

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 1 Identification

State: IN	Reporting Period: 10/1/2012	To: 9/30/2013
P&A Agency Name: INDIANA - Indiana Protection and Advocacy Services		
Contact Person Last Name: Richter First Name: Gary MI:		
Phone Number: 317-722-5555		

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 2 Individual Clients Served

A. Number of Individual Clients (Number of Persons with Disabilities Receiving Individual Advocacy):		
1. Number of clients receiving advocacy at start of fiscal year:		48
2. Number of new/renewed clients represented during fiscal year:		100
Total:		148
3. If program income was used to supplement the PADD allotment for the reporting period, estimate the number of individuals served as a result of program income dollars:		0
4. Number of individuals requesting individual advocacy and who are eligible under the PADD program but did not receive such		19
B. Number of Case Problems of Individual Clients		162
C. Number of Individual Clients by Age:		
Age 0 to 2:		0
Age 3 to 4:		1
Age 5 to 22:		75
Age 23 to 59:		63
Age 60 and over:		9
Total Clients:		148
D. Number of Individual Clients by Sex:		
Number of Male:		92
Number of Female:		56
Total Clients:		148
E. Number of Individual Clients by Racial/ Ethnic Background:	Single Response	Multiple Response
Asian:	2	0
Black or African American:	17	2
Hispanic / Latino:	3	0
American Indian or Alaskan Native:	0	0
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	0	0
White:	124	9
Multiple Response:	1	
Information Not Provided	1	
Total Clients:	148	
F. Number of Individual Clients by Geographic Location:	In-State	Out-of-State

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Urban (metropolitan area with population of 50,000 or more):	109	0
Rural (all other):	39	0
Total Clients:	148	0
G. Clients Living Arrangements		Number of Individual Clients
Independent		4
Parental or other Family Home		70
Community Residential Home		36
Foster Care		0
Nursing Home		25
Public (State Operated Institutional Living Arrangement)		2
Private Institutional Living Arrangement		10
Legal Detention / Jail / Prison / Detention Center		0
Homeless		0
Federal Facility (List)		0
Other		1
Information not provided		0
Total Client Cases by Living Arrangement		148
H. Individual Clients Disability		Number of Individual Clients
Autism		41
Cerebral Palsy		9
AIDS/HIV		0
Epilepsy		0
Mental Illness		7
Intellectual Disability		86
Muscular Dystrophy		1
Spina Bifida		0
Learning Disabilities		3
Traumatic Brain Injuries (TBI) and other head injuries		0
Tourette Syndrome		0
Visual Impairment / Blind		1
Hard of Hearing / Deaf		0

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Other Physical / Orthopedic *	0
Other Emotional / Behavioral *	0
Other Intellectual *	0
Disability Unknown	0
Total Disabilities	148

Section 2 County List

	County Name	Total Population	Number of Individual Clients
1	Adams County	34,387	1
2	Allen County	355,329	13
3	Bartholomew County	76,794	2
4	Benton County	8,854	0
5	Blackford County	12,766	0
6	Boone County	56,640	0
7	Brown County	15,242	0
8	Carroll County	20,155	0
9	Cass County	38,966	2
10	Clark County	110,232	2
11	Clay County	26,890	0
12	Clinton County	33,224	0
13	Crawford County	10,713	0
14	Daviess County	31,648	1
15	Dearborn County	50,047	1
16	Decatur County	25,740	0
17	DeKalb County	42,223	1
18	Delaware County	117,671	3
19	Dubois County	41,889	0
20	Elkhart County	197,559	0
21	Fayette County	24,277	1
22	Floyd County	74,578	0
23	Fountain County	17,240	1

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

24	Franklin County	23,087	0
25	Fulton County	20,836	0
26	Gibson County	33,503	0
27	Grant County	70,061	12
28	Greene County	33,165	2
29	Hamilton County	274,569	12
30	Hancock County	70,002	0
31	Harrison County	39,364	0
32	Hendricks County	145,448	2
33	Henry County	49,462	3
34	Howard County	82,752	3
35	Huntington County	37,124	0
36	Jackson County	42,376	1
37	Jasper County	33,478	0
38	Jay County	21,253	0
39	Jefferson County	32,428	1
40	Jennings County	28,525	3
41	Johnson County	139,654	2
42	Knox County	38,440	3
43	Kosciusko County	77,358	1
44	LaGrange County	37,128	4
45	Lake County	496,005	5
46	LaPorte County	111,467	0
47	Lawrence County	46,134	2
48	Madison County	131,636	2
49	Marion County	903,393	38
50	Marshall County	47,051	0
51	Martin County	10,334	0
52	Miami County	36,903	0
53	Monroe County	137,974	5
54	Montgomery County	38,124	1
55	Morgan County	68,894	3

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

56	Newton County	14,244	0
57	Noble County	47,536	0
58	Ohio County	6,128	0
59	Orange County	19,840	0
60	Owen County	21,575	0
61	Parke County	17,339	0
62	Perry County	19,338	0
63	Pike County	12,845	0
64	Porter County	164,343	2
65	Posey County	25,910	1
66	Pulaski County	13,402	0
67	Putnam County	37,963	0
68	Randolph County	26,171	0
69	Ripley County	28,818	0
70	Rush County	17,392	0
71	Scott County	24,181	0
72	Shelby County	44,436	1
73	Spencer County	20,952	1
74	St. Joseph County	266,931	1
75	Starke County	23,363	0
76	Steuben County	34,185	0
77	Sullivan County	21,475	1
78	Switzerland County	10,613	0
79	Tippecanoe County	172,780	0
80	Tipton County	15,936	0
81	Union County	7,516	0
82	Vanderburgh County	179,703	3
83	Vermillion County	16,212	0
84	Vigo County	107,848	2
85	Wabash County	32,888	0
86	Warren County	8,508	0
87	Warrick County	59,689	2

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

88	Washington County	28,262	0
89	Wayne County	68,917	1
90	Wells County	27,636	0
91	White County	24,643	0
92	Whitley County	33,292	0

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 3 Case Problem Areas of Individual Clients Served

This is the total number of problems addressed by the PADD program and collected at case closure. This will allow the PADD program to better determine the outcome of its work. This can be more than the number of problems presented upon intake that is the total number reported in Section 2 B.	
A. The outcome of problems addressed for Individual Clients:	
1. Number of persons with developmental disabilities living in institutions served by the P&A whose complaint of abuse, neglect, discrimination of their rights was remedied by the P&A:	9
2. Number of persons with developmental disabilities living in the community served by the P&A whose complaint of abuse, neglect, discrimination of their rights was remedied by the P&A:	48
B. Types of problems addressed by area of emphasis:	
1. Quality Assurance including abuse, neglect & other violations of rights	36
2. Education and early intervention	39
3. Child care	0
4. Health care	7
5. Employment	0
6. Housing	0
7. Transportation	0
8. Recreation	0
Total Case Problem Areas of Individual Clients Addressed upon closure	82
C. Reasons for Closing Individual's Case Files:	
1. Issues resolved partially or completely in the individual's favor	53
2. Other representation found	3
3. Individual withdrew complaint	7
4. Appeals were unsuccessful	0
5. PADD services were not needed due to individual's death, relocation, etc.	1
6. PADD withdrew because individual would not cooperate	9
7. PADD unable to take care because of lack of resources	0
8. Individual's case lacks merit	0
9. Other	9
D. Intervention Strategies Used in Serving Individuals: (List the highest level of Intervention used by PADD prior to closing each case file.)	
1. Technical assistance in self-advocacy	12
2. Short-term assistance	38

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

3. Investigation / monitoring	21
4. Negotiation	3
5. Mediation / alternative dispute resolution	4
6. Administrative hearings	3
7. Litigation	1
E. Satisfaction of Individuals Served:	
1. Number of satisfaction surveys distributed	82
2. Number of satisfaction surveys returned during the year	14
3. Of the total number of surveys returned, indicate how many individuals rated their overall satisfaction with PADD in the following ways:	
a. Satisfied	13
b. Not satisfied	1
4. Number of client grievances filed under the client grievance procedure	1

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 4 Interventions on Behalf of Groups of Clients

A.Summary Data	Number of cases	Potential number of individuals impacted	Number of cases concluded successfully	Number of cases concluded unsuccessfully	Number of cases pending
Summary Data on Group Advocacy Intervention	35	256,709	22	1	12
Summary Data on Investigations Intervention	0	0	0	0	0
Summary Data on Monitoring Activities Intervention	5	1,545	0	0	5
Summary Data on Court-Ordered Monitoring Activities Intervention	0	0	0	0	0
Summary Data on Systemic or Class-action Litigation Intervention	0	0	0	0	0
Summary Data on all Group Interventions	40	258,254	22	1	17

B. Group Advocacy:

1. What are the major issues addressed?

Indiana Protection and Advocacy Services (IPAS) worked on behalf of groups of individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities (I/DD) in several areas of interest. The agency conducted regular monitoring of the three largest Intermediate Care Facilities for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities (ICF/IID) and the one I/DD dual diagnosis unit positioned within a state operated psychiatric facility; IPAS participated in Human Rights Committee (HRC) meetings at these same facilities and on a statewide level on behalf of facilities without their own HRC. IPAS was greatly involved in the immediate closing of an ICF/IID facility that lost its' certification and either assisted, or was assisted by, several disability awareness groups in the provision of public information or making resources available for such. IPAS addressed the issue of restraint/seclusion in school, specifically advocating within a certain school district in which IPAS had a case assignment. IPAS continued to address parking lot disability access under Title III of the Americans With Disabilities Act, as well as the potential issue of what would individuals with disabilities do for housing in the event of an emergency or disaster.

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

2. Which groups are likely to be affected?

IPAS' regular monitoring at the three ICF/IIDs and the dual diagnosis I/DD unit impacted the lives of those facilities' patients/residents; that same group was impacted by IPAS' participation in the facilities' HRC meetings. Every patient receiving services within a facility that participated in the Statewide Developmental Disabilities HRC was impacted by IPAS' participation on that committee and the residents of the ICF/IID facility that was decertified and closed benefited from IPAS' assistance in that process.

IPAS partnered with several disability awareness groups serving the state, including Autism Society of Indiana, Self Advocates of Indiana, and Arc of Indiana. IPAS also worked with In*Source and Family Voices Indiana, as well as the one school system previously mentioned, located in Central Indiana.

It is estimated that, in total, 130,894 individuals with disabilities will benefit from IPAS' advocacy efforts (which spanned over two fiscal years) regarding the physical accessibility of 33 parking lots. This number is the approximated population of individual drivers issued a disability placard, living within a 5-mile radius of each site.

The issues IPAS addressed along with the other Disaster Housing and Emergency Services Advisory Committee participants would, in the event of an emergency or disaster, impact the more than 800,000 Hoosiers with disabilities, an estimated 150,000 of whom are individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities.

3. What have been the major outcomes during the fiscal year?

IPAS monitoring efforts resulted in IPAS advocates having a presence on the IID treatment and residential units, i.e., the daily living areas of the patients, so that care givers of individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities were observed in their on-the-job-environment and IPAS personnel were easily accessible to individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities. Participation in facilities' HRC meetings allowed IPAS to have input into decisions made in the review of patients' complaint resolution forms, conditional rights' restrictions and treatment plan revisions and amendments. In that IPAS also contributed to a Statewide DD HRC, individuals statewide received these same results, even without the facility they reside in having and FRC. IPAS' assistance and monitoring in the ICF/IID facility's closure ensured residents a smooth transition from the one facility into either another facility or community placements.

