

COLORADO DIVISION FOR  
DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

ACCOUNTABILITY FOCUS SERIES:

KEY INDICATORS OF  
PERFORMANCE –

FY 2002

January 29, 2003

*Program Evaluation and Information Services  
Division for Developmental Disabilities (DDD)  
Office of Adult, Disability and Rehabilitation Services  
Colorado Department of Human Services  
3824 West Princeton Circle  
Denver, Colorado 80236  
(303) 866-7450 (Voice)  
(303) 866-7471 (TDD)  
(303) 866-7470 (Fax)*

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction to Key Indicators of Performance .....	1
Key Performance Indicators for Colorado.....	1
Source of Data.....	3
Time Period Reported.....	3
Findings Based on Key Indicators .....	4
Summary of Statewide Findings.....	4
Trends that are Positive.....	4
Trends that are Concerning.....	4
Effectiveness and Outcomes (Table Series 1).....	7
Standard of Care (Table Series 2) .....	9
Contract Performance Standards and Efficiency (Tables Series 3)..	10
Accessibility (Table Series 4).....	15
Organization Stability (Table Series 5).....	20

## Introduction to Key Indicators of Performance

The “Key indicators” are a short list of performance measures that were adopted to provide an overall picture of the health of the Colorado service system for persons with developmental disabilities. They were selected as the best measures for summarizing how our service system is performing out of a much larger set of performance measures collected by Division for Developmental Disabilities (DDD)<sup>1</sup>.

The key indicators were initially identified in response to a request from the Colorado General Assembly through Footnote 83 to the FY 1996-97 Appropriations Long Bill. They were selected based on stakeholder input collected through several regional forums. To the extent possible when defining these key indicators, DDD has maintained consistency with a national effort undertaken by the National Association of State Directors of Division for Developmental Disabilities (NASDDDS).<sup>2</sup>

### ***Key Performance Indicators for Colorado***

The list below provides the key indicators that have been adopted to summarize how our service system is performing. Table references are provided to assist you to locate data within this report related to each of the following performance and outcome measures.

- ***Effectiveness and Outcomes*** - Are key outcomes occurring for consumers?  
(See Table Series 1.)
  - ✓ ***Employment*** - % of adults who are employed & average # of hours worked
  - ✓ ***Integration*** - % of adults receiving services in integrated settings
  - ✓ ***Satisfaction*** - % of adults and families who are satisfied with services
  - ✓ ***Choice*** - % of adults that feel they have enough choice in their lives
  - ✓ ***Stability*** - Frequency of changes in residential settings.
- ***Standard of Care*** - Are programs meeting critical requirements established for health and safety purposes? Do services conform to standards of care regarding health, safety, and accepted practices?  
(See Table 2.)
  - ✓ ***Appeals*** - # of appeals filed at the Department level

---

<sup>1</sup> The Division for Developmental Disabilities (DDD) is a State agency within the Office of Adult, Disability, and Rehabilitation Services within the Colorado Department of Human Services. DDD provides leadership for the direction, funding, and operation of services to persons with developmental disabilities within Colorado.

<sup>2</sup> The NASDDDS national project is now referred to as the National Performance Indicators (NPI) program and was previously referred to as the Core Indicators project. NASDDDS is working in collaboration with Human Services Research Inc (HSRI) to further refine and field test national quality indicators.

## Accountability Focus Series: Key Indicators of Performance

- ✓ **Health/Safety Requirements** - # & % of programs meeting critical health/safety requirements.
- **Contract Performance Standards and Efficiency** - Are Community Centered Boards (CCBs)<sup>3</sup> meeting or exceeding their service level obligations? Is overhead kept low? (See Table Series 3.)
  - ✓ **Minimum Number Served** - # of persons served compared to contract requirements.
  - ✓ **Member Months (or Days)** - # of months (or days) of service provided compared to contract requirements.
  - ✓ **Overhead** - of revenues spent on overhead
- **Accessibility to Services and to Resources** - Are people able to access services? Is service accessibility comparable across the state? Is the distribution of funds equitable?
  - ✓ **Known Demand Met based on Waiting List** - % of known demand met. (Known demand is defined as those in service plus those on Waiting List) (See Tables 4A and 4B.)
  - ✓ **Growth in Service Resources** - # of additional resources to serve people. (See Table 4C.)
  - ✓ **Equitability** - # of service types and levels provided are similar proportionally to those in other service regions. # of resources per CCB region relative to general population in that region. (See Tables 4D and 4E.)
- **Organizational Stability** – Are service organizations able to keep staff?
  - ✓ **Staff Stability** - Turnover rate (See Table 5A)
  - ✓ **Wage Equity** - How do wages compare between CCBs, Regional Centers (RCs) and other employers? (See Tables 5B-5D.)

---

<sup>3</sup> The State contracts with twenty CCBs to deliver community-based services to persons with developmental disabilities. CCBs are private non-profit organizations designated in Sections 27-10.5-102 (3) and 105, 8 C.R.S. (1998) as the single entry point into the long-term service and support system for persons with developmental disabilities. The CCBs are designated annually by DDD. Each has a non-overlapping geographic service region of one to ten counties serving from 80 to 1,600 individuals each. CCBs are responsible for intake, eligibility determination, service plan development, arrangement for services, delivery of services (either directly and/or through purchase with sub-contract agencies), monitoring, and many other functions.

### ***Source of Data***

The key indicators are collected from a variety of sources. The Effectiveness and Outcomes measures summarize the results of a Core Indicators survey that includes interviews with a random sample of consumers and their families and service providers to collect information related to satisfaction with services and outcomes of services. (Note that a more complete report on the results of the Core Indicators survey is available under separate cover.) The Standard of Care measures are derived from on-site monitoring of quality assurance by DDD staff against standards of care that define minimum health and safety requirements and from appeals that are filed at the state level. The Contract Performance Standards, Efficiency and Accessibility measures are derived from the billing information submitted through the CCMS data system and from audits of CCBs. The Organizational Stability measures are based on wage and turnover surveys.

