

**Working Group 5 – Conference Call #1 Summary
September 15, 2016; 3:00pm EDT**

Welcome and Introductions

Working Group Members in Attendance:

David Mandell – Co-Chair
Shannon Haworth – Co-Chair
Samantha Crane
Melissa Harris
Laura Kavanagh
Lauren Brookman-Frazee
Robert Cimera
Daniel Davis
Peter Gerhardt
Lisa Goring
Leticia Manning
Cathy Pratt
Anne Roux
Jane Tilly
Juliann Woods

Working Group Members Absent:

Brian Parnell
Larry Wexler
Aubyn Stahmer

Summary of 2013 Portfolio Analysis – Group Discussion (Pages 1-4, Data Analysis Slides)

1. Comments/observations on the overall portfolio?

- It was noted when looking at subcategory classification of the 2013 portfolio, practitioner training projects represent included in the research portfolio are limited to projects that involve evaluation of and research on (development of) practitioner training strategies that are effective and sustainable in the community.

Analysis of Question 3 Objectives (Multiyear Funding Table and 2013 Project List)

1. Has there been an adequate number of projects for each objective?

- Objectives surrounding health and safety were partially completed, but working group members feel this is a topic that should continue to be highlighted in the next Strategic Plan as an area requiring increased funding and attention. In the new plan, this topic should be broadened to encompass many of the emerging subtopics to health and safety such as: mortality, wandering, and considering self-determination and self-autonomy.
- While objective 5.S.A was fully completed, working group members discussed how this research topic should be taken one step further to study how to address variations in and access to services and how these affect diverse populations.

2. For each objective, do the funded projects cover the scope of the objective? Any noted areas of progress or gaps?

- Many of the projects classified as Core/Other were considered projects in emerging areas of research that are important to address in the new Strategic Plan objectives.
- Working group members noted a particular gap in implementing and evaluating coordination between policy and practice.
- More should be done to encourage the development of service systems taking a lifespan perspective approach. This includes service systems beyond education and early intervention, such as sustaining service interventions that will cover adolescents and adults as well.
- Working group members acknowledged there is a lack of service projects addressing adolescents and adults compared to early intervention. However, services projects focused on transition-age youth and adults are focused in Question 6 – Lifespan Issues instead of Question 5. Additional discussion is necessary to decide whether these projects should be considered in Question 5 or Question 6 in the next Strategic Plan.
- A general discussion evolved regarding whether there is a need to continue to include a separate Question on Lifespan Issues (Question 6) in the Strategic Plan, as is the case currently. Members discussed whether it is of benefit to segregate this subpopulation into its own chapter or if it would be more beneficial to restructure each question so that lifespan issues are incorporated into each question area. After discussion the group concluded with a broad consensus that Question 6 is necessary to maintain visibility and transparency with regard to research, services and policy that related to transition-age youth and adults.

3. Was the recommended budget for each objective reached? If less was spent, but the number/scope of projects was appropriate, should the objective be considered completed but accomplished with less than the expected budget? In cases where more was spent than the recommended budget, was it because many more projects were funded in that area or because projects were more costly than originally projected? Are there any concerns with regard to funding associated with objectives?

- Some working group members highlighted the decrease in funding over recent years for 5.L.D.: “Evaluate at least two strategies or programs to increase the health and safety of people with ASD that simultaneously consider principles of self-determination and personal autonomy by 2015.” It was explained that some of the decrease was due to the committee’s request to prorate projects categorized to this objective to include only portions related to research and evaluation or portions related specifically to ASD.
- Other working group members mentioned there has been an overall decrease in projects and funding for Question 5 since 2010, which does not match the increase in demand for services. It is important to note that the previously mentioned adjustments made in reporting Question 5 funding after 2010 to include only ASD-specific and research-related portions of larger projects, which caused the notable decrease in funding from 2010 to 2011. However, even if considering only 2011-2013, the group felt the funding was disproportionately small compared to the needs in this area.

4. Does the working group observe any areas of this question or specific projects that appear to be duplicative? Does the working group have suggestions about how duplication of effort can be avoided in this area?

- The working group members noted the importance of avoiding overlap between Question 5 and Question 6 in the revision of the Strategic Plan.

5. Are there areas of emerging research that do not appear to be represented strongly in the portfolio that should be considered for mention in the new Strategic Plan?

- Areas that the working group identified as potential future areas of focus were:
 - Services surrounding mental health and co-occurring conditions.
 - Housing and the different types of models and services surrounding housing (perhaps this topic can be reflected in the chapter on Question 6 as well).

Wrap up and preview of next call

- The next call will include a discussion of input received through the Request for Public Comment.
- The next call will also include a discussion of research updates since the development of the last Strategic Plan. Working group members are encouraged to send examples of any scientific breakthroughs for discussion on the next Working Group 5 conference call.