IPAS' partnerships with disability awareness groups saw to more widespread availability of peer-to-peer support for individuals and families with Autism and increased board member participation through a provision of funding to assist board members with travel expenses. There was collaboration in joint newsletter efforts to reach more individuals who may benefit from IPAS' various services, including educational advocacy and bullying prevention. Funding was also provided for increased dissemination of information regarding the Affordable Care Act.

Unfortunately, the school district in which IPAS was advocating for development of a Restraint/Seclusion Policy indicated they were unwilling to adopt such policy. They saw it as unproductive, being that the pertinent law (Indiana Code 20-20-40-13(a)(2)) is to change on July 1, 2014, at which point every school district in the state must develop such a policy based on a model policy that has been provided by the Commission on Seclusion and Restraint in Schools.

IPAS had surveyed the parking lots of 33 Central Indiana properties and found virtually all of them significantly out of compliance, not in adherence to the architectural guidelines (ADAAG) for parking facilities under the ADA; therefore, IPAS notified the management company in ownership of the lots and met with corporate representatives who stated their intention to work on correcting the problems. A later re-audit of the lots, however, indicated that the vast majority of the compliance issues had not been addressed; IPAS sent the management company a letter containing the specific audit and continued deficiency information to each parking lot, citing further requirement that each lot be brought into compliance so that by December 21, 2012, every issue raised by IPAS had been resolved.

The Disaster Housing and Emergency Services Advisory Committee on which IPAS participated, developed the Indiana Disaster Housing Plan, the first of its kind in the country, to address housing needs of Hoosiers with disabilities in the event of an emergency or disaster.

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

4. How do these outcomes contribute to the long-term objectives as stated in the Statement of Objectives and Priorities?
The advocacy activity undertaken by IPAS on behalf of groups works to strengthen the agency ties to the Indiana community, encouraging Hoosiers with disabilities and their families to utilize IPAS services. Efforts continuously address the abuse/neglect of individuals with intellectual or other developmental disabilities, to provide them a safer, more comfortable and just living environment, more equitable and appropriate educational services and equal access to goods and services.

C. Full Investigations:

1. What are the major areas of investigation?
Although IPAS does not, generally, serve as a primary investigator of allegations of abuse/neglect or other rights violations, but rather as a secondary investigator, IPAS does, on occasion, insist that a client's service provider conduct an investigation such as IPAS is the service provider's first informant of the allegation. As such, IPAS' primary role becomes that of a quasi-oversight agency, ensuring said provider complete an appropriate and thorough investigation. IPAS would then, need seek information pertaining to whether notification of said allegation was provided to the outside entities responsible for overseeing the service provider's day to day operations.

2. Which groups are likely to be affected?
Because IPAS is not a primary investigator, there are no specific and organized groups likely to be affected, though the clients and residents of the facilities IPAS accesses and/or monitors are surely affected in that their environments are bettered by IPAS' presence.

3. What have been the major outcomes during the fiscal year?
Even without being a primary investigator, IPAS has done much to assure facilities' investigative policies and procedures are intact and appropriately implemented so that staff and administration may quickly address allegations of abuse and neglect, or other health/safety issues.

4. How do these outcomes contribute to the long-term objectives as stated in the Statement of Objectives and Priorities?
Although there are no specific and direct outcomes which clearly contribute to IPAS' long-term objectives, effective investigation policies and practices serve to enhance residents' safety at the facilities accessed and/or monitored by IPAS; reason being, timely and effective investigation policies serve as a deterrent to staff abuse and neglect.

D. Monitoring:

1. What are the major areas of non-court ordered monitoring?
IPAS' monitoring activities involved regular visitation to the three largest Intermediate Care Facilities for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities (ICF/IIDs) and the one I/DD dual diagnosis unit positioned within a state operated psychiatric facility. Observation leaned toward the visual inspection of and reassured protection of individuals' health, safety and welfare, so as to prevent and/or alleviate abuse and neglect and to preserve the patients/residents' treatment rights. This same type of monitoring was conducted at an ICF/IID facility after it was decertified and was to close within a thirty days' time frame and also at the facility which emerged after the decertification. It was this facility which absorbed almost all the clients from the then-decertified facility. IPAS' monitoring efforts also consisted of reviewing the death report of any individual who died while receiving in-patient care in Indiana's state-operated facilities, assessment of special education services and compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

2. Which groups are likely to be affected?
IPAS' monitoring efforts impacted the lives of individuals with intellectual or other developmental disabilities receiving in-patient services at the large Intermediate Care Facilities for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities (ICF/IIDs) and the one state operated I/DD dual diagnosis unit, each individual who was a resident at the decertified ICF/IID and each individual with an intellectual or other developmental disability for whom IPAS provided educational advocacy or an assessment as to their rights under the ADA.

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

3. What have been the major outcomes during the fiscal year?

IPAS' monitoring and participation in and at the ICF/IID HRC meetings allowed for an opportunity for IPAS staff to provide constructive advocacy input into both general facility-wide issues as well as individual rights issues. IPAS advocacy provided additional protection as to patient/resident rights within the processes of treatment plan review, conditional rights restrictions and consumer grievance assessment. IPAS' participation in the one ICF/IID's closing provided protection to ensure the patients/residents transferring out maintained the ability to exercise their rights to the fullest extent of the law.

IPAS was unable to recognize any sort of trend or consistent causes among the deaths of individuals in state-operated facilities, nor was IPAS able to identify any specific commonality in the actions taken by school personnel.

4. How do these outcomes contribute to the long-term objectives as stated in the Statement of Objectives and Priorities?

IPAS' monitoring activities have given the agency a physical presence right inside the facilities, aside the staff members who are providing care to individuals with intellectual or other developmental disabilities, the staff members who sometimes hurt those individuals and it's very likely that IPAS' presence may deter that staff member from hurting that individual. Monitoring activities provide individuals with a face, a person to go to, an "outside" person they know they can trust to not retaliate against them because they told of a staff member's wrong doing. As the number of times a staff's potential abuse or neglect is negated and the number of times abuse is reported add up, IPAS has made a difference. IPAS has reduced and is on its' way to eliminating abuse and neglect by empowering that individual with intellectual or other developmental disabilities and assisting them in advocating on their own behalf.

E. Court Ordered Monitoring:

1. What are the major areas of court ordered monitoring?

During fiscal year 2013, IPAS was not court ordered to provide any sort of monitoring related to individuals with intellectual or other developmental disabilities.

2. Which groups are likely to be affected?

During fiscal year 2013, IPAS was not court ordered to provide any sort of monitoring related to individuals with intellectual or other developmental disabilities.

3. What have been the major outcomes during the fiscal year?

During fiscal year 2013, IPAS was not court ordered to provide any sort of monitoring related to individuals with intellectual or other developmental disabilities.

4. How do these outcomes contribute to the long-term objectives as stated in the Statement of Objectives and Priorities?

During fiscal year 2013, IPAS was not court ordered to provide any sort of monitoring related to individuals with intellectual or other developmental disabilities.

F. Systems or Class Action Litigation:

1. What are the major areas of litigation?

During fiscal year 2013, IPAS was not involved in any systems or class action type litigation involving individuals with intellectual or other developmental disabilities.

2. Which groups are likely to be affected?

During fiscal year 2013, IPAS was not involved in any systems or class action type litigation involving individuals with intellectual or other developmental disabilities.

3. What have been the major outcomes during the fiscal year?

During fiscal year 2013, IPAS was not involved in any systems or class action type litigation involving individuals with intellectual or other developmental disabilities.

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

4. How do these outcomes contribute to the long-term objectives as stated in the Statement of Objectives and Priorities? During fiscal year 2013, IPAS was not involved in any systems or class action type litigation involving individuals with intellectual or other developmental disabilities.	
G. Other Systems Change Activities:	
1. What are the major areas of systems change activities? During fiscal year 2013, IPAS was not involved in any system change activities outside of those planned for within the agency's annual priorities and objectives as IPAS' approach to advocacy is by way of addressing individual service requests and individual fact patterns to identify systemic change issues.	
2. Which groups are likely to be affected? During fiscal year 2013, IPAS was not involved in any system change activities outside of those planned for within the agency's annual priorities and objectives as IPAS' approach to advocacy is by way of addressing individual service requests and individual fact patterns to identify systemic change issues.	
3. What have been the major outcomes during the fiscal year? During fiscal year 2013, IPAS was not involved in any system change activities outside of those planned for within the agency's annual priorities and objectives as IPAS' approach to advocacy is by way of addressing individual service requests and individual fact patterns to identify systemic change issues.	
4. How do these outcomes contribute to the long-term objectives as stated in the Statement of Objectives and Priorities? During fiscal year 2013, IPAS was not involved in any system change activities outside of those planned for within the agency's annual priorities and objectives as IPAS' approach to advocacy is by way of addressing individual service requests and individual fact patterns to identify systemic change issues.	
5. Number of people with disabilities impacted?	0

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 5 Non-Case Directed Services

A. Information and Referral Services:			
(Individual Non-Case I&R) Total I&R			420
B. Public Education and Training Activities			
1. Number of Education / Training Activities Undertaken			74
2. Total number of persons trained (approximate)			832
C. Number of Information Dissemination Activities by type:			
1. Radio TV appearances			0
2. Newspaper articles			1
3. PSAs / video / films / etc. aired			0
4. Report disseminated			0
5. Publications disseminated			9,086
6. Information about P&A disseminated (include general training / outreach or presentations not included in training activities)			30
7. Number of hits on Website			99,769
8. Other media activities			0
Describe other media activities:			
Outcome Statement:			
Number of persons who received information about the P&A and its services			36,675
Number of persons with disabilities (or their family members) who received education or training about their rights, enabling them to be more effective self-advocates			832
D. Number of Consumers on Board by type:		Governing Board	Advisory Council
Primary consumers		3	0
Secondary consumers		4	0
Other consumers with disabilities		1	0
Total people		8	0
E. Number of People on Board by Racial / Ethnic type:		P&A Staff	Governing Board
African American		3	1
Hispanic American		0	1
Asian American		0	0
Native American		0	0
Other Racial / Ethnic		22	7

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Total people	25	9	0
Does the PADD program utilize volunteers? No			
If so, describe how?			

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: 1673 - 4043 To reduce or eliminate the abuse and neglect of individuals with intellectual disabilities - Review 85 allegations of abuse and neglect on behalf of individuals with intellectual disabilities.

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.

For each priority, provide the following information:

1. Priority number: 1673	Priority Description: To reduce or eliminate the abuse and neglect of individuals with intellectual disabilities
---------------------------------	---

2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:

Indicator number: 4043	Indicator Description: Review 85 allegations of abuse and neglect on behalf of individuals with intellectual disabilities, to ensure that the allegation is reported to the responsible entities and advocate for necessary action to protect the health, safety and welfare of the individual.
-------------------------------	--

Indicator is: Partially Met

If "Not Met" was checked, explain:

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:

IPAS was slated to review 85 allegations of abuse and neglect during this fiscal year. IPAS provided completed advocacy services within only 23 individual abuse and/or neglect cases, though each case was completely and thoroughly assessed through case closure, with no additional advocacy services necessary.

In total, though, IPAS provided advocacy services within 45 individual abuse and/or neglect cases. There were 24 cases carried over from last year, 21 new cases opened during the year and 22 cases carried over to the 2014 fiscal year.

IPAS has, in the last two years, experienced a significant drop in the number of contacts made by individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities. Belief is that recent trends to move individuals from large ICF/IID settings into smaller group home and Waiver home settings is directly correlated to such, as it seems there is less access to processes that concretely provide individuals with information pertaining to their rights and their right to contest violation of such. There is also less contact with administrative staff such as the IPAS personnel who monitor the larger settings.

