options

Easiest transition

Lowest impact on staff time to draft new contracts

FAAST does not own or manage inventory

Weaknesses:

Has local impact in 5 cities (limited statewide impact – specific to CIL catchment areas)

Hard to move items around the state. If someone finds something on AT list the transportation is difficult.

Deliverables include posting on FAAST website and recording reuse items (examples: high volume of data entry; not currently reporting exchange activities as defined by federal requirements)

The amount of devices a center can maintain is dependent on their size. A large CIL can maintain dozens of devices at a time and smaller CILs cannot.

Budget Impact:

Staff time to update and potentially bid contracts

Option 1 – \$10,000 Grants for Reutilization Activities

Strengths:

1-year grants, so number of grants can fluctuate each year

Greater potential for more of a statewide reach over current model



Reduce administration burden by reducing reporting for “grant” versus “contract”

FAAST does not own or manage inventory

Weaknesses:

Could potentially still not have statewide reach (more likely to serve local area)

Negative image of FAAST “taking away money” for current RRC partners (3 of 5 RRCs are currently RDCs)

Would still need a solution for AT List

Budget Impact:

More staff time for grant application and review, but potentially less staff time for contract reporting oversight

Legal fees to evaluate grant (especially if creating a new application process)

Option 2 – \$5,000 Grants for Reutilization Activities (or RRC contracts)

Strengths:

1-year grants, so number of grants can fluctuate each year

Greater potential for more of a statewide reach over current model

Similar contracts (with some adjustments for deliverables)

FAAST does not own or manage inventory

Weaknesses:

Could potentially still not have statewide reach (more likely to serve local area)

Lower amount of items that can be refurbished

Lower funding amount may deter current partners from applying/ Could lose current RRC partners (3 of 5 RRCs are currently RDCs)

Negative image of FAAST “taking away money” for current RRC partners (3 of 5 RRCs are currently RDCs)



Hard to move items around the state. If someone finds something on AT list the transportation is difficult.

The amount of devices a center can maintain is dependent on their size. A large CIL can maintain dozens of devices at a time and smaller CILs cannot.

Budget Impact:

More staff time to manage more contracts

Legal fees to evaluate contracts (especially if contract deliverables are changed)

Option 3 – Reuse Fund with Individual Grant Applications

Strengths:

Streamlines reuse activities to only refurbishing/repairing (individuals would have to ownership of the item for it to be repaired)

FAAST does not own or manage inventory

Reduce need for storage of donated items.

Refurbishing would be done by vendors so would reduce any liability of a client receiving an item from FAAST.

More diversity of different categories of AT refurbished.

Reduce the transportation/shipping barrier.

Weaknesses:

Could potentially still not have statewide impact, though reach would be statewide

Option to have partner organizations contracted to post on FAAST website (or do we consider MOUs for the website?) This would give FAAST a referrals system on where to send donated items.

Increased marketing needs (RRCs do majority of their own marketing)

Budget Impact:

Highest amount of staff time needed to manage grant applications and payments



Funds and staff time to market program

Other items to consider:

Should we rebrand to “supporting local recycling efforts” versus having a branded “Regional Reuse Center”?

Additional \$50,000 earmarked for RRC program in \$305,585 nonrecurring funding request.

Should an application process take place to identify partners (with subcontract model)?

Regional Demonstration Center Feedback Survey 2022

Goal of Survey: Evaluate successes and challenges of new service delivery model.

Instructions: Complete one survey on behalf of each Regional Demonstration Center.