### ***Time Period Reported***

The information within this report is principally based on data from either FY 2001-02 or June 30 2002. However, since some measures are not collected every year, and/or are collected retrospectively (such as financial audit information), those measures will be based on other time periods. In all cases, the most recent information available is used within this report and the dates are indicated for each table.

## Findings Based on Key Indicators

This section starts with a summary of the statewide findings and is followed by tables that present data for each of the key indicators identified in the previous section. When possible, this information is provided for multiple years by Community Centered Board (CCB) and statewide across CCBs.

### ***Summary of Statewide Findings:***

#### ***Trends that are Positive***

- ❖ ***Integration of Day Services*** – The percentage of individuals in integrated day services out of those in day services has grown from 81% in FY 1998 to 87% in FY 2000 (Table 1A).
- ❖ ***Satisfaction*** – In 2000, satisfaction with Comprehensive Services was generally high (91% satisfaction with where they live, 92% with their day activities and 96% with they support staff). The satisfaction with where they live has grown over the three years tracked (1998-2000). Satisfaction with day activities within SLS was also high (93%) in 2000. (Table 1A).
- ❖ ***Health and Safety*** – During FY 2002, a high proportion of group homes (87%) and day programs (86%) were meeting critical health and safety standards on their first visit and thus did not require a subsequent follow-up visit (Table 2). The percentage was somewhat lower for individualized residential programs (76%) and SLS programs (71%) in FY 2002. The number of appeals filed was quite low (6 in FY 2002).
- ❖ ***Contract Performance Standards*** – CCBs were generally doing a very good job of achieving their contract performance standards during FY 2002, with percentages ranging from 95% to over 100% of the standard being achieved (Table Series 3). Within SLS, it was not uncommon during FY 2002 for CCBs to exceed the minimum number of individuals to be served and the overall percentage was 111% for waiver SLS across CCBs and 126% for state SLS services (Table 3D).

#### ***Trends that are Concerning***

- ❖ ***Choices*** – In 2000, while satisfaction with choices was relatively high, it was still lower than other satisfaction measures. 77% of those both in Comprehensive Services and in SLS reported satisfaction with the amount of choice they were given in their lives (Table 1A) indicating that over one fourth of the individuals were not satisfied with the amount of choice they had.
- ❖ ***Stability*** - Staff stability and wage equity are two serious and related problems that face the Colorado community service system for persons with

developmental disabilities (see Table Series 5). In 2002, the turnover rate for direct care staff of community providers (58%) was much higher than the turnover experienced by state regional centers (27%) (Table 5A). High turnover can adversely impact the quality and stability of services. Staff wages at community agencies were substantially lower than at Regional Centers for similar positions (see Table 5B). For example direct care workers at Regional Centers were paid an average of 50% higher wages than were direct care workers at community providers. This is contributing to the high turnover problem and difficulty recruiting and filling staff vacancies. These problems were discussed in great detail in reports made to the Joint Budget Committee (JBC) (Footnote 96 – November 1, 2002 and Footnote 106 - September 15, 2000).

- ❖ ***Known Demand Met based on Waiting List*** – There is limited accessibility to Comprehensive Services and Supported Living Services. As of June 2002, the number of individuals who were waiting for services within a two-year period was 663 for Comprehensive Services and 1,265 for Supported Living Services. One way of measuring accessibility is to determine what percentage of the known demand has been met. Known demand is defined as those who have requested services (including those who receive services plus those who requested a service within 2 years and were placed on a waiting list). Within Comprehensive Services, 84% of the known demand for services over the next two years had been met (Table 4A). Within Supported Living Services, 74% of the known demand over the next two years had been met (Table 4B). This problem was discussed in more detail within the Footnote 106 report to the JBC (September 15, 2000).

It is possible that the Supported Living Services (SLS) waiting list is inflated, since recent efforts over the last two years to verify the Comprehensive Services waiting list through telephone surveys has resulted in a substantial reduction of individuals on that waiting list. This verification process has not been undertaken for SLS and might result in a similar adjustment. Approximately half of the individuals waiting for comprehensive services receive SLS while they wait for more comprehensive services.

- ❖ ***Equitability*** - There are differences in how fairly resources are distributed across CCB service regions (see Tables 4D and 4E). This problem appears to be related to (1) a differential rate of population growth across the state (i.e., some areas of the state have grown much faster than other areas) and (2) how few new resources are appropriated each year to address this population growth.

When possible, DDD has been allocating a larger proportion of new resources towards CCB service regions that have a smaller share than their general population would suggest. However, the progress towards addressing this equitability issue is slow since the number of new resources available for allocation each year is small relative to the total number of resources already distributed to CCBs. (New resources have been very limited and mostly targeted to foster care and/or emergencies that must be distributed based on

## Accountability Focus Series: Key Indicators of Performance

those occurrences and so have not helped to address equitability.) However, if the waiting list demand can be fully addressed, then the equitability of resource distribution can also be addressed.

- ❖ **Employment** – From FY 1998 to FY 2000, there appears to be a trend towards a reduced percentage of adults receiving employment services and towards fewer hours of work per week for those who are employed (see Table 1A). While the reasons behind this trend is not certain, some reasons that have been offered for the reduction in employment services include: (1) insufficient funds to address all service needs, (2) reduced funding incentives to service organizations for employment services under the Systems Change project, and (3) consumers and/or their families selecting community participation (community accessibility), skill training and other ‘day’ type services, over employment. Employment varies widely across CCB regions (see Table 1B). It is unknown whether this variation is due to differing priorities of the consumers and families across CCB regions, economic conditions, and/or CCBs success at procuring employment services.



***Effectiveness and Outcomes - Are key outcomes occurring for consumers?***

There are many important outcomes that Colorado hopes to support through services to persons with developmental disabilities, including (but not limited to) jobs, integration of day services, satisfaction of consumers with their services, increased involvement in choices, plus stability in where they live. Table 1A reports these outcomes statewide, while the Table 1B presents some of these same outcomes by CCB service region (satisfaction outcomes could not be presented by CCB due to attrition in sample size was too large at some CCBs to provide confidence in the data by CCB). Note that there are many additional outcomes that are tracked in another more comprehensive report issued by DDD, called "Outcomes of Services and Supports".