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

Of the 23 service requests completed and closed, each one was completely and thoroughly assessed through closure, by both the assigned advocate and a supervising attorney to ensure that, upon closure, no additional advocacy services were necessary.

Agencies were required to update policies and/or ensure consistency within multiple regional offices, regarding: how to thoroughly complete daily progress notes, on-call staffing processes ensuring those clients leaving the home could contact staff working at the home and cross referencing seizure management in terms of client safety and investigation protocol ensuring consistency across incidences.

Facilities created brand new policy/procedures regarding: procedures for writing new or changed orders on medication administration records and re-ordering medication from the pharmacy.

Staff training was conducted regarding when to complete an incident form was conducted after various staff members failed to complete one regarding the condition of a Waiver home and proper restraint usage.

State Medicaid Waiver case managers were reminded of their responsibility to follow up in accordance with established statewide time frames.

State Medicaid Quality Assurance personnel and home health care agency personnel have a better understanding of IPAS' role in monitoring abuse and neglect.

IPAS:

1. Provided every client and/or guardian with rights information
2. Provided reports, notification and/or assistance to: Adult Protective Services (APS); Indiana Professional Management Group (IPMG), a Medicaid Waiver case management provider; the Bureau of Quality Improvement Services (BQIS); the Indiana Attorney General's Medicaid Fraud Unit
3. Initiated the complaint and survey process with the Indiana State Department of Health (ISDH)
4. Assisted service providers with investigations and various reviews and amendments of clients' Individualized Support Plan (ISP), risk plan and/or Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP)
5. Reviewed the death of an individual for whom the care giver was arrested on charges of neglect

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

In responding to reports of or allegations made regarding abuse and neglect, IPAS does enter into and maintain effective working relationships with service providers and agencies statewide; however, there are no direct collaborative efforts to report under this priority for the 2013 fiscal year.

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

During the 2013 fiscal year, IPAS provided completed advocacy services within 23 individual cases, with each case completely and thoroughly assessed through case closure, with no additional advocacy services necessary.

In total, though, IPAS provided advocacy services within 45 individual abuse and/or neglect cases. There were 24 cases carried over from last year, 21 new cases opened during the year and 22 cases carried over to the 2014 fiscal year.

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.

IPAS' approach to advocacy is by way of addressing individual service requests and individual fact patterns to identify systemic issues; thus, during fiscal year 2013, IPAS has achieved, among others, the following systemic outcomes in reducing/eliminating abuse and neglect of individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities:

Agencies were required to update policies and/or ensure consistency within multiple regional offices, regarding: how to thoroughly complete daily progress notes, on-call staffing processes ensuring those clients leaving the home could contact staff working at the home and cross referencing seizure management in terms of client safety and investigation protocol ensuring consistency across incidences.

Facilities created brand new policy/procedures regarding: procedures for writing new or changed orders on medication administration records and re-ordering medication from the pharmacy.

Staff training was conducted regarding when to complete an incident form was conducted after various staff members failed to complete one regarding the condition of a Waiver home and proper restraint usage.

State Medicaid Waiver case managers were reminded of their responsibility to follow up in accordance with established statewide time frames.

State Medicaid Quality Assurance personnel and home health care agency personnel have a better understanding of IPAS' role in monitoring abuse and neglect.

7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.

IPAS' efforts under this priority were directed toward reports of or allegations made regarding abuse/neglect, without consideration of minority status or whether the involved individual might be classified within a group determined as underserved.

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

Adult twin males were receiving home health care and Developmental Disability Waiver services. Their guardian contacted IPAS with an allegation of neglect as the men had both been hospitalized due to dehydration and malnutrition. The guardian informed IPAS she had already made several complaints to the provider regarding the health care and treatment of the men.

IPAS reviewed written incident reports and policies of the provider agencies and the responsible state agencies. IPAS concluded that all agencies involved in the men's care were negligent, in that they failed to protect the men from harm and failed to provide them humane care. The Indiana State Department of Health launched an investigation and placed the home health agency on a corrective action plan (CAP) after receiving IPAS' complaint. The Bureau of Developmental Disabilities Services also placed the provider agency on a CAP as a result of their investigation. At IPAS' recommendation, provider policies were updated to comply with state and federal law; the provider agency also made a number of staff changes as a result of this incident.

At the conclusion of the investigation, IPAS and the Bureau of Quality Improvement Services (BQIS) began dialogue about ways the agencies could better collaborate on any future incidents such as this.

Incidentally, the two men have since changed providers and are currently receiving appropriate care so that nothing further is/was required of IPAS.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority? \$271,400

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year? Yes

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: 1674 - 4044 Reduce or eliminate the denial of rights and discrimination due to disability. - Review five allegations of where the school has changed placement through suspension/expulsion.	
List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.	
For each priority, provide the following information:	
1. Priority number: 1674	Priority Description: Reduce or eliminate the denial of rights and discrimination due to disability.
2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:	
Indicator number: 4044	<p>Indicator Description: Review allegations on behalf of five students where the school has proposed or instituted a change of placement through suspension or expulsion.</p> <p>Case Selection : Case selection criteria are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has there been or was the guardian told of an imminent plan for, a reduction in the length of the student's school day for a period exceeding 10 days or a total of 10 cumulative days for the school year, or 2. Has there been or was the guardian told of an imminent plan for the placement of the student in a different area? (i.e., a more restrictive setting within their building and expected to exceed 10 days or a total of 10 cumulative days for the school year) , or 3. Has there been or has the guardian been told of an imminent plan for the placement of the student in a different building? (i.e., a more restrictive environment expected to exceed 10 days or a total of 10 cumulative days for the school year) , or 4. Including this event, has the student been suspended 10 or more cumulative days during the school year, or 5. Has the school scheduled a manifestation determination review? <p>Note: If yes to any of the five criteria then case is to be forwarded to CRC for consideration.</p>
Indicator is: Met	
If "Not Met" was checked, explain:	

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:

During the 2013 fiscal year, IPAS was slated to review five allegations of where the school had changed a student's placement through suspension or expulsion. IPAS provided completed advocacy services within 17 individual cases, though, with each case completely and thoroughly assessed through case closure, with no additional advocacy services necessary.

In total, IPAS provided advocacy services within 20 individual change of placement cases. There were 10 cases carried over from last year, 10 new cases opened during the year and three cases carried over to the 2014 fiscal year.

IPAS provided educational advocacy services that resulted in and/or contributed to a young lady receiving an independent neuropsychological evaluation at her school's expense. Following said evaluation, the student was transitioned from a homebound placement to a non-traditional educational setting inside her local education agency (LEA), i.e., her local school. Further, the school ceased to expect the child's adoptive mother to serve as a full-time, on-site resource and eventually, through further IEP development and amendment, this child was transitioned to a normal classroom setting. Integrated into her Individualized Education Plan (IEP), Functional Behavioral Assessment (FBA) and Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP) were the findings and conclusions of the independent neuropsychological exam, as well as provisions for Extended School Year services.

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

Within the service requests completed and closed, IPAS' advocacy efforts resulted in Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs) that addressed:

1. Appropriate educational services based on an independent psycho-educational evaluation
2. Attendance in a regular school setting
3. Participation in a mainstream classroom
4. Functional Behavioral Assessments (FBA)
5. Behavior Intervention Plan (BIP)
6. Extended School Year (ESY) services
7. Crisis Plan
8. Prevention of expulsion
9. Prevention of residential placement
10. Information and guidance to enhance self advocacy skills

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

While assessing denial of rights and/or discrimination allegations, then working to alleviate the same, IPAS does enter into and maintain effective working relationships with entities in the statewide community; however, there are no direct collaborative efforts to report under this priority for the 2013 fiscal year.

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

During the 2013 fiscal year, IPAS provided completed advocacy services within 52 individual cases, with each case completely and thoroughly assessed through closure, with no additional advocacy services necessary.

In total, though, IPAS provided advocacy services within 117 individual denial of rights cases. There were 27 cases carried over from last year, 90 new cases opened during the year and 59 cases carried over to the 2014 fiscal year.

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.

IPAS' approach to advocacy is by way of addressing individual service requests and individual fact patterns to identify systemic change issues; thus, during fiscal year 2013, IPAS has achieved, among others, the following systemic outcomes in reducing/eliminating denial of rights and discrimination:

A petting zoo was physically reconfigured so that individuals with disabilities could have equal participation. Every individual who utilizes the petting zoo will notice the difference as the changes are major structural changes.

A high school was required to make structural and mechanical changes to school entrances and exits with doors in compliance with Title II of the ADA. These changes have increased accessibility to the building and the educational services provided there. This access will assist all students attending (approximately 300 every school year) and will be of particular benefit to those students with mobility or other physical impairments.

7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.

IPAS' efforts under this priority were directed toward alleviating rights denials and/or violations for all individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities that contacted IPAS, without consideration of minority status or whether the involved individual might be classified within a group determined as underserved.

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

A young woman's father contacted IPAS after receiving a Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA) Notice of Action (NOA) regarding the intention to reduce the attendant care hours his daughter received via the Aged and Disabled Waiver. Such a reduction, according to the woman's father, would result in his daughter's health and safety being placed at risk. The reduction had already been appealed by the father, with the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruling in favor of FSSA; therefore, IPAS legal filed a request for an agency review in which the ALJ's decision was upheld by the FSSA's ultimate authority. IPAS legal then filed for judicial review on the young woman's behalf. It was then that IPAS legal learned that the Americans with Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) had successfully brought a class action suit against FSSA which determined that the reduction of hours for recipients of the A&D Waiver was inappropriate. Working with FSSA and their legal counsel in the Attorney General's Office, IPAS reached an agreement to set aside the original NOA and reverse the decision of the agency review. As a result of IPAS advocacy, the woman's hours were not reduced and the risks to her health and safety were avoided.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority? \$362,100

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year? Yes

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: 1674 - 4045 Reduce or eliminate the denial of rights and discrimination due to disability. - Review 25 allegations of discrimination under Title II or III of the Americans with Disabilities Act.	
List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.	
For each priority, provide the following information:	
1. Priority number: 1674	Priority Description: Reduce or eliminate the denial of rights and discrimination due to disability.
2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:	
Indicator number: 4045	Indicator Description: Review 25 allegations of discrimination under Title II or III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, Fair Housing Act, or other disability discrimination law.
Indicator is: Not Met	
If "Not Met" was checked, explain: During the 2013 fiscal year, IPAS was slated to review 25 allegations of discrimination under disability law. IPAS provided complete advocacy services within only two individual cases, though each case was completely and thoroughly assessed through closure, with no additional advocacy services necessary. In total, IPAS provided advocacy services within six individual allegations of discrimination. There was one case carried over from last year, five new cases opened during the year and four cases carried over to the 2014 fiscal year.	
If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:	
3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable): No other outcomes were realized.	
4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration: While assessing denial of rights and/or discrimination allegations, then working to alleviate the same, IPAS does enter into and maintain effective working relationships with entities in the statewide community; however, there are no direct collaborative efforts to report under this priority for the 2013 fiscal year.	
5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority. During the 2013 fiscal year, IPAS provided completed advocacy services within 52 individual cases, with each case completely and thoroughly assessed through closure, with no additional advocacy services necessary. In total, though, IPAS provided advocacy services within 117 individual denial of rights cases. There were 27 cases carried over from last year, 90 new cases opened during the year and 59 cases carried over to the 2014 fiscal year.	

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.

IPAS' approach to advocacy is by way of addressing individual service requests and individual fact patterns to identify systemic change issues; thus, during fiscal year 2013, IPAS has achieved, among others, the following systemic outcomes in reducing/eliminating denial of rights and discrimination:

A petting zoo was physically reconfigured so that individuals with disabilities could have equal participation. Every individual who utilizes the petting zoo will notice the difference as the changes are major structural changes.

