CHALLENGES IDENTIFIED BY ADVOCATES

GOAL

As mentioned within the Satisfaction portion of this report, it is important that consumers and the advocates who represent them have input into the evaluation of services and identification of problems that need correction. This section of the report asks advocates to identify system problems that affect consumers and to rank how big of a problem they pose for consumers.

PROGRESS TOWARDS THE GOAL

Information will be presented relevant to answering the following questions regarding problems facing the service system:

❖ What situations or challenges were identified by advocates as problems?

❖ How big a problem do these challenges pose for consumers from the perspective of advocates?

❖ Does the perspective of advocate regarding the importance of these problems vary by service approach?

❖ Does the importance of these problems vary by the type of advocate who responded?

METHODOLOGY

The 2000 Core Indicators survey requested that advocates identify challenges facing the service system and to indicate how big a problem each of these challenges presented for the consumer they represented. An advocate, for the purpose of this survey, was defined as "that person who helps to represent the consumer at planning meetings and in making important decisions". This could include a guardian, parent, a support living consultant (SLC) or some other form of a personal representative. SLCs were the only type of paid staff who could be interviewed for these questions. The respondent was categorized as either a family member (parent or other relative), other advocate or guardian or SLC.

The advocates were asked to rate the degree to which some situations presented problems for consumers. These situations included: turnover of staff, training level of staff, too frequent changes in where a consumer resided, choice of provider agencies, and finding transportation. The scale used was 0=no problem, 1=little problem, and 2=big problem.

LIMITATIONS OF ANALYSES

This evaluation has some limitations. No information was collected from advocates regarding how best to address these challenges. The opinions of service providers were not collected regarding these challenges. A few advocates mentioned other challenges, beyond those listed on the form for rating. Those are not represented here, but were used to improve the list for input from advocates to be collected during the 2002 survey.

RESULTS

Figure 25 presents information regarding the percentage of respondents who rated each potential issue or problem by how problematic it was in their opinion. These percentages are compared by major CCB service approaches, by CCB versus RC services, and by the respondent type.

OVERALL FINDINGS (See Figure 25, Column 8)

❖ The most frequently identified problem was the high turnover of staff providing supports for consumers. This situation was identified as a problem by approximately 1/3 of the respondents overall and fairly consistently for all of the sub-categories (i.e. for Columns 1-6 and 8). Only SLCs identified it less frequently (18.2%).

❖ The next most frequently identified problems were:

➢ That staff are inexperienced and seem to lack sufficient training. This was identified by 1 out of 5 respondents in total.

➢ Next were transportation (10% in total) and insufficient choice of providers (9.9% in total).

❖ In general, problems were not often identified as being a "big" problem for consumers. Looking at the Total (Column 8), frequent turnover of staff was identified as a big problem for 15.1% of the consumers and all other challenges were a big problem for 5.2% or less of the consumers.

COMPARISON OF CCB ADULT SERVICE APPROACHES (see Figure 25, Columns 1 & 2)

There were only small differences between the frequency with which problems were identified or rated between CCB Supported Living Services (SLS) and Comprehensive Services. The most notable differences were:

❖ Staff was identified as being inexperienced and lacking sufficient training more often under SLS (21.5%) than under Comprehensive Services (16.6%).

❖ Finding transportation was identified as a problem more frequently under Comprehensive Services (12.4%) than under SLS (7.2%).

Figure 25: Challenges Identified by Advocates Compared by Major CCB Service Approach, CCBs to RCs, and By Who Identified the Challenge

System Challenges or Problems	Comparison of CCB Adult Services		Comparison of CCB and RC Services		Comparison of Who Responded to Questions			
	Supp'ed Living Services (SLS)	Comprehensive Services (Comp)	CCB Adults (SLS + Comp)	RC Adults	Parent or other Relative	Other Advocate or Guardian	Supported Living Consultant	Total
	Col. 1	Col. 2	Col. 3	Col. 4	Col. 5	Col. 6	Col. 7	Col. 8
Frequent Turnover of staff providing supports for consumer								
No problem, don't know	65.0%	67.1%	66.0%	69.7%	65.2%	66.7%	81.8%	66.4%
Small problem	19.5%	16.3%	18.0%	22.7%	19.4%	18.6%	6.1%	18.5%
Big problem	15.5%	16.7%	16.1%	7.6%	15.4%	14.7%	12.1%	15.1%
Problem (big or small)	35.0%	32.9%	34.1%	30.3%	34.8%	33.3%	18.2%	33.6%
Staff are inexperienced and seem to lack sufficient training								
No problem, don't know	78.5%	83.4%	80.9%	79.1%	82.4%	69.6%	96.9%	81.0%
Small problem	14.8%	10.9%	13.0%	20.9%	12.6%	23.5%	0.0%	13.8%
Big problem	6.7%	5.7%	6.2%	0.0%	5.0%	6.9%	3.1%	5.2%
Problem (big or small)	21.5%	16.6%	19.2%	20.9%	17.6%	30.4%	3.1%	19.0%
Finding transportation to get places								
No problem, don't know	92.8%	87.6%	90.3%	86.4%	90.4%	87.5%	90.9%	89.9%
Small problem	4.3%	7.2%	5.7%	12.1%	5.6%	10.6%	6.1%	6.4%
Big problem	2.9%	5.2%	4.0%	1.5%	4.1%	1.9%	3.0%	3.6%
Problem (big or small)	7.2%	12.4%	9.7%	13.6%	9.7%	12.5%	9.1%	10.0%
Insufficient choice of provider agencies								
No problem, don't know	88.8%	90.3%	89.5%	95.7%	90.4%	87.1%	93.3%	90.0%
Small problem	7.6%	5.6%	6.7%	2.1%	5.9%	9.4%	3.3%	6.3%
Big problem	3.6%	4.2%	3.9%	2.1%	3.7%	3.5%	3.3%	3.6%
Problem (big or small)	11.2%	9.7%	10.6%	4.3%	9.6%	12.9%	6.6%	9.9%
Frequent changes in where he/she lives (he/she was moved too many times to different homes)								
No problem, don't know	93.0%	96.6%	94.5%	92.5%	94.6%	92.7%	93.1%	94.2%
Small problem	4.4%	1.5%	3.1%	6.0%	3.3%	6.3%	0.0%	3.6%
Big problem	2.6%	1.9%	2.3%	1.5%	2.1%	1.0%	6.9%	2.2%
Problem (big or small)	7.0%	3.4%	5.4%	7.5%	5.4%	7.3%	6.9%	5.8%
% of Sample Size	52.4%	47.6%	88.5%	11.5%	77.4%	17.2%	5.5%	100.0%

COMPARISON OF CCB and RCs (see Figure 25, Columns 3 & 4)

The differences between the frequency with which problems were identified between CCBs and RCs were generally small. Some of the differences were:

❖ Frequent turnover of staff was reported more often for adults served by CCBs (34.1%) than for those served by RCs (30.3%).

❖ Finding transportation was reported more often for adults served by RCs (13.6%) than for those served by CCBs (9.7%).

COMPARISON BY RESPONDENT TYPE (Figure 25, Columns 5-7)

❖ Problems with staff turnover were reported much more frequently by family and other advocates (33.3-34.8%) than by Supported Living Consultants (SLCs – 18.2%)

❖ Problems with staff training were reported much more frequently by non-family advocates (30.4%) than by family members (17.6%) or by SLCs (3.1%).

❖ Choice of provider agencies and finding transportation were also more frequently identified as problems by non-family advocates (12.5-12.9%) than by family members (9.6-9.7%) and SLCs (6.6-9.1%).