**Table 1A: Statewide Results for Effectiveness and Outcomes Measures by Fiscal Year**

<b>Employment:</b>	<b>FY 98</b>	<b>FY 99</b>	<b>FY 00</b>
Adults receiving an employment service	50%	44%	44%
Adults receiving an employment service who are employed	76%	83%	76%
Average hours worked per week	19.4 hr	18.7 hr	17.5 hr
<b>Integration:</b>			
Adults who receive day services in integrated settings			
Of all in service (whether in day or not)	76%	77%	82%
Of all who have chosen day service	81%	81%	87%
<b>Satisfaction</b>			
Satisfaction with Comprehensive Services:			
With where they live.	78%	88%	91%
With their day activity.	93%	90%	92%
With their support staff.	93%	92%	96%
Satisfaction with Supported Living Services (SLS):			
With their day activity.	89%	93%	93%
<b>Choices</b>			
Adults in survey in Comprehensive services who expressed satisfaction that they were given enough choices in their lives.	69%	78%	77%
Adults in survey in Supported Living Services (SLS) who expressed satisfaction that they were given enough choices in their lives.	73%	77%	77%
<b>Stability</b>			
Average Length of time in residential setting	4.6 yrs	4.8 yrs	4.8 yrs
Average Number of places lived during the year	1.2	1.2	1.2

Source: Numbers derived from annual Core Indicators Survey. A survey was not conducted in FY 2001. The FY 2002 survey results will not be available until Fall, 2003.

Accountability Focus Series: Key Indicators of Performance

**Table 1B: FY 2000 Employment and Integration of Day Service Outcomes by CCB**

There is a wide variation across CCBs in terms of employment and day program integration outcomes, as can be noted by comparing the key indicators for each CCB to the Statewide results at the bottom. This information was based on a sample of individuals included in the Core Indicators 2000 Survey.

- The first column indicates that in FY 2000, only 44% of adults were receiving an employment service statewide and that varied between 21% to a high of 85% across the CCBs.
- The second column indicates that 76% of those receiving an employment service, 76% had successfully been placed into a job statewide and this ranged from 44% as a low to 100% as a high across CCBs.
- The statewide average hours worked was 17.5 hours per week for individuals who held a job and that varied from a low of 9 hrs/week average to a high of 23.7 hrs/week.
- Of adults who receive a day program, 87% of them receive it in an integrated setting statewide. This ranged from a low of 68% to a high of 100% across CCBs.

CCBs	% of Adults that Receive an Employment Service	% of Adults Receiving an Employment Service that Have A Job	Average Hours Worked Per Week for Employed Adults	Of Adults in a Day Service, % that Receive a Day Services in an Integrated Setting
Arkansas Valley	33%	44%	21.5 hrs	74%
Blue Peaks	45%	100%	9.0 hrs	97%
Centennial Dev. Svc	30%	90%	18.6 hrs	76%
Colo. Bluesky Enterp.	21%	88%	20.4 hrs	83%
Commun.Connections	48%	77%	11.0 hrs	100%
Community Options	85%	74%	17.9 hrs	92%
Denver Options	41%	67%	21.2 hrs	84%
DDC (Imagine!)	62%	75%	15.4 hrs	91%
Dev. Disab. Res. Ctr	57%	48%	18.8 hrs	90%
Dev. Opportunities	37%	90%	21.3 hrs	78%
Dev. Pathways	27%	90%	17.1 hrs	84%
Eastern Colo	65%	65%	15.9 hrs	96%
Foothills-Gateway	40%	75%	13.9 hrs	68%
Horizons	76%	91%	15.4 hrs	100%
Mesa Dev. Svc	67%	72%	18.6 hrs	85%
Mt. Valley	62%	87%	23.7 hrs	96%
North Metro	31%	64%	20.8 hrs	83%
Southeastern	67%	94%	20.7 hrs	95%
Southern	69%	72%	13.9 hrs	80%
Resource Exch.	33%	79%	15.9 hrs	95%
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>17.5 hrs</b>	<b>87%</b>

Source: Numbers derived from annual Core Indicators Survey. A survey was not conducted in FY 2001. The FY 2002 survey results will not be available until Fall, 2003.

**Standard of Care - Are programs meeting critical requirements established for health and safety purposes? Do services conform to standards of care regarding health, safety, and accepted practices?**

- ✓ *Appeals* - # of appeals filed at the Department level

It is critical that decisions regarding eligibility for services, terminating, changing or reducing services are made in a fair manner. Any concerns regarding such decisions can be raised through the DDD Dispute Resolution process and are referred to as 'appeals' below.

- ✓ *Health/Safety Requirements* - # & % of programs meeting critical health/safety requirements.

It is also vital that services meet standards for health and safety. DDD performs on-site quality monitoring from which a few key indicators have been selected for presentation within this report. Those indicators are the percentage facilities/programs that met critical standards at the time of the survey and which, therefore, did not require any follow-up.

**Table 2: Statewide Results for Standard of Care Measures by Fiscal Year**

The number of appeals filed was quite low (6 in FY 2002). During FY 2002, a high proportion of group homes (87%) and day programs (86%) were meeting critical health and safety standards on their first visit and thus did not require a subsequent follow-up visit. The percentage was somewhat lower for individualized residential programs (76%) and SLS programs (71%) in FY 2002. Trends were not consistent across the areas surveyed. For example, the percentage of group homes surveyed that met critical requirements fluctuated up from FY 1998 to FY 1999 and then back down through FY 2002, but generally were still high at 87%. Other areas surveyed had up, down, up trends across time and generally were higher in FY 2002 than in previous years.