A high school was required to make structural and mechanical changes to school entrances and exits with doors in compliance with Title II of the ADA. These changes have increased accessibility to the building and the educational services provided there. This access will assist all students attending (approximately 300 every school year) and will be of particular benefit to those students with mobility or other physical impairments.

7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.

IPAS' efforts under this priority were directed toward alleviating rights denials and/or violations for all individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities that contacted IPAS, without consideration of minority status or whether the involved individual might be classified within a group determined as underserved.

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

A young woman's father contacted IPAS after receiving a Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA) Notice of Action (NOA) regarding the intention to reduce the attendant care hours his daughter received via the Aged and Disabled Waiver. Such a reduction, according to the woman's father, would result in his daughter's health and safety being placed at risk. The reduction had already been appealed by the father, with the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruling in favor of FSSA; therefore, IPAS legal filed a request for an agency review in which the ALJ's decision was upheld by the FSSA's ultimate authority. IPAS legal then filed for judicial review on the young woman's behalf. It was then that IPAS legal learned that the Americans with Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) had successfully brought a class action suit against FSSA which determined that the reduction of hours for recipients of the A&D Waiver was inappropriate. Working with FSSA and their legal counsel in the Attorney General's Office, IPAS reached an agreement to set aside the original NOA and reverse the decision of the agency review. As a result of IPAS advocacy, the woman's hours were not reduced and the risks to her health and safety were avoided.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority? \$362,100

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year? Yes

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: 1674 - 4046 Reduce or eliminate the denial of rights and discrimination due to disability. - Represent ten individuals in their appeal of reduced Medicaid waiver services.

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.

For each priority, provide the following information:

1. Priority number: 1674	Priority Description: Reduce or eliminate the denial of rights and discrimination due to disability.
---------------------------------	---

2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:

Indicator number: 4046	<p>Indicator Description: Represent ten individuals in their appeal of reduced Medicaid waiver services when the alleged reduction in services will have a serious and negative impact on the health and safety of the individual, or when the reduction of services places the individual at risk of being placed in a more restrictive setting.</p> <p>Case Selection :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Receiving Medicaid waiver services (DD, A&D, Autism, Family Supports Waiver), and have received a notice of action and have submitted a letter of appeal, which are provided to intake; and 2. Alleging that Medicaid has or is threatening a forced and arbitrary decrease in services i.e. financial cap, and either; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The alleged decrease in services will have a serious and negative impact on the health and safety of the individual, or • The reduction of services puts the individual at risk of being placed in a more restrictive setting.
-------------------------------	---

Indicator is: Not Met

If "Not Met" was checked, explain:
During the 2013 fiscal year, IPAS was slated to represent 10 individuals regarding their proposed Waiver reductions. IPAS provided completed advocacy services within only six individual cases, though, with each case completely and thoroughly assessed through case closure, with no additional advocacy services necessary.

In total, IPAS provided advocacy services represented 10 individuals regarding their proposed Waiver reductions. There were four cases carried over from last year, six new cases opened during the year and four cases carried over to the 2014 fiscal year.

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):
No other outcomes were realized.

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:
While assessing denial of rights and/or discrimination allegations, then working to alleviate the same, IPAS does enter into and maintain effective working relationships with entities in the statewide community; however, there are no direct collaborative efforts to report under this priority for the 2013 fiscal year.

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

During the 2013 fiscal year, IPAS provided completed advocacy services within 52 individual cases, with each case completely and thoroughly assessed through closure, with no additional advocacy services necessary.

In total, though, IPAS provided advocacy services within 117 individual denial of rights cases. There were 27 cases carried over from last year, 90 new cases opened during the year and 59 cases carried over to the 2014 fiscal year.

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.

IPAS' approach to advocacy is by way of addressing individual service requests and individual fact patterns to identify systemic change issues; thus, during fiscal year 2013, IPAS has achieved, among others, the following systemic outcomes in reducing/eliminating denial of rights and discrimination:

A petting zoo was physically reconfigured so that individuals with disabilities could have equal participation. Every individual who utilizes the petting zoo will notice the difference as the changes are major structural changes.

A high school was required to make structural and mechanical changes to school entrances and exits with doors in compliance with Title II of the ADA. These changes have increased accessibility to the building and the educational services provided there. This access will assist all students attending (approximately 300 every school year) and will be of particular benefit to those students with mobility or other physical impairments.

7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.

IPAS' efforts under this priority were directed toward alleviating rights denials and/or violations for all individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities that contacted IPAS, without consideration of minority status or whether the involved individual might be classified within a group determined as underserved.

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

A young woman's father contacted IPAS after receiving a Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA) Notice of Action (NOA) regarding the intention to reduce the attendant care hours his daughter received via the Aged and Disabled Waiver. Such a reduction, according to the woman's father, would result in his daughter's health and safety being placed at risk. The reduction had already been appealed by the father, with the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruling in favor of FSSA; therefore, IPAS legal filed a request for an agency review in which the ALJ's decision was upheld by the FSSA's ultimate authority. IPAS legal then filed for judicial review on the young woman's behalf. It was then that IPAS legal learned that the Americans with Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) had successfully brought a class action suit against FSSA which determined that the reduction of hours for recipients of the A&D Waiver was inappropriate. Working with FSSA and their legal counsel in the Attorney General's Office, IPAS reached an agreement to set aside the original NOA and reverse the decision of the agency review. As a result of IPAS advocacy, the woman's hours were not reduced and the risks to her health and safety were avoided.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority? \$362,100

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year? Yes

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: 1674 - 4047 Reduce or eliminate the denial of rights and discrimination due to disability. - Review three allegations of disability based discrimination that may have systemic implications.	
List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.	
For each priority, provide the following information:	
1. Priority number: 1674	Priority Description: Reduce or eliminate the denial of rights and discrimination due to disability.
2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:	
Indicator number: 4047	Indicator Description: Review three allegations of disability based discrimination that may have systemic implications.
Indicator is: Met	
If "Not Met" was checked, explain:	
<p>If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:</p> <p>During the 2013 fiscal year, IPAS was slated to review three individual allegations of disability based discrimination that may have systemic implications. IPAS provided completed advocacy services within four individual cases, with each case completely and thoroughly assessed through case closure, with no additional advocacy services necessary.</p> <p>In total, IPAS provided advocacy services within 25 individual allegations of disability based discrimination that may have systemic implications. Though none were carried over from last year, 25 new cases were opened during the year, with 21 cases carried over to the 2014 fiscal year.</p> <p>IPAS was notified that a newly established Intermediate Care Facility for Individuals with Intellectual Disabilities (ICF/IID) had lost its Medicaid certification and would be abruptly closing. The facility was said to be closing its doors within thirty days, making it necessary for the state to find immediate alternative placements for the 29 residents, all individuals with intellectual and other developmental disabilities. IPAS became involved in representation of those residents who wished to have assistance in the process of transitioning from a client of the first ICF/IID to a client of the ICF/IID which would be taking over responsibility for their care.</p> <p>The second facility's plan of action was to purchase and refurbish a facility in a nearby county, into which the clients would move. All movement and transition was to be completed within the established Bureau of Developmental Disabilities' Services (BDDS) guidelines set forth to protect the rights of individual with intellectual and other developmental disabilities. Further, the building into which the residents transitioned must also meet State Department of Health licensing standards.</p> <p>In one of the 25 residents' cases, the guardian did not authorize IPAS to access the resident's records so that case had to be closed. In the remaining 24 residents' cases, IPAS advocated for the residents' rights in relation to the move and attempted to make sure guardians and families were knowledgeable about the details and timeline for the move. IPAS also took steps to assure that Family Social Services Administration/BDDS was taking all prudent, reasonable and required steps to assure that the change of placement was appropriate, safe and transparently carried out .</p>	
3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):	
No other outcomes were realized.	

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

While assessing denial of rights and/or discrimination allegations, then working to alleviate the same, IPAS does enter into and maintain effective working relationships with entities in the statewide community; however, there are no direct collaborative efforts to report under this priority for the 2013 fiscal year.

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

During the 2013 fiscal year, IPAS provided completed advocacy services within 52 individual cases, with each case completely and thoroughly assessed through closure, with no additional advocacy services necessary.

In total, though, IPAS provided advocacy services within 117 individual denial of rights cases. There were 27 cases carried over from last year, 90 new cases opened during the year and 59 cases carried over to the 2014 fiscal year.

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.

IPAS' approach to advocacy is by way of addressing individual service requests and individual fact patterns to identify systemic change issues; thus, during fiscal year 2013, IPAS has achieved, among others, the following systemic outcomes in reducing/eliminating denial of rights and discrimination:

A petting zoo was physically reconfigured so that individuals with disabilities could have equal participation. Every individual who utilizes the petting zoo will notice the difference as the changes are major structural changes.

A high school was required to make structural and mechanical changes to school entrances and exits with doors in compliance with Title II of the ADA. These changes have increased accessibility to the building and the educational services provided there. This access will assist all students attending (approximately 300 every school year) and will be of particular benefit to those students with mobility or other physical impairments.

7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.

IPAS' efforts under this priority were directed toward alleviating rights denials and/or violations for all individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities that contacted IPAS, without consideration of minority status or whether the involved individual might be classified within a group determined as underserved.

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

A young woman's father contacted IPAS after receiving a Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA) Notice of Action (NOA) regarding the intention to reduce the attendant care hours his daughter received via the Aged and Disabled Waiver. Such a reduction, according to the woman's father, would result in his daughter's health and safety being placed at risk. The reduction had already been appealed by the father, with the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruling in favor of FSSA; therefore, IPAS legal filed a request for an agency review in which the ALJ's decision was upheld by the FSSA's ultimate authority. IPAS legal then filed for judicial review on the young woman's behalf. It was then that IPAS legal learned that the Americans with Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) had successfully brought a class action suit against FSSA which determined that the reduction of hours for recipients of the A&D Waiver was inappropriate. Working with FSSA and their legal counsel in the Attorney General's Office, IPAS reached an agreement to set aside the original NOA and reverse the decision of the agency review. As a result of IPAS advocacy, the woman's hours were not reduced and the risks to her health and safety were avoided.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority? \$362,100

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year? Yes

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: 1674 - 4048 Reduce or eliminate the denial of rights and discrimination due to disability. - Review five allegations of unregulated or under regulated use of restraint/seclusion.

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.

For each priority, provide the following information:

1. Priority number: 1674	Priority Description: Reduce or eliminate the denial of rights and discrimination due to disability.
---------------------------------	---

2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:

Indicator number: 4048	Indicator Description: Review five allegations of unregulated or under regulated use of restraint and/or seclusion by a school and advocate for adoption of policies that promote and protect the health and safety of students.
-------------------------------	---

Indicator is: Not Met

If "Not Met" was checked, explain:

During the 2013 fiscal year, IPAS was slated to review five allegations of unregulated or under regulated use of restraint/seclusion in school. IPAS has yet been unable to completely and thoroughly assess any one case all the way through case closure, so that no additional advocacy services are necessary.

IPAS provided advocacy services regarding unregulated or under regulated use of restraint/seclusion in school in only one case during fiscal year 2013; that one case was opened within the year and remains open. No cases had been carried over from the previous year.

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

No other outcomes were realized.

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

While assessing denial of rights and/or discrimination allegations, then working to alleviate the same, IPAS does enter into and maintain effective working relationships with entities in the statewide community; however, there are no direct collaborative efforts to report under this priority for the 2013 fiscal year.

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

During the 2013 fiscal year, IPAS provided completed advocacy services within 52 individual cases, with each case completely and thoroughly assessed through closure, with no additional advocacy services necessary.

