



Oregon Council on
Developmental Disabilities

Executive Committee
Feb. 1, 2024, 9-11 a.m.

Join ZoomGov Meeting

<https://www.zoomgov.com/j/1601198127?pwd=VklldytmT1VKbGlwVWl4NXBodklwQT09>

Meeting ID: 160 119 8127 Passcode: 817930 --- One tap mobile +16692545252,,1601198127#

Minutes:

Attending: Julie Farrell, Kristen Darmody, Kelly McCauley, Alisha Overstreet, Leslie Sutton

9:00-9:05 Welcome – agenda review and approval

- Kristen moves to approve agenda, Kelly seconds. Unanimous approval.

9:05-9:10 Jan. 24, 2024 Minutes approval

- Kelly abstains (was not in attendance at last meeting)
- Changes to minutes: Kristen moves to approve motion to approve agenda. And page two fourth bullet from the bottom waiting to vote.
- Kristen moves to approve the minutes with edits, Alisha seconds. Julie, Kristen, Alisha in favor. Motion passes.

9:10-9:15 Review University of Washington Survey format

- Reviewed the categories of the survey: quality of work, quantity of work, job knowledge, working relationship, supervisory skills, optional factor.
- Kristen: taking questions we have already worked on and putting it into a format like this. Last week, we started adding multiple questions into each section. Concerned that it is important to allow Council members to provide an evaluation on each question individually. Looking at this format throws things off. Are we putting multiple question in the box of performance expectations. We need to let people consider each question individually. Not sure how this format improves accessibility.

- Julie: Agreement not to give this form to the full council. But something along the lines where you put the questions in each performance factor and in the future.
- Kristen: for the Council meeting in February, we want to be able to talk about what the Council members will be looking at. Hesitant to bring something with this format forward to the Council members at that time. This doesn't feel accessible.
- Julie: this is future work. We don't have time to do lots of modification now. In the future, we need to consider the form where we put the answer to the survey questions and a way to improve on that to make it look more professional
- Alisha: Use the format we started with last week that we created. We would be using the basic information coming from this form but plugging into a more accessible format that we can create as the Executive Committee. Create accessible format we have already started with the different factors and the questions and that is the Council facing document. The Executive Committee is going to complete the rest of the performance evaluation piece rather than have an ad hoc committee for the formal evaluation. The Council facing document that is more accessible can come to us as the EC. Then we can parse out the information that is coming from the different Council members and plug it into this UW form or something similar. That can be given to the ED. That is how she sees this UW form or a version of it being utilized. So we don't have to just give a letter to the ED. Allows for the ED not to be completely overwhelmed with having individual pieces of council member surveys. Everything can be put into one document. ED could still have access to individual responses to the surveys.
- Julie agrees with Alisha. We need to take something like the UW format and take it through HR and use the job description in the future. Goal should be to stay on track. Let's move to the survey questions in development and make it the best we can to get it ready for the full Council. Give them a chance to work on it. Whatever they decide today, inform the Council what the thoughts are moving forward.
- Kelly agrees.
- Julie: need to spend most of our time working on the survey questions with the goal to do it the best we can. Knowing we can change it as we go through this evaluation. Can modify moving forward.

9:15-10:35 Executive Director Review Survey Review

- Leslie changed the survey to try to make it fit in the format we discussed last time, but many questions fit in more than one of the four job description categories. That meant it was hard to have sections of the survey for each of the job description categories.
- Julie mentioned that Leslie's changes made the introduction and questions more accessible. The committee still has discussion to do on the survey before it is ready for the Council.
- Five minute break
- Leslie reviewed the introduction section
- Kristen: appreciate the plain language. More clear about what is being asked and what will happen with the info
- Rating scale review: Leslie acknowledges that the scale phrases "exceeds expectations" is not accessible. She would like ideas for how to make more accessible.
- Julie mentioned using faces as the scales in the future, but may be difficult to do now.
- Leslie said she spoke with the agency about giving this EC the Job Description for the ED. They have a staffing change and were going to be out of the office this week. Leslie doesn't have an answer on the request for the ED Job Description at this point.
- Alisha: have to trust that whatever is written in this survey is in line with what was presented to the previous EC. It is important to have a copy of the Job Description. Can we use a public record request
- Julie: state agencies are looking at this as they are the supervisor of the ED. That is why the job description is being held. Waiting for clarification from feds about this and don't have that now.
- Alisha: if we are tasked with making a survey based on the job description, it is hard to do that without the job description.
 - o Are we going with this format or are we going with this?
- Julie: We are looking at the content this meeting, we only have two weeks before giving this to the Council. We want to give a document to the Council knowing we will be discussing further.
- Kristen: tricky situation where we are asked to do something but not feeling like we have necessary resources to do that. As state employee, this happens. It would be worthwhile to move forward to discuss the questions in front of us and that as we do this work, we bring it to the Council, ask

them to approve the survey and then we administer the survey. Be up front with people that we are doing the best we can with what we have. To do the ideal survey, we need to see the job description. We are giving you these questions based on what we have. The questions in future years may look different once they are resolved.