Standard of Care Measures	FY 98	FY 99	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02
# of appeals filed at the Department level *	NA	NA	10	6	6
<b>Health/Safety Requirements</b>					
Group Homes surveyed which met critical requirements at the time of the survey, thus requiring no follow up	90%	96%	93%	91%	87%
Individualized Residential Programs (three or fewer consumers) surveyed which met critical requirements at the time of the survey, thus requiring no follow up.	77%	79%	67%	77%	76%
Day Programs surveyed which met critical requirements at the time of the survey, thus requiring no follow up.	75%	80%	80%	69%	86%
SLS Programs surveyed which met critical requirements at the time of the survey, thus requiring no follow up.	78%	58%	38%	64%	71%

**Source:** Numbers for appeals derived from Department counsel and Health/Safety Numbers are derived from Program Quality survey results.  
NA – Not Available

**Contract Performance Standards and Efficiency - - Are Community Centered Boards (CCBs)<sup>4</sup> meeting or exceeding their service level obligations? Is overhead kept low?**

Contracts contain standards that must be met in order for CCBs to earn their contracts. Two key standards were selected for reporting here.

Tables 3A, B, C and D report on the following two standards. Note that Tables 3A and 3B provide statewide information by fiscal year. Tables 3C and 3D provide data for each CCB region for Fiscal Year 2002.

- ✓ *Minimum Number Served* - # of persons served compared to contract requirements.
- ✓ *Member Months (or Days)* - # of months (or days) of service provided compared to contract requirements.

Tables 3E reports on the following standard:

- ✓ *Overhead* - Adherence to overhead limits (% of revenues spent on overhead)

**Table 3A: Statewide Contract Measures for Comprehensive Services by Fiscal Year**

Statewide data indicates that CCBs on average met or expected contract expectations in FY 2002 regarding the minimum number of individuals to be served within Comprehensive Services and the member days of service to deliver across those individuals. However, it should be noted that DDD reviews CCB contracts before the end of each FY to identify any resources that may be underutilized and to determine if there are other CCBs or program areas that these resources can be shifted to in order to maximize the utilization of all resources.

Comprehensive Services	FY 2000		FY 2001		FY 2002	
	State	Waiver	State	Waiver	State	Waiver
<b>Minimum Number to Serve</b>						
Contract Minimum Number	91	3,093	76	3,257	74	3,360
Number Served as Reported in CCMS	90	3,175	84	3,370	75	3,492
Number Served as a % of Contract Minimum	99%	103%	111%	103%	101%	104%
% Required by Contract Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>Member Days</b>						
Contract Member Days	27,193	928,097	21,160	960,922	20,027	1,001,214
Days Paid Through Contract	26,065	917,520	20,784	964,128	20,339	1,000,345
% of Contract Member Days that were Paid*	96%	99%	98%	100%	102%	100%
% Required by Contract Standard	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

**Source:** Numbers pulled at fiscal year end from the monthly Contract Performance Standards report.

NA – Not applicable, these measures are tracked, but a requirement (standard) is not set within the contract, since funds are not paid unless days of service are delivered.

\* In FY 2000 and 2001, rejected billings were not included in these counts, starting with FY 2002 what would have been rejections in older years were posted to the contract and submitted to MMIS to protect timely filing and to bring the year end CCMS contract figures closer to what would be shown in the audit and final Medicaid payments.

<sup>4</sup> The State contracts with twenty CCBs to deliver community-based services to persons with developmental disabilities. CCBs are private non-profit organizations designated in Sections 27-10.5-102 (3) and 105, 8 C.R.S. (1998) as the single entry point into the long-term service and support system for persons with developmental disabilities. The CCBs are designated annually by DDD. Each has a non-overlapping geographic service region of one to ten counties serving from 80 to 1,600 individuals each. CCBs are responsible for intake, eligibility determination, service plan development, arrangement for services, delivery of services (either directly and/or through purchase with sub-contract agencies), monitoring, and many other functions.

Accountability Focus Series: Key Indicators of Performance

Table 3B: Statewide Contract Measures for Support Living Services (SLS) by Fiscal Year

Definitions:

- Minimum number Served – The contract identifies the minimum number of persons who must be served in order to earn the contract.
- Member Months –Contract member months are the # of months of Supported Living Services that need to be delivered in order to earn the contract.

During FY 2002 within SLS, it was not uncommon for CCBs to exceed the minimum number of individuals to be served and the overall percentage was 111% for waiver SLS and 126% for state SLS services. Member month requirements were achieved on average and/or exceeded.

Supported Living Services	FY 2000		FY 2001		FY 2002	
	State	Waiver	State	Waiver	State	Waiver
<b>Minimum Number to Serve</b>						
Contract Minimum Number	767	2,715	779	2,715	777	2,717
Number Served Reported in CCMS	963	2,971	969	3,007	981	3,006
% of Contract Minimum Number	126%	109%	124%	111%	126%	111%
% Required by Contract Standard	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>Member Months</b>						
Contract Member Months	8,982	31,792	9,151	32,424	9,314	32,473
Months of Service in CCMS Billing	9,230	31,183	9,727	32,470	9,672	32,439
YTD % of Contract Member Months	103%	98%	106%	100%	104%	100%
% Required by Contract Standard	90%	90%	95%	95%	95%	95%

**Source:** Numbers pulled at fiscal year end from the monthly Contract Performance Standards report.

NA – Not applicable, these measures are tracked, but a requirement (standard) is not set within the contract, since funds are not paid unless member months of service are delivered.

Accountability Focus Series: Key Indicators of Performance

**Table 3C: FY 2002 Contract Measures for Comprehensive Services by CCB**

Generally, CCBs have achieved their minimum number to serve and member day contract measures within Comprehensive Services. The lowest was 96% within State funded services and 99% within Comprehensive Services.