In total, though, IPAS provided advocacy services within 117 individual denial of rights cases. There were 27 cases carried over from last year, 90 new cases opened during the year and 59 cases carried over to the 2014 fiscal year.

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.

IPAS' approach to advocacy is by way of addressing individual service requests and individual fact patterns to identify systemic change issues; thus, during fiscal year 2013, IPAS has achieved, among others, the following systemic outcomes in reducing/eliminating denial of rights and discrimination:

A petting zoo was physically reconfigured so that individuals with disabilities could have equal participation. Every individual who utilizes the petting zoo will notice the difference as the changes are major structural changes.

A high school was required to make structural and mechanical changes to school entrances and exits with doors in compliance with Title II of the ADA. These changes have increased accessibility to the building and the educational services provided there. This access will assist all students attending (approximately 300 every school year) and will be of particular benefit to those students with mobility or other physical impairments.

7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.

IPAS' efforts under this priority were directed toward alleviating rights denials and/or violations for all individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities that contacted IPAS, without consideration of minority status or whether the involved individual might be classified within a group determined as underserved.

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

A young woman's father contacted IPAS after receiving a Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA) Notice of Action (NOA) regarding the intention to reduce the attendant care hours his daughter received via the Aged and Disabled Waiver. Such a reduction, according to the woman's father, would result in his daughter's health and safety being placed at risk. The reduction had already been appealed by the father, with the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruling in favor of FSSA; therefore, IPAS legal filed a request for an agency review in which the ALJ's decision was upheld by the FSSA's ultimate authority. IPAS legal then filed for judicial review on the young woman's behalf. It was then that IPAS legal learned that the Americans with Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) had successfully brought a class action suit against FSSA which determined that the reduction of hours for recipients of the A&D Waiver was inappropriate. Working with FSSA and their legal counsel in the Attorney General's Office, IPAS reached an agreement to set aside the original NOA and reverse the decision of the agency review. As a result of IPAS advocacy, the woman's hours were not reduced and the risks to her health and safety were avoided.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority? \$362,100

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year? Yes

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: 1675 - 4049 Increase awareness and effective self-advocacy by providing education and training about disability rights and the exercise of these rights. - Provide education and training about disability rights and IPAS.

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.

For each priority, provide the following information:

1. Priority number: 1675	Priority Description: Increase awareness and effective self-advocacy by providing education and training about disability rights and the exercise of these rights.
---------------------------------	---

2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:

Indicator number: 4049	Indicator Description: Provide education and training about disability rights and IPAS to individuals with intellectual disabilities, parents, guardians, advocates, and/or service program providers.
-------------------------------	---

Indicator is: Met

If "Not Met" was checked, explain:

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:

During the fiscal year 2013, there were a total of 113 agency wide education/training events and public information activities (AW202) introducing IPAS services, including PADD, to approximately 37,512 individuals. This objective was, in all actuality, exceeded.

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

IPAS participated in a panel discussion in regards to the state services provided to children and families served by Indiana Department of Child Services. Said panel was featured at a provider fair purposed to increase the effectiveness of Family Case Managers within their casework and in their partnership of other providers in the community. Panel discussion was shared with approximately 100 Family Case Managers and was in regards to IPAS services and equal rights to services as well as disability rights.

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

IPAS collaboration efforts reached statewide within this priority. IPAS organized education and training events to create collaboration with individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities, their parents or guardians, advocates and other service providers and agreed to participate in events sponsored by or organized by the service providers themselves to do the same. Self advocacy groups allowing IPAS to participate in their committees and internal groups created on-going collaboration, while IPAS' participation with already more established groups, e.g., Institute for Disability and Community (IIDC) Family Council is an example of continued collaboration efforts.

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

This priority was not addressed through individual advocacy.

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.

This priority addressed systemic advocacy in terms of participating in groups and committees, providing input into decisions made, policies being written and rewritten. The imprint provided by IPAS, both within and upon, these entities are ones that will carry forward, reaching the clients and administrators to come.

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.

It could be viewed that within this priority, individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities, themselves, are the ones considered as the under/unserved population. IPAS' utilized education and training as a way of reaching and teaching them and self-advocacy groups were specifically chosen for IPAS' participation and collaboration.

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

While this is not a case summary, it is a narrative regarding IPAS' efforts within the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2013.

IPAS and IN*source, a parent information network, collaborated in an effort to bring the PACER Center's bullying prevention training to Indiana; a July meeting held at the IPAS Central Office. Representatives from interested agencies discussed the project and explored opportunities for these groups to collaborate. A month later, the PACER's Center's National Bullying Prevention Center staff conducted a training at which representatives from IN*Source, the Autism Society of Indiana and IPAS' were present. This training will be provided throughout Indiana; IN*Source staff have already scheduled over a dozen trainings, conducted one webinar and have several Spanish trainings scheduled.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority? \$54,900

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year? Yes

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: 1675 - 4050 Increase awareness and effective self-advocacy by providing education and training about disability rights and the exercise of these rights. - Support education and training efforts of self-advocacy organizations.

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.

For each priority, provide the following information:

1. Priority number: 1675	Priority Description: Increase awareness and effective self-advocacy by providing education and training about disability rights and the exercise of these rights.
---------------------------------	---

2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:

Indicator number: 4050	<p>Indicator Description: Support education and training efforts of self advocacy organizations to increase awareness of disability rights.</p> <p>Work Plan: (1) Indiana Institute for Disability & Community (IIDC) Family Council - IPAS will participate on the Council (2) Self Advocates of Indiana - IPAS will work together with the Self Advocates of Indiana (SAI) Board of Directors during the coming year to determine how IPAS can provide training to meet member needs. IPAS will also present information on the FY 2013 IPAS Strategic Plan to the SAI Board for their feedback and comments to the IPAS Commission. (3) Building Pathways to Empowerment - IPAS is a sponsor of the project and will continue to monitor its activities during the year. The ARC of Indiana has undertaken this campaign in order to explore new ways to provide services to individuals with developmental disabilities.</p>
-------------------------------	--

Indicator is: Met

If "Not Met" was checked, explain:

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:

IPAS is an active participant to the following groups/committees: Indiana Department of Homeland Security Disaster Housing and Emergency Services Advisory Committee; Self-Advocates of Indiana; Arc of Indiana, Autism Society of Indiana, IN*Source; Family Voices Indiana and Institute for Disability and Community (IIDC) Family Council.

IPAS attends meetings to provide professional, assistive input into decisions made and on occasion, IPAS has provided financial assistance to the groups' boards for specific objectives.

While this is not a case summary, it is a narrative regarding IPAS' efforts within the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2013.

IPAS continues to provide funding so that SAI board members can travel to board meetings. IPAS continues to collaborate with SAI on their annual picnic, at which IPAS offered an awareness activity on bullying prevention. Six hundred, fifty people attended the July 2013 annual picnic so by participating, IPAS greatly raised awareness of IPAS' services.

The Self Advocates of Indiana are assisting in IPAS' outreach activities by including information about IPAS in their newsletter and through other means of information/communication, such as information cards.

The SAI Newsletter "Nim's" did not go out this quarter. It is expected to be completed and distributed in October 2013. An article about bullying prevention, written by IPAS, will be included in the next issue. IPAS will also present a Bullying panel/workshop at the SAI October 2013 conference.

Although there was no movement on the "If you need help" cards during the fourth quarter, work will resume during the first quarter of 2014 FY.

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

No other were realized.

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

IPAS collaboration efforts reached statewide within this priority. IPAS organized education and training events to create collaboration with individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities, their parents or guardians, advocates and other service providers and agreed to participate in events sponsored by or organized by the service providers themselves to do the same. Self advocacy groups allowing IPAS to participate in their committees and internal groups created on-going collaboration, while IPAS' participation with already more established groups, e.g., Institute for Disability and Community (IIDC) Family Council is an example of continued collaboration efforts.

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

This priority was not addressed through individual advocacy.

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.

This priority addressed systemic advocacy in terms of participating in groups and committees, providing input into decisions made, policies being written and rewritten. The imprint provided by IPAS, both within and upon, these entities are ones that will carry forward, reaching the clients and administrators to come.

7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.

It could be viewed that within this priority, individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities, themselves, are the ones considered as the under/unserved population. IPAS' utilized education and training as a way of reaching and teaching them and self-advocacy groups were specifically chosen for IPAS' participation and collaboration.

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

While this is not a case summary, it is a narrative regarding IPAS' efforts within the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2013.

IPAS and IN*source, a parent information network, collaborated in an effort to bring the PACER Center's bullying prevention training to Indiana; a July meeting held at the IPAS Central Office. Representatives from interested agencies discussed the project and explored opportunities for these groups to collaborate. A month later, the PACER's Center's National Bullying Prevention Center staff conducted a training at which representatives from IN*Source, the Autism Society of Indiana and IPAS' were present. This training will be provided throughout Indiana; IN*Source staff have already scheduled over a dozen trainings, conducted one webinar and have several Spanish trainings scheduled.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority? \$54,900

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year? Yes

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: 1675 - 4052 Increase awareness and effective self-advocacy by providing education and training about disability rights and the exercise of these rights. - Strengthen policies and practices affecting the state's response to disability rights issues affecting individuals with intellectual disabilities through participation on groups and committees.

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.

For each priority, provide the following information:

1. Priority number: 1675	Priority Description: Increase awareness and effective self-advocacy by providing education and training about disability rights and the exercise of these rights.
---------------------------------	---

2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:

Indicator number: 4052	<p>Indicator Description: Strengthen policies and practices affecting the State's response to disability rights issues affecting individuals with intellectual disabilities through attending at least 50% of the meetings of select committees, groups and task forces.</p> <p>Work Plan: IPAS assigned staff will attend and participate in the following meetings and report significant progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Statewide DD Human Rights Committee- committee reviews plans submitted by community residential providers that have no Human Rights Committees. (2) Mental Health America of Greater Indianapolis Adult Guardianship Services Committee (3) North Willow ICF-MR Human Rights Committee (4) Hickory Creek Human Rights Committee (5) Arcadia ICF-MR Human Rights Committee (6) Indiana Department of Homeland Security et al. Disaster Housing and Emergency Services Advisory Committee
-------------------------------	---

Indicator is: Met

If "Not Met" was checked, explain:

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:

Calculations are that in order to strengthen policies and practices affecting the State's response to disability rights issues, IPAS attended 71% of the meetings of selected committees, groups and task forces affecting individuals with developmental disabilities. This objective was exceeded.

While this is not a case summary, it is a narrative regarding IPAS' efforts within the second quarter of fiscal year 2013.

IPAS attended each of the four HRC meetings held at North Willow during this quarter; an additional meeting was held as a quorum was not present at the February meeting. During this quarter, 33 behavior support plans were reviewed, 32 of which were approved, with the one plan was tabled until next quarter to allow a treatment team review of the behaviors documented as having no occurrences over the past year. Fourteen psychotropic treatment plans were reviewed, 13 of which were approved; the one plan was tabled until next quarter, as the plan contained some areas of inconsistency in regards to medication dosage and intended use.

Thirty-six pre-medications were reviewed and approved. Pre-medications are utilized for physician and dental appointments in which an individual has high anxiety, moves around during procedures or is combative and require approval each time they are used, regardless of whether an individual has had the medication previously.

Twenty-two restrictions were reviewed and approved by the committee. Restrictions this quarter included pelvic stabilizers (wheel chair seat belts and lap trays) for those with seizure disorders or gait issues to improve posture and to assist with falls, helmets, bed and chair alarms and bed rails for those individuals who fall due to seizure activity. Other restrictions included situations in which personal items, e.g., electric toothbrushes, electric razors and eyeglasses, were restricted due the individual's inability to care for the item. These items are kept in the Program Director's office, with individuals permitted to retrieve them at any time; once the individual is finished using the item, however, it is returned to the Program Director's office. One guardian requested that an iPod be kept in the program director's office when not in use, as the individual has already broken two iPods, being unable to care for it.