- Alisha: She's okay with moving forward with this. Agrees with Kristen's suggestion for how to move this to the Council.
- Kristen: rewording of the questions are much easier to follow. Not so sure about including the "this question impacts x part of the job description".
- Kelly: likes the reword
- Julie: the part of the question where we talk about the job description categories throws off the question flow and isn't important to the council members. If we can't have a title with description, can use a number to allow people to reference which areas of the job
- Kristen: important for EC it is important to know which areas of the job description are in each question to do their work with the letter and finalizing the evaluation.
- Alisha: agrees with Kristen on the job description categories need to be tracked by the EC. Alisha doesn't like the second part of the question where we talk about the job description. That information is helpful for the EC, but not necessarily something that she would need as just a council member.
- Julie: what about if below the comments in a small font, we add a number that corresponds to the job description category. Then remove the sentence at the end.
- Alisha: likes that idea, but let Council know that they don't need to think about the numbers outside the question and that it is for the EC to refer back to the different job description categories.
- Leslie We could do a cross walk for EC to use in their reviews to remove the codes from the survey for accessibility. The codes aren't needed for Council members to complete the survey.
- Kristen: Can make the cross walk available if people want it. But keeping the survey as clean simple and focused as we can is be beneficial.
- Julie: then we would update the questions and the cross walk at the same time.
- Alisha: likes the crosswalk idea. This would fall under the responsibilities of the ED and Chair to make sure the documents are updated regularly.

- Add that it is the responsibility of the ED and chair to ensure that council facing survey and the cross walk are updated simultaneously.
- Council EC will review the survey as a group and create the letter together. Can work around and plan to supporting each other to identify the pieces of the questions and how they align with the job description.
- Julie: keep the current survey for EC and then remove the second half of the question for the Council members.
- Kristen: the document we are reviewing should be what the Council looks at.
 - The crosswalk is a table: Text of each question down left side, across the top there is a column for each job description area. Put a check in the column if the question deals with that.
 - Kristen can help with this cross walk
 - Then remove the second part of the questions for the council members.
 - Leslie will help Kristen with this project.
- Julie we need to decide if these questions are what we want in the survey and if they are worded in the way we want.
 - Are these questions the ones we should bring to the Council. Are they worded the way we want them worded.
- For ease of reading, Leslie streamlined the questions to remove the rating scale to facilitate discussion of each question by the committee. Five minute break to do this.
- Went through each question for committee comments with a focus on ease and accessibility. Thinking about what are we asking (are we asking about the right thing) and are we asking in a way that is clear and accessible.
 - Question 1: Discussion about if this is about overall communication style or limited to scenarios. Could say something like, “as a whole, the ED...”. Or when the Executive Director talks to me or to the full Council. But there is a difference between speaking to individual person versus presenting information overall to the group of people. Discussion the ED talks to me in the way I understand, then have a separate question that says the ED presents information to the Council in a way that I understand. Split these questions so we are evaluating one idea per question. This becomes question 1 and 2. Changed “presents” to “explains” in question 2.

- Unbold each question, use underline for emphasis where needed in questions.
- Question 3: is the ED asking Council members for input and then is that input used in the work. That is two different questions. Break it up into two questions as question 3 and 4.
- Discussion about having a separate sheet about the definitions: Five Year Plan, annual plan, etc.
- Question 5: What the ED talks about, not how they talk about it (question 2)
- Question 6: it is hard to assess whether someone understands something. The ED shows that they understand the issues that impact people with DD and their families. This is a subjective question. Suggestion to remove this question because it is subjective and can get the same information from how people respond to question 7. Discussion about if the question would be attenuated because Council members may see the work plan changes but not relate that to the ED showing they understand the issues of people with DD and their families. Come back to this question due to time.
- Question 7: previously changed values to vision because it is defined and values are not.
- Question 8: remove because not all Council members are part of the EC. Can be added in the process where the EC compiles the letter.
- New Number 8: sounds good
- New Number 9: removes Five Year Plan – suggested language change: ED hires staff and makes sure staff supports the council.
- New Number 10: Left off here for time. Need to schedule another meeting.

11:00

Motion to adjourn – Alisha, Kristen seconds. Unanimous.