Comp. Services CCBs	State		Waiver	
	% of Minimum Number to be Served who were Served	% of Contract Member Days Paid	% of Minimum Number to be Served who were Served	% of Contract Member Days Paid
Arkansas Valley	NA	NA	106%	100%
Blue Peaks	NA	NA	108%	100%
Centennial Dev. Svc	NA	NA	105%	100%
Colo. Bluesky Enterp.	NA	NA	104%	101%
Commun.Connections	NA	NA	105%	101%
Community Options	NA	NA	106%	100%
Denver Options	96%	96%	105%	100%
DDC (Imagine!)	114%	99%	104%	100%
Dev. Disab. Res. Ctr	114%	114%	103%	100%
Dev. Opportunities	NA	NA	105%	100%
Dev. Pathways	100%	107%	103%	99%
Eastern Colo	NA	NA	102%	100%
Foothills-Gateway	NA	NA	102%	100%
Horizons	NA	NA	105%	101%
Mesa Dev. Svc	NA	NA	102%	99%
Mt. Valley	NA	NA	103%	100%
North Metro	100%	100%	106%	101%
Southeastern	NA	NA	105%	100%
Southern	NA	NA	105%	100%
Resource Exch.	100%	100%	104%	99%
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>101%</b>	<b>102%</b>	<b>104%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Source:** Numbers pulled at fiscal year end from the monthly Contract Performance Standards report.  
 NA – Not applicable for CCBs who did not have any State funded Comprehensive Services in FY 2002

Accountability Focus Series: Key Indicators of Performance

**Table 3D: FY 2002 Contract Measures for Supported Living Services by CCB**

Again, CCBs generally were meeting and often exceeding their contract standards within SLS during FY 2002. The statewide average was 126% of the minimum number to be served for state-funded SLS and 111% for waiver SLS. For state funded SLS services, the lowest % of member months met was 85% and ranged as high as 127%. For waiver SLS, the lowest percentage of member months met was 95% and the highest was 104%. It should be noted that the contract standard is 95% for SLS member months and so all CCBs met that standard for waiver SLS.

SLS CCBs	State		Waiver	
	% of Minimum Number to be Served who were Served	% of Contract Member Months Paid	% of Minimum Number to be Served who were Served	% of Contract Member Months Paid
Arkansas Valley	140%	85%	107%	101%
Blue Peaks	180%	133%	105%	102%
Centennial Dev. Svc	127%	100%	119%	104%
Colo. Bluesky Enterp.	132%	110%	107%	98%
Commun.Connections	133%	85%	121%	96%
Community Options	132%	104%	113%	101%
Denver Options	109%	96%	108%	101%
DDC (Imagine!)	131%	119%	109%	100%
Dev. Disab. Res. Ctr	129%	113%	104%	100%
Dev. Opportunities	139%	110%	116%	102%
Dev. Pathways	175%	120%	115%	102%
Eastern Colo	107%	92%	108%	99%
Foothills-Gateway	126%	112%	113%	100%
Horizons	225%	127%	154%	98%
Mesa Dev. Svc	112%	99%	113%	100%
Mt. Valley	100%	97%	138%	101%
North Metro	124%	107%	108%	99%
Southeastern	133%	133%	104%	95%
Southern	113%	104%	109%	99%
Resource Exch.	114%	94%	113%	97%
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>126%</b>	<b>104%</b>	<b>111%</b>	<b>100%</b>

Source: Numbers pulled at fiscal year end from the monthly Contract Performance Standards report.

**Table 3E: Percentage of Overhead by Fiscal Year and CCB**

The State is interested in maximizing the amount of resources that directly benefit consumers. However, the State also acknowledges that there are legitimate costs related to any business operation. Additionally, there are state and federal mandates that are not related to direct services and for which adequate reimbursement must be made available.

The overhead reported in this table is derived from the annual financial audits of CCBs. This table only includes CCB overhead -- it does not include overhead that may be associated with sub-contractor providers.

Audited administrative costs averaged across CCBs statewide have averaged 8% for the last several years, which is very reasonable. Some of the smaller CCBs who deliver more services directly rather than through sub-contract services, have a higher overhead as would be expected. This would also be expected since many administrative expenses are fixed regardless of the CCB size.

<b>CCBs.</b>	<b>FY 99</b>	<b>FY 00</b>	<b>FY 01</b>
Arkansas Valley	8%	10%	11%
Blue Peaks	15%	15%	14%
Centennial Dev. Svc	7%	7%	7%
Colo. Bluesky Enterp.	8%	8%	8%
Commun.Connections	12%	12%	10%
Community Options	7%	6%	7%
Denver Options	6%	6%	6%
DDC (Imagine!)	7%	7%	7%
Dev. Disab. Res. Ctr	9%	9%	9%
Dev. Opportunities	9%	10%	8%
Dev. Pathways	8%	7%	7%
Eastern Colo	8%	7%	6%
Foothills-Gateway	5%	6%	6%
Horizons	14%	15%	13%
Mesa Dev. Svc	8%	8%	8%
Mt. Valley	12%	13%	12%
North Metro	8%	7%	7%
Southeastern	18%	13%	13%
Southern	18%	18%	19%
Resource Exch.	8%	7%	6%
<b>Statewide Weighted Average</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>8%</b>

Source: % of Overhead is defined as Management and General as a percentage of Total Expenses as derived from Annual Audits of CCB Financials. Note results of combined audit reports for FY 2002 will not be available until Fall, 2003.



**Accessibility - - Are people able to access services? Is service accessibility comparable across the state? Is the distribution of funds equitable?**

- ✓ *Known Demand Met based on Waiting List* - % of known demand met. (See Tables 4A and 4B.)
- ✓ *Growth in Service Resources* - # of additional resources to serve people. (See Table 4C.)
- ✓ *Equitability* - # of service types and levels provided are similar proportionally to those in other service regions. # of resources per CCB region relative to general population in that region. (See Tables 4D and 4E.)

**Table 4A: Percentage of Known Demand Met within Comprehensive Services**

**Known demand** is defined as those in service plus those on the Waiting List Registry (with a need for service within two years). One measure of accessibility to service is what proportion of the known demand for services is met, e.g. what proportion of those asking for services are provided those services? Table 4A presents the % of Known Demand for Comprehensive Services that is met by CCB and across time. Table 4B provides the same information for Supported Living Services.