One topic of committee discussion during this quarter was that the Bureau of Developmental Disabilities office is doing a presentation regarding moving individuals into waiver settings from ICF-IID settings. BDDS, along with the ARC of Indiana, are the interviewers. The committee has not received any information that anyone has left North Willow because of these efforts.

Another topic of discussion, which will continue next quarter, is in regard to the verbiage found in psychotropic and behavior treatment plans when discussing pre-medications. The verbiage states the individual is 100% chemically restrained, which caused the committee concern, as the term refers to someone being completely sedated and possible sleeping, which is not what is currently occurring. The Human Rights Committee Chairperson will be inquiring how that verbiage began and see if the verbiage can be written more clearly in the future.

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

IPAS staff continues to participate in the human rights committee meetings for individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities at three of the state's largest ICF/IIDs. Their presence on said committees allows for input and advocacy regarding a variety of issues, including, but in no way limited to: review of restrictive treatment plans, i.e., those plans including the use of either psychotropic medications, physical holds or restriction of rights; the right to access certain goods, services or even money, as well as providing input into patient complaint resolution processes.

IPAS staff also participated on the following committees/groups: Statewide Developmental Disabilities Human Rights Committee; Mental Health America of Greater Indianapolis Adult Guardianship Services Committee; North Willow ICF/IID Human Rights Committee; Hickory Creek ICF/IID Human Rights Committee and Arcadia Developmental Center Human Rights Committee.

IPAS' presence at said meetings allowed for the provision of general advocacy in terms of rights advisement, etc.

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

IPAS collaboration efforts reached statewide within this priority. IPAS organized education and training events to create collaboration with individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities, their parents or guardians, advocates and other service providers and agreed to participate in events sponsored by or organized by the service providers themselves to do the same. Self advocacy groups allowing IPAS to participate in their committees and internal groups created on-going collaboration, while IPAS' participation with already more established groups, e.g., Institute for Disability and Community (IIDC) Family Council is an example of continued collaboration efforts.

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

This priority was not addressed through individual advocacy.

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.

This priority addressed systemic advocacy in terms of participating in groups and committees, providing input into decisions made, policies being written and rewritten. The imprint provided by IPAS, both within and upon, these entities are ones that will carry forward, reaching the clients and administrators to come.

7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.

It could be viewed that within this priority, individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities, themselves, are the ones considered as the under/unserved population. IPAS' utilized education and training as a way of reaching and teaching them and self-advocacy groups were specifically chosen for IPAS' participation and collaboration.

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

While this is not a case summary, it is a narrative regarding IPAS' efforts within the fourth quarter of fiscal year 2013.

IPAS and IN*source, a parent information network, collaborated in an effort to bring the PACER Center's bullying prevention training to Indiana; a July meeting held at the IPAS Central Office. Representatives from interested agencies discussed the project and explored opportunities for these groups to collaborate. A month later, the PACER's Center's National Bullying Prevention Center staff conducted a training at which representatives from IN*Source, the Autism Society of Indiana and IPAS' were present. This training will be provided throughout Indiana; IN*Source staff have already scheduled over a dozen trainings, conducted one webinar and have several Spanish trainings scheduled.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority? \$54,900

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year? Yes

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: 1676 - 4054 Provide timely and accurate information about disability rights and technical assistance concerning the exercise of these rights. - IPAS will respond within two working days to requests for information or assistance according to established IPAS Intake Guidelines.	
List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.	
For each priority, provide the following information:	
1. Priority number: 1676	Priority Description: Provide timely and accurate information about disability rights and technical assistance concerning the exercise of these rights.
2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:	
Indicator number: 4054	Indicator Description: IPAS will respond within two working days to requests for information or assistance according to established IPAS Intake Guidelines.
Indicator is: Met	
If "Not Met" was checked, explain:	
<p>If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:</p> <p>IPAS provided information and referral services on behalf of 420 individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities. Said information was provided either directly to the individual or to a family member or an otherwise concerned individual and included a variety of disability related materials. IPAS staff has knowledge of the most pertinent, applicable referrals and information to assist callers based upon their report or questions. Specifically, it is IPAS' Intake staff who was responsible for providing the vast majority of information; however, a portion was also provided by IPAS' general advocacy staff.</p> <p>Parents of students with intellectual or developmental disabilities were provided with general guidelines and materials regarding the special education process and the rights of their child within the process.</p> <p>Others were provided with a variety of general community resource information.</p>	
3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):	
There are no other outcomes to report for fiscal year 2013.	

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

<p>4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:</p> <p>IPAS Intake personnel are very versed in the resources available throughout the state. When callers are in need of services that IPAS, perhaps, cannot or does not provide, they are provided with referral information to agencies and/or individuals who may be able to assist them. Additionally, IPAS is contacted by individuals who have been provided IPAS as a resource by another entity.</p> <p>During fiscal year 2013, IPAS emphasized collaborative efforts with centralized advocacy groups such as Autism Society of Indiana, Self Advocates of Indiana and Family Voices Indiana and regional advocacy groups such as In*Source, as well as Arc of Indiana, the primary resource for individuals with intellectual or other developmental disabilities. Efforts included explanative dialogue and exchange of information detailing agency provided services so that all parties could and would have increased ability to refer individuals to outside resources.</p> <p>Continued were relationships and participation between IPAS and the Institute for Disability and Community (IIDC) Family Council, University Centers for Excellence in Developmental Disabilities Education, Research, and Service (UCEDD) and the Indiana Governor's Planning Council (IGPC), all of which certainly aid in being considered a state-wide referral resource.</p>
<p>5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.</p> <p>Though this priority was not addressed through individual advocacy, IPAS provided information and referral services to 420 individuals during the 2013 fiscal year</p>
<p>6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.</p> <p>This Priority was not addressed through systemic advocacy or capacity building.</p>
<p>7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.</p> <p>This priority addressed all calls directed to IPAS in which assistance was requested; there was no emphasis placed upon or priority given to those calls received of the under/unserved or minority populations.</p>
<p>8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.</p> <p>This priority was not carried out via individual case work. Information and referral services were provided on every call received.</p>
<p>9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority? \$159,200</p>
<p>10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year? Yes</p>

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: 1674 - 4055 Reduce or eliminate the denial of rights and discrimination due to disability. - Review ten allegations where the school is not providing appropriate educational services.	
List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.	
For each priority, provide the following information:	
1. Priority number: 1674	Priority Description: Reduce or eliminate the denial of rights and discrimination due to disability.
2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:	
Indicator number: 4055	Indicator Description: Review allegations on behalf of ten students where the school is not providing appropriate educational services.
Indicator is: Met	
If "Not Met" was checked, explain:	
<p>If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:</p> <p>During the 2013 fiscal year, IPAS was slated to review 10 allegations of where the school was not providing appropriate educational services. IPAS provided completed advocacy services within 22 individual cases, though, with each case completely and thoroughly assessed through case closure, with no additional advocacy services necessary.</p> <p>In total, IPAS provided advocacy services within 43 individual cases in which appropriate educational services were not being provided. There were eight cases carried over from last year, 35 new cases opened during the year and 21 cases carried over to the 2014 fiscal year.</p> <p>IPAS provided educational advocacy services on behalf of three a year old preschool student. This young student's mother/guardian was concerned over her daughter's safety during her bus ride to and from preschool. Mother was, therefore, requesting additional transportation services be added to her daughter's Individual Educational Plan (IEP) so that she would be adequately protected during her transport to school. Mother specifically desired that an aide be added since the driver was the sole personnel assigned to the transport. IPAS attended a case conference and advocated that appropriate surveillance and personnel be provided on the bus; it was agreed to at the case conference that the camera on the school bus be repaired and a bus monitor, provided.</p>	
3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):	
Within the service requests completed and closed, IPAS' advocacy efforts resulted in:	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Development and implementation of revised Individualized Educational Plans (IEP) based upon current educational evaluations 2. Provision of appropriate related services 3. Agreement for a student to attend a program at Indiana State School for the Blind as a supplemental educational program 4. Systemic change in an LEA that will provide students attending Life Skills classes the opportunity to enroll in an Adaptive PE Class for provision of swimming instruction 5. Provision of information and guidance to enhance self advocacy skills 	

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

While assessing denial of rights and/or discrimination allegations, then working to alleviate the same, IPAS does enter into and maintain effective working relationships with entities in the statewide community; however, there are no direct collaborative efforts to report under this priority for the 2013 fiscal year.

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

During the 2013 fiscal year, IPAS provided completed advocacy services within 52 individual cases, with each case completely and thoroughly assessed through closure, with no additional advocacy services necessary.

In total, though, IPAS provided advocacy services within 117 individual denial of rights cases. There were 27 cases carried over from last year, 90 new cases opened during the year and 59 cases carried over to the 2014 fiscal year.

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.

IPAS' approach to advocacy is by way of addressing individual service requests and individual fact patterns to identify systemic change issues; thus, during fiscal year 2013, IPAS has achieved, among others, the following systemic outcomes in reducing/eliminating denial of rights and discrimination:

A petting zoo was physically reconfigured so that individuals with disabilities could have equal participation. Every individual who utilizes the petting zoo will notice the difference as the changes are major structural changes.

A high school was required to make structural and mechanical changes to school entrances and exits with doors in compliance with Title II of the ADA. These changes have increased accessibility to the building and the educational services provided there. This access will assist all students attending (approximately 300 every school year) and will be of particular benefit to those students with mobility or other physical impairments.

7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.

IPAS' efforts under this priority were directed toward alleviating rights denials and/or violations for all individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities that contacted IPAS, without consideration of minority status or whether the involved individual might be classified within a group determined as underserved.

8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority.

A young woman's father contacted IPAS after receiving a Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA) Notice of Action (NOA) regarding the intention to reduce the attendant care hours his daughter received via the Aged and Disabled Waiver. Such a reduction, according to the woman's father, would result in his daughter's health and safety being placed at risk. The reduction had already been appealed by the father, with the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruling in favor of FSSA; therefore, IPAS legal filed a request for an agency review in which the ALJ's decision was upheld by the FSSA's ultimate authority. IPAS legal then filed for judicial review on the young woman's behalf. It was then that IPAS legal learned that the Americans with Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) had successfully brought a class action suit against FSSA which determined that the reduction of hours for recipients of the A&D Waiver was inappropriate. Working with FSSA and their legal counsel in the Attorney General's Office, IPAS reached an agreement to set aside the original NOA and reverse the decision of the agency review. As a result of IPAS advocacy, the woman's hours were not reduced and the risks to her health and safety were avoided.

9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority? \$362,100

10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year? Yes

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 6 Outcomes of Priorities and Goals: 1674 - 4056 Reduce or eliminate the denial of rights and discrimination due to disability. - Review three cases involving alleged rights violations and the use of the provider's internal complaint provider.

List reporting year priorities from the Statement of Objectives and Priorities in order by priority.

For each priority, provide the following information:

1. Priority number: 1674	Priority Description: Reduce or eliminate the denial of rights and discrimination due to disability.
---------------------------------	---

2. Identify and describe indicators PADD used to determine successful outcome of activities pursued under this priority:

Indicator number: 4056	Indicator Description: Review three cases involving alleged rights violations and the use of the internal complaint process of the provider, in situations not involving abuse or neglect.
-------------------------------	---

Indicator is: Met

If "Not Met" was checked, explain:

If "Met or Partially Met" was checked, summarize details, including one or two cases that exemplify the success; for fully met goals, the example case(s) should be successfully closed:

During the 2013 fiscal year, IPAS was slated to review three cases involving alleged rights violations and the use of the service provider's internal complaint policy. IPAS provided completed advocacy services within eight individual cases, with each case completely and thoroughly assessed through case closure, with no additional advocacy services necessary.