* Required

1. Request for Proposals (RFP): Please select the response most appropriate for your RDC. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The instructions on how to complete the RFP were clear.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The timeline to submit the RFP was appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expectations of the program deliverables were well defined in the RFP.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expectations of the program budget/award amount were well defined in the RFP.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The overall RFP process was straightforward.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

2. RFP: What were the strengths of this item/process? *

3. RFP: What were the challenges of this item/process? *

4. Contract Execution: Please select the response most appropriate for your RDC. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The instructions on how to complete the contract were clear (regarding submitting a budget and Certificates of Insurance for Liability and Workers Compensation).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The timeline to finalize the contract was appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
FAAST staff were able to clarify contract and budgeting questions and concerns.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expectations of the program budget/award amount were well defined in the contract.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expectations of the program deliverables were well defined in the contract.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The overall contract execution process was straightforward.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5. Contract Execution: What were the strengths of this item/process? *

6. Contract Execution: What were the challenges of this item/process? *

7. FAASTU (October 2021 and/or January 2022): Please select the response most appropriate for your RDC. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The instructions on how to attend/participate at FAASTU were clear.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Travel instructions and reimbursements were straightforward and appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The length of FAASTU was appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expectations of FAASTU were well defined by FAAST staff.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expectations of the RDC program were well defined by FAAST staff during FAASTU.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Attending FAASTU prepared our RDC staff to administer the program.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
FAAST staff were able to clarify program administration questions and concerns during and after FAASTU.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
FAAST has provided additional training opportunities as needed/requested.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The overall FAASTU training was straightforward.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. FAASTU: What were the strengths of this item/process? *

9. FAASTU: What were the challenges of this item/process? *

10. RDC Deliverables: Please select the response most appropriate for your RDC. Based on the RDC region's population... *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The training deliverables are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The transition training deliverables are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The information and assistance deliverables are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The device demonstration deliverables are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The short-term device loan deliverables are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The device loan device deliverables are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The success story/testimonial deliverables are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The annual newsletter deliverables are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The annual newsletter distribution statistics deliverables are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The deliverables by county are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

11. RDC Deliverables: Please select the response most appropriate for your RDC. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Measuring deliverables on a quarterly basis is appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

12. RDC Deliverables: What were the strengths of this item/process? *

13. RDC Deliverables: What were the challenges of this item/process? *

14. RDC Manual: Please select the response most appropriate for your RDC. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Expectations of the services provided/executed by my RDC are well defined.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Definitions of deliverables are well defined.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Processes for RDCs are well defined.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

15. RDC Manual: What were the strengths of this item/process? *

16. RDC Manual: What were the challenges of this item/process? *

17. RDC Budget: Please select the response most appropriate for your RDC. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The total contract amount for my RDC region is appropriation based on the regions population of individuals who have disabilities.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expectations of financial consequences are well defined.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The program's allowable costs for expenses are well defined.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The program's allowable costs for expenses are appropriate for my organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The flexibility to define program budgets by RDC needs is appropriate for my organization.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

18. RDC Budget: What were the strengths of this item/process? *

19. RDC Budget: What were the challenges of this item/process? *

20. RDC Reporting: Please select the response most appropriate for your RDC. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Expectations for data entry are well defined.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expectations for data entry are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Processes for data entry are well defined.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Processes for data entry are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expectations for report submissions are well defined.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expectations for report submissions are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Processes for report submission are well defined.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Processes for report submission are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

21. RDC Reporting: What were the strengths of this item/process? *

22. RDC Reporting: What were the challenges of this item/process? *

23. RDC Communication/Collaboration: Please select the response most appropriate for your RDC. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Expectations for RDC-to-RDC communication and collaboration are well defined.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expectations for RDC-to-RDC communication and collaboration are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Processes for RDC-to-RDC communication and collaboration are well defined.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Processes for RDC-to-RDC communication and collaboration are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

24. RDC Communication/Collaboration: What were the strengths of this item/process? *

25. RDC Communication/Collaboration: What were the challenges of this item/process? *

26. Inventory: Please select the response most appropriate for your RDC. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The AT devices in the core inventory are appropriate for my RDC's needs.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My RDC has the inventory/access to the inventory to meet deliverables.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expectations for maintaining AT device inventory are well defined.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expectations for maintaining AT device inventory are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Processes for maintaining AT device inventory are well defined.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Processes for maintaining AT device inventory are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

27. Inventory: What were the strengths of this item/process? *

28. Inventory: What were the challenges of this item/process? *

29. FAAST Headquarters/Assistive Technology Advisory Council: Please select the response most appropriate for your RDC. *

Mark only one oval per row.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Expectations from FAAST are well defined.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Expectations from FAAST are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Processes from FAAST are well defined.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Processes from FAAST are appropriate.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

30. What does this RDC model or program do well? *

31. What should change about this RDC model or program? *

32. Anything else you'd like to add?

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms

Service Delivery Committee
2020 Strategic Planning Tracking

Strategic Issue	TASK	DUE	STAFF	ACTIONS	Key			
					Not Started	In Progress	Completed	
Issue 2, Objective 2	By September 30, 2022, FAAST will create, develop, and establish an online Training Resource page on the FAAST website.							
	Utilize other state AT program data to create best practice for online Training page.	By December 31, 2021, the training webpage will be live and marketing/dissemination plan will begin. Any collaboration opportunities with other state AT programs will be confirmed and implemented.	Whitney & Hannah	Strategy 2-1: Review website capabilities and establish home webpage for training videos.	Strategy 2-2: Gather data from other state AT Act programs on their training video libraries to understand models of best practice and for potential partnerships opportunities. 3/23/2021 Training website is delayed due to turnover on website contractor 5/25/2021 Training website page has been incorporated into website build for FY2022 (launch date Oct. 1, 2021). Website build has been included in the proposed FY22 budget and is being reviewed by TAC 7/13/2021 Website build was approved by ATAC at June meeting. Training website will be incorporated into build. 3/1/2022 Resource Directory webpage is scheduled to launch in March 2022 with training videos			
Issue 2, Objective 4	By September 30, 2021, evaluate and adjust AT List.							
	Explore options to support current reuse services in Florida to best understand the needs and where FAAST can best serve individuals who can benefit from reuse services.	Indicator 4-1: By September 30, 2022, the AT List will be revised as needed.	Whitney & Hannah	Strategy 4-1: Create cost benefit and value analysis of AT List. 3/23/2021 Discussion to evaluate RRC service delivery model in FY2022 added to Mar. meeting agenda 5/25/2021 RRC service delivery model approved by SD to be reviewed in FY22	Strategy 4-2: Research current programs (CILs) that have reuse and refurbish programs to explore partnership opportunities. 5/25/2021 Scheduled time in FY22 for CILs to present current reuse programs			
Issue 2, Objective 5	By September 30, 2022, FAAST will implement the updated service delivery model for RDCs.							
	Evaluate successes and challenges of updated RDC service delivery model.	Indicator 5-2: By June 30, 2022, successes and challenges of new service delivery model are collected and presented to the Service Delivery Committee.	Whitney & Hannah	Strategy 5-1: FAAST will hold orientation and training for RDCs during FAASTU 2021. 10/14/2021 Northwest, Midland, and Southwest RDCs attended FAASTU in person, Atlantic, Gulf Coast, Central, South, and Broward attended virtually. A second FAASTU will be held in January 2022 for Northeast, North Central, West Central and Southeast RDCs.	Strategy 5-2: Evaluate successes and challenges of new service delivery model.	Strategy 5-3: Make any necessary changes to service delivery models for next contract period.		
Issue 2, Objective 9	By September 30, 2022, FAAST will research and establish an updated service delivery model for Regional Reuse Centers.							
	Gather and analyze data to create/update RRC service delivery model.	Indicator 9-2: By March 31, 2022, all data and updates will be gathered and presented to the Service Delivery Committee.	Whitney & Hannah	Strategy 9-1: Revise updated Florida map for accurate geographical representation of FAAST reuse services from 2015-2020. Contrast service delivery with demographic data of PWD throughout Florida, broken down by focus populations of partner state agencies. Identify gaps. 1/25/2022 Tabular data was presented in January SDC meeting instead of in a geographical form.	Strategy 9-2: Gather data from the other state AT Act programs on their service delivery to understand models of best practice. 3/1/2022 10 other state AT programs reviewed at March SDC meeting	Strategy 9-4: Gather data on different funding strategies for FAAST to serve more geographical areas. (Answer questions listed in Strategic Plan for this Strategy.)	Strategy 9-5: Bring together all research to create draft service delivery models.	