Looking at the June 2002 columns, 84% of the known demand for Comprehensive Services was met statewide. However as of June 2002, some CCBs had no individuals on the waiting list who have requested Comprehensive Services now or in the next two years (e.g. 100% of known demand is met at Arkansas Valley and Southern). On the other hand, some CCBs only had sufficient resources to address a smaller proportion of known demand for Comprehensive Services within their regions, such as Developmental Pathways at 73% and Resource Exchange at 69% of known demand met. Similar differences exist within SLS per Table 4B.

Comprehensive CCBs.	June, 2000			June, 2001			June, 2002		
	Total Demand	In Service	% Known Demand Met	Total Demand	In Service	% Known Demand Met	Total Demand	In Service	% Known Demand Met
Arkansas Valley	68	62	91%	66	66	100%	67	67	100%
Blue Peaks	48	45	94%	45	45	100%	51	49	96%
Centennial Dev. Svc	164	148	90%	161	159	99%	176	164	93%
Colo. Bluesky Enterp.	211	196	93%	215	212	99%	222	218	98%
Commun.Connections	66	51	77%	54	52	96%	60	55	92%
Community Options	112	101	90%	117	101	86%	120	105	88%
Denver Options	662	486	73%	535	495	93%	559	507	91%
DDC (Imagine!)	269	230	86%	268	234	87%	283	240	85%
Dev. Disab. Res. Ctr	528	345	65%	418	357	85%	456	360	79%
Dev. Opportunities	88	78	89%	85	81	95%	85	83	98%
Dev. Pathways	378	254	67%	358	279	78%	405	295	73%
Eastern Colo	112	82	73%	93	88	95%	109	93	85%
Foothills-Gateway	276	210	76%	247	224	91%	268	233	87%
Horizons	34	32	94%	36	35	97%	44	36	82%
Mesa Dev. Svc	159	136	86%	147	138	94%	157	147	94%
Mt. Valley	86	59	69%	82	63	77%	84	64	76%
North Metro	381	217	57%	271	229	85%	302	236	78%
Southeastern	26	15	58%	18	16	89%	21	20	95%
Southern	43	35	81%	37	35	95%	38	38	100%
Resource Exch.	498	288	58%	431	322	75%	527	361	69%
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>4209</b>	<b>3070</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>3684</b>	<b>3231</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>4034</b>	<b>3371</b>	<b>84%</b>

Source: June 30 Data from CCMS Billing and Waiting List Registry (including updates from a special phone surveys in 2001 and 2002).

Accountability Focus Series: Key Indicators of Performance

**Table 4B: Percentage of Known Demand\* Met within Supported Living Services**

SLS	June, 2000			June, 2001			June, 2002		
	Total Demand	In Service	% Known Demand Met	Total Demand	In Service	% Known Demand Met	Total Demand	In Service	% Known Demand Met
<b>CCBs.</b>									
Arkansas Valley	62	56	90%	59	56	95%	55	55	100%
Blue Peaks	47	41	87%	49	44	90%	51	42	82%
Centennial Dev. Svc	202	172	85%	220	171	78%	244	173	71%
Colo. Bluesky Enterp.	294	243	83%	288	241	84%	296	248	84%
Commun.Connections	56	44	79%	57	45	79%	55	48	87%
Community Options	115	100	87%	128	101	79%	137	96	70%
Denver Options	664	535	81%	704	523	74%	711	494	69%
DDC (Imagine!)	229	189	83%	243	186	77%	275	194	71%
Dev. Disab. Res. Ctr	527	419	80%	532	412	77%	559	395	71%
Dev. Opportunities	86	78	91%	87	77	89%	85	78	92%
Dev. Pathways	431	345	80%	481	363	75%	538	423	79%
Eastern Colo	151	120	79%	158	112	71%	153	104	68%
Foothills-Gateway	252	209	83%	276	209	76%	286	211	74%
Horizons	19	16	84%	27	15	56%	36	21	58%
Mesa Dev. Svc	141	123	87%	147	117	80%	157	128	82%
Mt. Valley	38	36	95%	43	30	70%	47	38	81%
North Metro	360	272	76%	358	272	76%	348	264	76%
Southeastern	35	27	77%	34	26	76%	34	23	68%
Southern	79	79	100%	87	82	94%	84	79	94%
Resource Exch.	526	361	69%	619	392	63%	644	415	64%
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>4314</b>	<b>3465</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>4595</b>	<b>3474</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>4793</b>	<b>3528</b>	<b>74%</b>

Source: June 30 Data from CCMS Billing and Waiting List Registry

\* Known total demand is defined as those in service plus those on the Waiting List Registry with a need for service within two years.

Accountability Focus Series: Key Indicators of Performance

**Table 4C: Growth in Resources to Serve Adult by CCB  
(as of June 30 of each Fiscal Year Shown)**

Another important measure related to accessibility of services is the growth in the number of resources available to serve adults across fiscal years. This growth indicates that services are accessible to more individuals each year. The number of resources for Comprehensive Services grew by 256 resources or 8% from FY 2000 to FY 2002. Over the same time period, the number of resources to serve adults in SLS grew by 10 resources or 0.3%.

CCBs	Comprehensive Services			Supported Living Services		
	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02
Arkansas Valley	66	67	67	58	56	56
Blue Peaks	46	47	49	40	42	40
Centennial Dev. Svc	156	162	163	168	169	167
Colo. Bluesky Enterp.	199	213	221	248	245	250
Commun.Connections	52	54	56	45	47	48
Community Options	104	105	108	94	95	91
Denver Options	495	505	511	518	510	517
DDC (Imagine!)	232	243	246	184	186	189
Dev. Disab. Res. Ctr	346	358	363	390	391	386
Dev. Opportunities	81	84	86	75	73	73
Dev. Pathways	264	298	316	360	381	383
Eastern Colo	83	88	93	117	113	112
Foothills-Gateway	220	232	239	203	205	204
Horizons	35	35	37	16	16	17
Mesa Dev. Svc	137	144	154	121	122	124
Mt. Valley	62	64	64	37	33	36
North Metro	223	231	236	272	269	262
Southeastern	15	17	20	26	26	26
Southern	36	37	38	81	80	80
Resource Exch.	326	349	367	403	409	405
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>3,178</b>	<b>3,333</b>	<b>3434</b>	<b>3,456</b>	<b>3,468</b>	<b>3466</b>

Source: Numbers taken from CCMS end of June contracts for each year and include Medicaid plus State funded consumers.