In total, IPAS provided advocacy services within 12 cases involving alleged rights violations and the use of the service provider's internal complaint policy. There were four cases carried over from last year, eight new cases opened during the year and four cases carried over to the 2014 fiscal year.

IPAS represented a nineteen year old female who resided in a waiver home and had a history of aggressive behaviors. The young lady's guardian had received a letter stating the residential provider could no longer provide services for her and they would stop their services in sixty days. The provider cited lack of partnership with the guardian and an inability to be successful in providing meaningful services to this residential client as the reason for termination of services. The guardian contacted IPAS with concerns regarding the termination of services and a possible violation of her ward's rights.

IPAS reviewed the Division of Disability and Rehabilitative Services' (DDRS) Service Provider Agreement. It requires that all service providers provide at least a sixty day written notice to the recipient and/or recipient's legal representative before terminating services. This sixty day notice was provided from the service provider to the guardian.

The client's case manager for Indiana Professional Management Group (IPMG) provided a list of service providers to her guardian. The young lady and her guardian interviewed several providers before choosing one. IPAS confirmed an appropriate discharge for the client in her transition to her new provider. The guardian reported to IPAS that she is doing well and is satisfied with the services being received from the newly chosen provider.

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

3. List other outcomes realized (if applicable):

Outcomes achieved within the closed service requests included:

1. Ensuring client and his treatment team were knowledgeable regarding client's rights as an emancipated adult.
2. Ensuring client would not have his water intake restricted, but rather, staff would continue to educate the client as to the dangers of over consumption, as he suffers from Polydipsia.
3. Review of the DDRS' Service Provider Agreement to find that daily living service providers must provide a 60 day notice prior to termination of services
4. Review of agency policies
5. Review of the Bureau of Developmental Disabilities Services (BDDS) policies

4. Explain whether pursuing this priority involved collaborative efforts by other entities. If so, describe this collaboration:

While assessing denial of rights and/or discrimination allegations, then working to alleviate the same, IPAS does enter into and maintain effective working relationships with entities in the statewide community; however, there are no direct collaborative efforts to report under this priority for the 2013 fiscal year.

5. If this was this addressed through individual advocacy, provide the number of cases handled under the priority.

During the 2013 fiscal year, IPAS provided completed advocacy services within 52 individual cases, with each case completely and thoroughly assessed through closure, with no additional advocacy services necessary.

In total, though, IPAS provided advocacy services within 117 individual denial of rights cases. There were 27 cases carried over from last year, 90 new cases opened during the year and 59 cases carried over to the 2014 fiscal year.

6. If this priority addressed systemic advocacy or capacity building of the service delivery system for persons with developmental disabilities, please describe how including indicating if any were class actions.

IPAS' approach to advocacy is by way of addressing individual service requests and individual fact patterns to identify systemic change issues; thus, during fiscal year 2013, IPAS has achieved, among others, the following systemic outcomes in reducing/eliminating denial of rights and discrimination:

A petting zoo was physically reconfigured so that individuals with disabilities could have equal participation. Every individual who utilizes the petting zoo will notice the difference as the changes are major structural changes.

A high school was required to make structural and mechanical changes to school entrances and exits with doors in compliance with Title II of the ADA. These changes have increased accessibility to the building and the educational services provided there. This access will assist all students attending (approximately 300 every school year) and will be of particular benefit to those students with mobility or other physical impairments.

7. Was this priority targeted to under/unserved and minority populations? If so please describe whether or not services to the targeted population resulted in an increase in clients served.

IPAS' efforts under this priority were directed toward alleviating rights denials and/or violations for all individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities that contacted IPAS, without consideration of minority status or whether the involved individual might be classified within a group determined as underserved.

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

<p>8. Provide at least one case summary that demonstrates the impact of the priority. A young woman's father contacted IPAS after receiving a Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA) Notice of Action (NOA) regarding the intention to reduce the attendant care hours his daughter received via the Aged and Disabled Waiver. Such a reduction, according to the woman's father, would result in his daughter's health and safety being placed at risk. The reduction had already been appealed by the father, with the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruling in favor of FSSA; therefore, IPAS legal filed a request for an agency review in which the ALJ's decision was upheld by the FSSA's ultimate authority. IPAS legal then filed for judicial review on the young woman's behalf. It was then that IPAS legal learned that the Americans with Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) had successfully brought a class action suit against FSSA which determined that the reduction of hours for recipients of the A&D Waiver was inappropriate. Working with FSSA and their legal counsel in the Attorney General's Office, IPAS reached an agreement to set aside the original NOA and reverse the decision of the agency review. As a result of IPAS advocacy, the woman's hours were not reduced and the risks to her health and safety were avoided.</p>
<p>9. Rounding off to the nearest hundred dollars how much of this year's grant or award or its program income was spent on this priority? \$362,100</p>
<p>10. Will this priority be continued in the next fiscal year? Yes</p>

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 7 Developmental Disabilities Network Collaboration

A. Provide information related to only those issues / barriers affecting individuals with developmental disabilities and their families in your State that the DDC, P&A, and UCEDD (the DD network) have jointly identified as critical State issues /barriers:

Using short titles, list 5-10 areas that the DDC, P&A, and UCEDD have identified as critical State issues/barriers. Then, identify at least one issue/barrier selected by your State DD Network for joint collaboration:

1. Continued existence of abuse/neglect

2. Individual denial of Medicaid eligibility. services, equipment and assistive technology

3. Lack of accessible transportation in rural areas

4. Protection/promotion of disability rights with implementation of Affordable Care Act

5. Restraint/Seclusion in schools

6. Support of the Self Advocates of Indiana

7. Building Leadership Series for Self Advocacy

8. Communities for a lifetime survey project

9. Indiana Disability History project

10. Coordination and Planning meeting of DD network

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 7 Issues/Barriers Elaboration: Continued existence of abuse/neglect

1. Issue/Barrier number (from A in Section VII): 1

2. Provide a brief description of the collaborative issue/barrier and expected outcome(s):

Collaborative efforts will continue between IPAS and outside state entities, such as Bureau of Developmental Services (BDDS), Family and Social Services Administration (FSSA), Department of Mental Health (DMHA) and the Indiana State Department of Health (ISDH), as well as the many community service providers there are throughout the state.

3. Reference applicable SGP Goals(s): Priority number(s): 1673 - To reduce or eliminate the abuse and neglect of individuals with intellectual disabilities

4. Describe the P&A's specific roles and responsibilities in this collaborative effort:

IPAS will continue to address abuse/neglect, with the intention of responding to calls or reports that come into IPAS regarding alleged abuse/neglect of individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities, assessing them for probable cause, if necessary, then fact finding to determine, if possible, whether the alleged action did occur, i.e., if the allegation can be substantiated. Further fact finding will be completed in reference whether the service providers' policies were followed as written and whether said policies are written in accordance with state and federal law.

5. Briefly identify problems, if any, encountered as a result of this collaboration:

No problems are foreseen.

6. Describe unexpected benefits, if any, of this collaborative effort:

As IPAS continues to assess allegation of abuse and neglect, especially in reference the application of service provider policy, there is a continuous scrutinization of said policies and when problems are discovered, resolutions of said problems, by way of communication and negotiation with the service providers. This communication is beneficial as it aids in developing a working relationship between IPAS and the service provider.

7. If your P&A can provide technical assistance expertise in this area to other States, please describe:

IPAS has developed a strategic way of tracking contacts made, records obtained and policies reviewed throughout the life of a service request. This fact finding report provides an on-going and up-to-date "list" of what has already been made available to IPAS.

8. If any, describe the technical assistance needs the P&A/DD Network have in this area:

IPAS could benefit from discussion of how other P&As might be providing greater numbers of abuse/neglect services to greater numbers of clients than is IPAS; is it that IPAS' processes of assessment require more time and, subsequently result in less availability for additional cases? Do other P&As have better documentation processes? Are other P&As better at outreach so they receive more calls which result in more service requests?

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 7 Issues/Barriers Elaboration: Individual denial of Medicaid eligibility. services, equipment and assistive technology

1. Issue/Barrier number (from A in Section VII): 2

2. Provide a brief description of the collaborative issue/barrier and expected outcome(s):

Individuals are constantly receiving notification of further reductions of their Medicaid Waiver hours, many of which result in a risk to the individual's health and safety; individuals are constantly also receiving notification of Medicaid denial, either for coverage or for equipment or devices.

3. Reference applicable SGP Goals(s): Priority number(s): 1674 - Reduce or eliminate the denial of rights and discrimination due to disability.

4. Describe the P&A's specific roles and responsibilities in this collaborative effort:

IPAS will provide representation to individuals who receive notification of either a reduction in Medicaid Waiver hours or denial of either coverage or for equipment or devices.

5. Briefly identify problems, if any, encountered as a result of this collaboration:

No problems are foreseen.

6. Describe unexpected benefits, if any, of this collaborative effort:

All benefits are easily foreseen, that individuals will be found eligible for Medicaid services.

7. If your P&A can provide technical assistance expertise in this area to other States, please describe:

At case selection, there is discussion amongst the legal staff as to which way the legal arguments for appeal can and/or should lean towards; this, even before a decision to assess the case is made. This practice allows for a better decision as to if and how the request for services becomes a service request, i.e., a case.

8. If any, describe the technical assistance needs the P&A/DD Network have in this area:

No technical assistance is needed in this area.

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 7 Issues/Barriers Elaboration: Lack of accessible transportation in rural areas
1. Issue/Barrier number (from A in Section VII): 3
2. Provide a brief description of the collaborative issue/barrier and expected outcome(s): This is an issue of concern which the Governor's Council for People with Disabilities has identified. Both the University Center for Excellence and IPAS participate on the Council.
3. Reference applicable SGP Goals(s): Priority number(s): 1674 - Reduce or eliminate the denial of rights and discrimination due to disability.
4. Describe the P&A's specific roles and responsibilities in this collaborative effort: Where and when possible to advocate for the expansion of accessible public transportation.
5. Briefly identify problems, if any, encountered as a result of this collaboration: Community support and funding are the primary barriers.
6. Describe unexpected benefits, if any, of this collaborative effort: Slow development of support for the concept of livable communities to benefit all persons.
7. If your P&A can provide technical assistance expertise in this area to other States, please describe: NO
8. If any, describe the technical assistance needs the P&A/DD Network have in this area: None

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 7 Issues/Barriers Elaboration: Protection/promotion of disability rights with implementation of Affordable Care Act
1. Issue/Barrier number (from A in Section VII): 4
2. Provide a brief description of the collaborative issue/barrier and expected outcome(s): The network has discussed rights issues related to the development of the ACA in Indiana and has heard a number of presentations by various advocacy groups and state officials concerning Indiana's plan for implementation.
3. Reference applicable SGP Goals(s): Priority number(s): 1674 - Reduce or eliminate the denial of rights and discrimination due to disability.
4. Describe the P&A's specific roles and responsibilities in this collaborative effort: IPAS has provided testimony in a number of public hearings and venues to promote strong beneficiary rights and friendly appeal processes to be incorporated into Indiana's implementation of the ACA. Also advocacy to include as many persons as possible in the coverage.
5. Briefly identify problems, if any, encountered as a result of this collaboration: The current administration is not supportive of the expansion of Medicaid and wishes to narrow the application of the ACA to the fewest at the least cost.
6. Describe unexpected benefits, if any, of this collaborative effort: We continue to keep the needs and rights of persons with disability included in the public policy discussion in relation to the ACA.
7. If your P&A can provide technical assistance expertise in this area to other States, please describe: Not applicable
8. If any, describe the technical assistance needs the P&A/DD Network have in this area: Nothing is needed at this point in the implementation.