**Table 4D: Equitability of Comprehensive Services Resource Distribution by Fiscal Year and CCB**

If it is assumed that the prevalence of persons with developmental disabilities is similar across the state, (i.e. that the proportion of the general population that have a developmental disability is similar across the state), then you would expect that the number of resources allocated to serve persons with developmental disabilities would be distributed in equal proportion to the general population within each CCB region. The columns titled "Ratio per 1,000" on Tables 4D and 4E show the differences in the number of resources for persons with developmental disabilities as a proportion of 1,000 adults in the general population of each CCB service region.

Looking at the Statewide row for June 2002 of Table 4D for Comprehensive Services, it can be seen that the average ratio is 1.02 resources per 1,000 adults in the Colorado general population. Some CCBs have a much higher ratio (indicating that they have more comprehensive services resources relative to other CCBs), while other CCBs have a much smaller ratio. Table 4E shows similar differences in the distribution of SLS resources.

Comprehensive Services	June, 2000			June, 2001			June, 2002		
	Contract Resources	Gen. Pop (Age 18+)	Ratio per 1,000	Contract Resources	Gen. Pop (Age 18+)	Ratio per 1,000	Contract Resources	Gen. Pop (Age 18+)	Ratio per 1,000
<b>CCB</b>									
Arkansas Valley	66	21,576	3.06	67	22,017	3.04	67	22,258	3.01
Blue Peaks	46	33,968	1.35	47	33,951	1.38	49	34,588	1.42
Centennial Dev. Svc	156	130,407	1.20	162	135,649	1.19	163	140,923	1.16
Colo. Bluesky Enterp.	199	105,673	1.88	213	107,232	1.99	221	109,047	2.03
Commun.Connections	52	58,727	0.89	54	62,841	0.86	56	64,837	0.86
Community Options	104	64,236	1.62	105	68,080	1.54	108	69,824	1.55
Denver Options	495	389,548	1.27	505	435,123	1.16	511	435,032	1.17
DDC (Imagine!)	232	219,033	1.06	243	229,220	1.06	246	233,291	1.05
Dev. Disab. Res. Ctr	346	424,002	0.82	358	432,483	0.83	363	438,722	0.83
Dev. Opportunities	81	50,828	1.59	84	53,604	1.57	86	54,486	1.58
Dev. Pathways	264	490,986	0.54	298	494,233	0.60	316	507,878	0.62
Eastern Colo	83	78,148	1.06	88	79,436	1.11	93	81,567	1.14
Foothills-Gateway	220	184,220	1.19	232	197,254	1.18	239	202,046	1.18
Horizons	35	38,505	0.91	35	41,377	0.85	37	42,501	0.87
Mesa Dev. Svc	137	88,614	1.55	144	89,752	1.60	154	91,911	1.68
Mt. Valley	62	74,350	0.83	64	84,709	0.76	64	87,217	0.73
North Metro	223	239,227	0.93	231	268,203	0.86	236	275,067	0.86
Southeastern	15	17,118	0.88	17	17,341	0.98	20	17,525	1.14
Southern	36	18,375	1.96	37	18,923	1.96	38	19,455	1.95
Resource Exch.	326	402,138	0.81	349	412,677	0.85	367	422,661	0.87
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>3,178</b>	<b>3,129,679</b>	<b>1.02</b>	<b>3,333</b>	<b>3,284,104</b>	<b>1.01</b>	<b>3434</b>	<b>3,350,836</b>	<b>1.02</b>

**Source:** Data derived from a combination of June 30 contract resources for each year and general population statistics from the Colorado Dept. of Local Affairs Demographics Section Projections, (<http://www.dola.state.co.us/demog/Projections.htm>)

Accountability Focus Series: Key Indicators of Performance

**Table 4E: Equitability of Supported Living Services Resource Distribution by Fiscal Year and CCB**

SLS	June, 2000			June, 2001			June, 2002		
CCB	Contract Resources	Gen. Pop (Age 18+)	Ratio per 1,000	Contract Resources	Gen. Pop (Age 18+)	Ratio per 1,000	Contract Resources	Gen. Pop (Age 18+)	Ratio per 1,000
Arkansas Valley	58	21,576	2.69	56	22,017	2.54	56	22,258	2.52
Blue Peaks	40	33,968	1.18	42	33,951	1.24	40	34,588	1.16
Centennial Dev. Svc	168	130,407	1.29	169	135,649	1.25	167	140,923	1.19
Colo. Bluesky Enterp.	248	105,673	2.35	245	107,232	2.28	250	109,047	2.29
Commun.Connections	45	58,727	0.77	47	62,841	0.75	48	64,837	0.74
Community Options	94	64,236	1.46	95	68,080	1.40	91	69,824	1.30
Denver Options	518	389,548	1.33	510	435,123	1.17	517	435,032	1.19
DDC (Imagine!)	184	219,033	0.84	186	229,220	0.81	189	233,291	0.81
Dev. Disab. Res. Ctr	390	424,002	0.92	391	432,483	0.90	386	438,722	0.88
Dev. Opportunities	75	50,828	1.48	73	53,604	1.36	73	54,486	1.34
Dev. Pathways	360	490,986	0.73	381	494,233	0.77	383	507,878	0.75
Eastern Colo	117	78,148	1.50	113	79,436	1.42	112	81,567	1.37
Foothills-Gateway	203	184,220	1.10	205	197,254	1.04	204	202,046	1.01
Horizons	16	38,505	0.42	16	41,377	0.39	17	42,501	0.40
Mesa Dev. Svc	121	88,614	1.37	122	89,752	1.36	124	91,911	1.35
Mt. Valley	37	74,350	0.50	33	84,709	0.39	36	87,217	0.41
North Metro	272	239,227	1.14	269	268,203	1.00	262	275,067	0.95
Southeastern	26	17,118	1.52	26	17,341	1.50	26	17,525	1.48
Southern	81	18,375	4.41	80	18,923	4.23	80	19,455	4.11
Resource Exch.	403	402,138	1.00	409	412,677	0.99	405	422,661	0.96
<b>Statewide</b>	<b>3,456</b>	<b>3,129,679</b>	<b>1.10</b>	<b>3,468</b>	<b>3,284,104</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>3466</b>	<b>3,350,836</b>	<b>1.03</b>

Source: Data derived from a combination of June 30 contract resources for each year and general population statistics from the Colorado Dept. of Local Affairs Demographics Section Projections, (<http://www.dola.state.co.us/demog/Projections.htm>)

**Organizational Stability - Do service organizations have stable staff?**

- ✓ *Staff Stability* - Turnover rate (See Table 5A)
- ✓ *Wage Equity* - How do wages compare between CCBs, Regional Centers (RCs) and other employers? (See Tables 5B-5D.)

**Table 5A: Comparison of Turnover Rates in the Community Versus Regional Centers in 2001 and 2002**

Staff turnover is the rate at which employees leave (i.e., resign, are fired, etc.) in proportion to the total number of employee positions. High turnover of staff can seriously impact the quality, safety, and cost of services, including such problems as employees who are less experienced handling medical, safety and behavioral incidents; interruption of training programs; lowered qualifications for new employees; etc.

Table 5A below indicates that community providers of services to persons with developmental disabilities (DD) are experiencing a very high turnover rate of key staff relative to the state operated Regional Centers (RCs).

Organization Type	Direct Care		Case Manager		Program Manager	
	2001	2002	2001	2002	2001	2002
Community (CCB & CCB Sub-contractors)	58%	58%	24%	29%	33%	20%
Regional Center	16%	27%	4%	5%	14%	0%
Overall	51%	53%	23%	28%	33%	19%

Source: 2001 Effective Compensation Inc. (ECI) bases data on a survey and 2002 is based on a survey conducted by DDD.

**Table 5B: Wage Equity - Comparison of Average Wages Paid in the DD Community (CCBs & CCB Sub-contractors) versus Regional Centers (RCs) and the Difference in 2000 and 2002**

It is necessary to pay appropriate wages that are competitive within the job market in order to attract and retain qualified and capable staff. The developmental disabilities (DD) community service system (i.e. CCBs and their sub-contractors) compete for staff with many employers including: (1) the state operated Regional Centers (RCs), (2) other human service systems providing direct care, and (3) Colorado general industry employers who hire employees that have similar education and/or skills, such as retail, food services, janitorial, etc. In order to compete successfully, DD community providers must be able to pay wages that are comparable to those paid by the other competing employers. A recent survey compared CCBs and their sub-contractors to Regional Centers. (A general industry comparison update was not possible due to the freeze on personal services contracts in the Spring, 2002).

Table 5B below compares the average wages paid by DD community providers to those paid by Regional Centers.

As can be seen in Table 5B, employees were paid significantly higher wages in 2002 for the same positions at the state-operated Regional Centers than at DD community providers (i.e. at Community Centered Boards – CCBs and their sub-contractors).

Based on reasons given by staff who leave DD community providers, it is clear that continued efforts to increase wages is a critical factor in decreasing community turnover.

- Salary concerns were the most frequently listed reason for leaving employment at 32% of DD community providers. Salary concerns were also within the top three reasons for leaving given by employees at 68% of community DD organizations.
- Where wages are much higher (i.e. in the Regional Centers), salary concerns were never ranked as a top reason.

Average Hourly Wage For Full-time Staff	2000	2002		
	Percentage Regional Centers) Pay above DD Community *	DD Community Average \$/Hr Wage	Regional Centers Average \$/Hr Wage**	Percentage Regional Centers) Pay above DD Community *
Direct Care	46.2%	\$9.50	\$14.27	50.2%
Case Manager	62.2%	\$14.11	\$25.48	80.6%
Program Manager	101.1%	\$15.48	\$34.34	121.8%

Source: 2000 Effective Compensation Inc. (ECI) bases data on a survey and 2002 is based on a survey conducted by DDD.

\* The column "Percentage RC pays above Community" is calculated as RC wages minus community wages with that result being divided by community wages

\*\* The RC column in this table only includes two RCs, due to date problems with the third. Since all three RCs use the same state salary scales, only including the averages of two RCs should not have appreciably affected the findings. This problem will be corrected in any future surveys but was discovered too late to correct for 2002.

**Table 5C: Comparison of Average Wages Paid in the DD Community (CCBs & CCB Sub-contractors) as Compared to Other Human Service Organizations – 2000**

Tables 5C and 5D document that the DD community wages are also low in comparison to other human service organizations beyond RCs and in comparison to general industry for jobs that require similar experience and education.

<b>Average Hourly Wage For Full-time Staff</b>	<b>DD Community Average \$/Hr Wage</b>	<b>Other Human Service Orgs – Average \$/Hr Wage</b>	<b>% Difference Other Human Service Orgs pay above DD Community)</b>
Direct Care	\$8.95	\$11.48	28.3%
Case Mgr	\$13.43	\$15.13	12.7%
Program Mgr.	\$14.95	\$22.65	51.5%

Source: ECI study, Spring, 2000. This information was not collected in subsequent surveys.

**Table 5D: Comparison of Average Wages Paid in the DD Community (CCBs & CCB Sub-contractors) as Compared to Colorado General Industry – 2000**

<b>Average Hourly Wage For Full-time Staff</b>	<b>Community Average \$/Hr Wage</b>	<b>General Industry Average \$/Hr Wage</b>	<b>% Difference General Industry pays above DD community</b>
Direct Care	\$8.95	\$12.78	42.8%
Case Mgr	\$13.43	\$21.04	56.7%
Program Mgr.	\$14.95	\$27.43	83.5%

Source: ECI study, Spring, 2000. This information was not collected in subsequent surveys