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 7 Issues/Barriers Elaboration: Restraint/Seclusion in schools

1. Issue/Barrier number (from A in Section VII): 5

2. Provide a brief description of the collaborative issue/barrier and expected outcome(s):

In August 2013, a model policy/procedure was distributed to Indiana schools so that schools would have an expected model upon which they can base their own restraint and seclusion policy, to be developed by July 14, 2014. Meetings were held prior to development of the model so that interested agencies could weigh in on what should be included in a model policy.

3. Reference applicable SGP Goals(s): Priority number(s): 1674 - Reduce or eliminate the denial of rights and discrimination due to disability.

4. Describe the P&A's specific roles and responsibilities in this collaborative effort:

IPAS staff attended three meetings of the Commission on Restraint/Seclusion in Schools. IPAS staff expressed concerns that the two initial meetings were being conducted without adhering to the Indiana Open Door Law as well as the Commission's originating statute. Specifically, it was cited that the meeting agenda was not posted; meeting dates were not posted in a timely manner in advance of meetings; the Commission lack failed to provide an opportunity for public comment; and the Commission had failed to use/allow telephonic participation. These issues were addressed and remedied in subsequent meetings. On August 22, 2013, the Committee adopted a model policy and procedure, which was then to be distributed to all included schools via the Indiana Department of Education.

5. Briefly identify problems, if any, encountered as a result of this collaboration:

Each school district may interpret the model policy differently and either implement it in accordance with their understanding of the same or there may be issues in their developing their own based upon the model.

6. Describe unexpected benefits, if any, of this collaborative effort:

There are no unexpected benefits.

7. If your P&A can provide technical assistance expertise in this area to other States, please describe:

IPAS' Assistant Director of Client Services participated in meetings held by the Commission on Restraint/Seclusion In Schools; therefore, he has first hand knowledge as to the policy development process.

8. If any, describe the technical assistance needs the P&A/DD Network have in this area:

IPAS does not need technical assistance in this area.

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 7 Issues/Barriers Elaboration: Support of the Self Advocates of Indiana

1. Issue/Barrier number (from A in Section VII): 6

2. Provide a brief description of the collaborative issue/barrier and expected outcome(s):

All three network partners provide support of various types to the Self Advocates. IPAS and the Governor's Council provide funds to enable certain of the Self Advocate's activities and the Indiana Institute on Disability and Community provides funds, technical assistance and assistance with organization.

3. Reference applicable SGP Goals(s): Priority number(s): 1675 - Increase awareness and effective self-advocacy by providing education and training about disability rights and the exercise of these rights.

4. Describe the P&A's specific roles and responsibilities in this collaborative effort:

IPAS provides funds to enable SAI board members to travel to board meetings. IPAS sponsored the SAI conference this fall and has assisted two board members to travel to Washington DC to attend the national board meeting and also to participate in the recent celebration of the 50th anniversary of the DD Act.

5. Briefly identify problems, if any, encountered as a result of this collaboration:

None it has been a pleasure.

6. Describe unexpected benefits, if any, of this collaborative effort:

Our partnerships have all benefitted. The SAI also refer individuals to IPAS who need our advocacy services.

7. If your P&A can provide technical assistance expertise in this area to other States, please describe:

Probably what we are doing here is not unique.

8. If any, describe the technical assistance needs the P&A/DD Network have in this area:

None needed.

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 7 Issues/Barriers Elaboration: Building Leadership Series for Self Advocacy
1. Issue/Barrier number (from A in Section VII): 7
2. Provide a brief description of the collaborative issue/barrier and expected outcome(s): The network partners collaborate to conduct a three part training series each year to develop leadership skills with persons with disabilities to create a network of community advocates. This is the fifth year for this collaborative project.
3. Reference applicable SGP Goals(s): Priority number(s): 1675 - Increase awareness and effective self-advocacy by providing education and training about disability rights and the exercise of these rights.
4. Describe the P&A's specific roles and responsibilities in this collaborative effort: IPAS provides funding and channels Council funding to the UCEDD to support the project. IPAS collaborates on the subject matter each year for the training series.
5. Briefly identify problems, if any, encountered as a result of this collaboration: None
6. Describe unexpected benefits, if any, of this collaborative effort: Nothing unexpected. Builds confidence and knowledge base of persons with disability which enable them to act in leadership roles in their local communities.
7. If your P&A can provide technical assistance expertise in this area to other States, please describe: Yes if anyone is interested.
8. If any, describe the technical assistance needs the P&A/DD Network have in this area: None

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 7 Issues/Barriers Elaboration: Communities for a lifetime surfeey project

1. Issue/Barrier number (from A in Section VII): 8

2. Provide a brief description of the collaborative issue/barrier and expected outcome(s):

IPAS and the Governor's Council provided funding and the UCEDD conducted the research to gather opinions as to what livable communities in Indiana would look like. This was the first step in encouraging community awareness of how we can construct communities which benefit all persons and permit aging in place.

3. Reference applicable SGP Goals(s): Priority number(s): 1675 - Increase awareness and effective self-advocacy by providing education and training about disability rights and the exercise of these rights.

4. Describe the P&A's specific roles and responsibilities in this collaborative effort:

IPAS provided funding and collaborated on the project design and survey content.

5. Briefly identify problems, if any, encountered as a result of this collaboration:

None

6. Describe unexpected benefits, if any, of this collaborative effort:

Caused many persons to think about this issue and built imcreased awareness,

7. If your P&A can provide technical assistance expertise in this area to other States, please describe:

Probably what we did is not unique.

8. If any, describe the technical assistance needs the P&A/DD Network have in this area:

None needed.

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 7 Issues/Barriers Elaboration: Indiana Disability History project

1. Issue/Barrier number (from A in Section VII): 9

2. Provide a brief description of the collaborative issue/barrier and expected outcome(s):

The network partners have collaborated and pooled resources to gather interviews from individuals across the state to piece together a history of the disability rights movement in the state and to memorialize those individuals, who down through the years were the leaders in the evolution and strengthening of disability rights organizations and collaborative networks in the state.

3. Reference applicable SGP Goals(s): Priority number(s): 1675 - Increase awareness and effective self-advocacy by providing education and training about disability rights and the exercise of these rights.

4. Describe the P&A's specific roles and responsibilities in this collaborative effort:

IPAS provides funding and collaborated on project design. We also disseminate to the community opportunities for input by individuals and groups to the project content.

5. Briefly identify problems, if any, encountered as a result of this collaboration:

None

6. Describe unexpected benefits, if any, of this collaborative effort:

Builds a sense of pride and accomplishment on the part of individuals with disabilities as to the contributions which others have made to the cause and brings perspective to how far we have come in terms of disability rights.

7. If your P&A can provide technical assistance expertise in this area to other States, please describe:

If anyone is interested any of the three network partners could share information about what we have done.

8. If any, describe the technical assistance needs the P&A/DD Network have in this area:

None needed.

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 7 Issues/Barriers Elaboration: Coordination and Planning meeting of DD network
1. Issue/Barrier number (from A in Section VII): 10
2. Provide a brief description of the collaborative issue/barrier and expected outcome(s): The network partners meet on a regular basis for the purpose of identifying common goals, coordinating efforts and assessing progress. Recently for example IPAS and the Director of the Governor's Council participated in a review of the UCEDD conducted by the Indiana University Provost Office. Our involvement was helpful to the Institute in terms of preserving University funding for some of the Institute's programs.
3. Reference applicable SGP Goals(s): Priority number(s): 1675 - Increase awareness and effective self-advocacy by providing education and training about disability rights and the exercise of these rights.
4. Describe the P&A's specific roles and responsibilities in this collaborative effort: Meet as a partner to collaborate and coordinate activities.
5. Briefly identify problems, if any, encountered as a result of this collaboration: None. We all work well together and respect each other's efforts and contributions.
6. Describe unexpected benefits, if any, of this collaborative effort: Collaboration raises the profile of all three partners' organizations and facilitates our achievement of goals.
7. If your P&A can provide technical assistance expertise in this area to other States, please describe: Again probably we are not sufficiently unique to believe that other's may benefit from what we are doing here.
8. If any, describe the technical assistance needs the P&A/DD Network have in this area: None

P & A Program Performance Report PADD PPR

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 8 Coordination

Check if the following programs are housed in the same organization as the P&A program:
Client Assistance Program (CAP) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Long Term Care Ombudsman (Older Americans Act) <input type="checkbox"/>
Other <input type="checkbox"/>
If other, please list:
<p>If the Client Assistance Program (CAP) and the Long Term Care Ombudsman (Older Americans Act) are not part of the P&A System (PADD, PAIMI, PAIR and PAAT programs) describe coordination between the PADD program and the CAP and the Long Term Care Ombudsman (Older Americans Act.)</p> <p>Indiana's Client Assistance Program is embedded within IPAS. In contrast, IPAS receives referrals from, and refers clients to, the Indiana's Long Term Care Ombudsman office. The Long Term Care Ombudsman office is located within another state agency, the Indiana Family and Social Services Administration. IPAS administration met recently with the coordinator of the Ombudsman program and with the Waiver Ombudsman to discuss ways to improve coordination and service delivery. It was agreed to meet on a regular basis.</p>
<p>Describe your system's relations with agencies other than above and any inter-agency agreements or joint projects you may have, other than mentioned above.</p> <p>IPAS continued participation the very collaborative efforts of the Indiana Institute on Disability and Community, Developmental Disabilities Network, the Governor's Planning Council for People With Disabilities and Self-Advocates of Indiana, with the purpose of funding a fourth year of the "Building Leadership" self advocacy training program and to develop and disseminate the agency's "critical barriers" survey used to assess future priorities and objectives.</p> <p>IPAS continued the partnership with Autism Society of Indiana to further their efforts in providing useful and up-to-date information pertaining to individuals with Autism and other intellectual disabilities and their involvement in the community. Specific tasks at hand include a mobile phone app, for both Android and iPhone users, which will provide information to police officers and correctional officers as to how best to respond to individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities in times of emergency.</p> <p>IPAS collaborated with the Self Advocates of Indiana (SAI), by continuing to grant them monies to provide funding and reimbursement to SAI Board members for travel and other expenses related to their obligations as board members.</p> <p>IPAS collaborated with both the IGCPD and the ARC of Indiana, financially assisting in their respective annual conferences and disability expos and celebrations. IPAS was also attending and manned an exhibit booth at both events.</p> <p>IPAS continued in the statewide collaboration of individual school systems' transition fairs</p>
Section VIII. Services Provided Using Non-Part C Funding:
Are services and activities benefiting persons with developmental disabilities and their families supported by funding other than that provided by Part C of the DD Act or its program income: No
Please describe the projects funded with non-part C funding or its program income:

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 9 Comments and Clarifications

Comments and Clarifications:

IPAS continues to strive to provide excellent services to individuals with intellectual or developmental disabilities and is welcoming to the challenges that lie ahead in doing so, for as we are challenged, we grow. We do welcome specific input as to how best to improve our services and it is with the most sincere and humble heart that we express our gratitude for your support and assistance.

**P & A Program Performance Report
PADD PPR**

Grantee: IN

Reporting Period: 10/1/2012 - 9/30/2013

OMB Clearance No.: 0980-0160

Expiration Date.: 06/30/2014

Section 10 ADD Comments

ADD Comments: