

SUMMARY OF SERVICE OUTCOMES

Colorado has many accountability mechanisms in place to encourage and to monitor service quality and efficient use of funds (see Introduction Section for a list of these mechanisms). The Core Indicators survey, which is the focus of this report, is just one part of this overall accountability effort.

The Core Indicators survey seeks to collect information relevant to assessing what progress is being made towards the goals and philosophies that should guide service delivery to adults with developmental disabilities in Colorado. It is conducted through interviews with a random sample of consumers and their families, advocates, and providers. This survey tracks performance against important values including increased (1) satisfaction, (2) self-determination (decision-making), (3) community inclusion, (4) social relationships, (5) community integrated employment, and others.

Some of the findings of the Core Indicators survey were positive and others indicate the need for improvements. These findings are summarized below.

Summary of Satisfaction Findings

While the majority of persons surveyed were satisfied with their services, many persons would like to see improvements.

- ❖ Most adults served by CCBs are satisfied with the residential and supported living services they are provided. They like where they live (89%), feel the people who provide them with supports in the home are nice and polite to them (97%), they have enough things to do around the house (74%), feel safe in their house (95%) and in their neighborhood (89%). Most adults served by CCBs indicate that they are happy on most days (87%). (See Figure 4, Column 7.)
- ❖ Regarding their jobs, day program and/or school, most adults served by CCBs like their day service (94%) and feel that people who provide them supports at their day program are polite and nice to them (97%). However, it should also be noted that 1 out of every 4 adults served by CCBs who work would like to work more hours. (See Figure 5, Column 7.)
- ❖ It is also reassuring that a higher proportion of adults with developmental disabilities (94%) like their jobs (or day programs) than do other adults in the general population (89%). (See Figure 5, Columns 7 & 8.)

- ❖ There were very few differences in the satisfaction of consumers served by CCBs through the Supported Living Services (SLS) versus the Comprehensive Services.
- ❖ Satisfaction levels increased from 1993 to 2000 for all five satisfaction measures for which comparative information was available. (See Figure 4, Columns 7 & 9.)
- ❖ The most frequent complaint from consumers was not working enough hours (24%). The next most frequent concerns were not having enough to do during spare time (7%) and not liking where he/she lived (7%). (See Figures 4 and 5.)



Outcomes of Services and Supports for Persons with Developmental Disabilities

Summary of Decision-Making Involvement Findings

The majority of adults have involvement in most choice areas measured. However, there were several areas in which choices were rarely made by consumers and where improvements are needed to provide more consumer involvement.

- ❖ Most adults at CCBs had involvement in choosing their services (82%), felt they were listened to at program planning meetings (89%), felt they made most of the important decisions in their lives (70%) and could talk to their case managers when they wanted to (91%) (Figure 6, Column 4).
- ❖ 70% of adults at CCBs said they felt that they made most of the important decisions and felt in control of their life. (Figure 6, Column 4).
- ❖ Most adults choose without assistance what they do for fun (65%), can see their friends when they want to (85%), and can see their family when they want to (91%). When choice with and without assistance is considered, then the percentages are even higher. (Figure 6, Column 7).
- ❖ However, there were some areas where choice was rarely provided. The majority of adults receiving services have had no involvement in choosing: who they live with (75%) or the people and/or agencies who provide them with supports in their home (78%). Almost half of the adults in services had no involvement in choosing the place where they live (47%) and were not given access their money when they wanted (49%). (Figure 6, Column 7)
- ❖ Consumers served by CCBs through Supported Living Services (SLS) were more likely to have involvement in 6 of the 14 choice areas than were those served via Comprehensive Services (that were statistically significant, Figure 6, Columns 1-3).
- ❖ More involvement in decision-making was reported as consumers required less support (Figure 7).
- ❖ Consumers served through Community Centered Boards (CCBs) were more involved in more decisions than were those in Regional Centers (RCs), even when differences in support level needs were taken into account (Figure 7).
- ❖ Only two differences (seeing family or friends when the consumer wanted to) were statistically significant in decision-making involvement between consumers served by RCs in their campus versus their group home settings (Figure 8, Columns 4-6).
- ❖ Involvement in decision making (decisions made by self or with help of others) increased (9-10%) for consumers from 1993 to 2000 for two measures (choosing when you eat or go to bed and when you see your friends) (Figure 6, Columns 7 & 9). One measure showed a decrease (involvement in choosing who to live with) and all other measures either stayed at a similar level.
- ❖ Adults living in urban areas made decisions in 2 more areas on the average than did those living in rural areas.

Summary of Community Inclusion Findings

- ❖ Of the 55 activities surveyed, consumers were participating in an average of 15 (at CCBs) to 21 (at RCs) activities in a two-week period depending on their service approach.
- ❖ Adults with developmental disabilities served in Colorado have fewer opportunities than do other Colorado citizens to participate in 35 of the 55 activity areas measured. In many cases these differences were quite large (Figure 10, Columns 7 & 9).
- ❖ While consumers served by CCBs through the Supported Living Services (SLS) were more likely to do 12 of the 55 activities than those in the Comprehensive Services, there were 9 other activities that persons in Comprehensive Services were more likely to participate in than were those in SLS. (See Figure 10, Columns 1-3 and looking only at those differences that were statistically significant.)

“Today, many adults around the country who previously were thought to require care in institutions or congregate group homes now live in typical housing and need less than full-time supervision. They participate in community life, with the assistance of individual supports that respond to their particular needs.”

Wright and King, National Conference of State Legislatures, February, 1991

Outcomes of Services and Supports for Persons with Developmental Disabilities

- ❖ Consumers served through CCBs were involved in a greater number of activities than those served by RCs, even when differences in their support needs were taken into account (Figure 11).
- ❖ There were only 12 of the 55 activities where there were statistically significant differences between the activity levels of individuals served on RC campuses versus those served in RC group homes. Adults on RC campuses participated more frequently in 5 of those 12. Adults in RC group homes participated more frequently in 7 of those 12 activities. (See Figure 12, Columns 4-6.)
- ❖ There was no clear trend in activity level changes from 1993 to 2000, the number of activities that increased were similar to those that decreased. Most activity levels stayed at a similar level (Figure 10, Columns 7 & 9).
- ❖ Activity levels drop as age increases; this was true for consumers and the general population (Figure 14).
- ❖ Adults living in urban areas were involved in 5 more activities in a two-week period on the average than were those living in rural areas.
- ❖ Adults who were minorities were involved in 3 fewer activities in a two-week period on the average than were those who were not minorities.

Summary of Findings Regarding Relationships

- ❖ Most consumers have friends (90% if all friends counted, 79% if staff or relatives are not included as friends). 76% have a close or best friend. (See Figure 15, Column 7.)
- ❖ Most consumers do not or rarely feel lonely (91%) (Figure 15, Column 7).
- ❖ Most consumers can see their friends or family when they want to (85-91%) (Figure 15, Column 7).
- ❖ Despite these encouraging findings, it should be noted that nearly 1 out of 10 consumers said they had no friends (10%) and were often lonely (9%). Almost 1 out of every 4 consumers (24%) did not have someone they would consider a close or best friend. (See Figure 15, Column 7.)
- ❖ Adults in the Colorado general population were more likely to respond positively to 17 of the 20 relationship factors than were adults with developmental disabilities served in Colorado. Most of these differences were large. (See Figure 15, Columns 7-8.)

- ❖ Changes from 1993 to 2000 were inconclusive as a similar number of measures increased as decreased (Figure 15, Columns 7 & 9).

Summary of Community Supported Employment Findings

- ❖ The numbers of adults who have community integrated jobs has increased from 117 in 1985 to 1,728 in 2000 (Figure 17).
- ❖ Despite that steady increase, the proportion of adults receiving day programs who have a community integrated job has decreased in recent years from 40.6% to 32.6% (Figure 18). Indicating that while there is growth in total number of adults served and thus in those having jobs in the community, a higher proportion of adults are being offered or are choosing non-work day program alternatives than in the past.
- ❖ The proportion of adults with community jobs who earn at or above minimum wage increased in 2000 (Figure 19).
- ❖ Historically, adults with community jobs who worked less than half time were in the minority (meaning most adults worked half-time or longer). However, there has been a steady decrease in the number of hours worked from 1998 to 2000 and now the majority of adults with community jobs work less than half-time. (See Figure 20.)
- ❖ Adults with community integrated jobs make higher wages on the average (\$6.22/hr) than do those with non-integrated jobs (\$3.70/hr). However, those with non-integrated jobs work more hours on the average in a week (20.4 hrs/week) than those with community integrated jobs (17.9 hrs/week). (See Figure 21, Column 7 or Figure 22, Columns 1 & 2.)

Summary of Challenges Identified by Advocates

- ❖ The problem identified most frequently by advocates was the high turnover of staff (34%) (Figure 25, Column 8).
- ❖ The next most frequently identified problems were staff with insufficient training or experience (19%), access to transportation (10%) and insufficient choice of providers (10%). (See Figure 25, Column 8.)
- ❖ In general, problems were not often identified as being a "big" problem for consumers. Frequent turnover of staff was identified as a big problem for 15% of the consumers and all other challenges were a big problem for 5% or fewer of the consumers. (See Figure 25, Column 8).

Outcomes of Services and Supports for Persons with Developmental Disabilities

REFERENCES

- Accreditation Council on Services for People with Disabilities, 1992, *Proposed Outcome Based Performance Measures*, 8100 Professional Place, Suite 204, Landover, MD 20785-2225, (301) 459-3191, March.
- Alinsky, S., 1992, reprinted from *The Quality Assurance Network*, New York State Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, Volume 7, Number 1, Winter, pg. 11.
- Berwick, D., Godfrey, B., and Roessner, J., 1991, *Curing Health Care: New York*.
- Carabello, B. and Bittinger, A., 1992, "Consumer Advocacy", *The Quality Assurance Network*, New York State Office of Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, Volume 7, Number 1, Winter.
- Coloradans for Family Support, 1990, *Supporting Families of Children with Challenging Needs: A report to the Governor, the Legislature, and the Citizens of Colorado*, Colorado Developmental Disabilities Planning Council.
- Diener, E., 1984, "Subjective well-being", *Psychological Bulletin*, Volume 95, 3, pg. 542-575.
- Dougherty, C., 1992, "The Consumer Opinion Questionnaire", *The Quality Assurance Network*, Vol. 7, No. 1, Winter, pg. 7.
- Government Accounting Standards Board, 1987, *Codification of Governmental Accounting and Financial Reporting Standards*, June 15, 1987
- Kozleski, E. B. and Sands, D. J., 1992, "The yardstick of social validity: evaluating quality of life as perceived by adults without disabilities", *Education and Training in Mental Retardation*, June.
- Kunc, N., 1992, "A Need for Belonging", *TASH Newsletter*, Vol. 18, Issue 293, Feb./March, 11201 Greenwood Ave. N., Seattle, WA
- O'Brien, J. O. and O'Brien L. O., 1993, *Assistance With Integrity: The Search for Accountability and The Lives of People with Developmental Disabilities*. Responsive Systems Associates, 58 Willowick Dr., Lithonia, GA 30038-1722.
- Richardson, S.A., Katz, M. and Koller, H., 1993, "Patterns of leisure activities of young adults with mild mental retardation", *American Journal on Mental Retardation*, Vol. 97, No. 4, pg. 431-442.
- Rosen, M., Floor, L., and Zistein, L., 1974, "Investigating the phenomenon of acquiescence in the mentally handicapped: I-Theoretical model, test development, and normative data", *British Journal of Mental Subnormality*, Vol. 20, pg. 58-68
- Rosen, J. W. and Burchard, S. N., 1990, "Community activities and social support networks: A social comparison of adults with and adults without mental retardation", *Education and Training In Mental Retardation*, Volume 25, pg. 193-204, June.
- Sigelman, C. K., Budd, E. C., Spanhel, C. L., and Schoenrock, C. J., 1981, "When in doubt, say yes: Acquiescence in interviews with mentally retarded persons," *Mental Retardation*, Vol. 19, pg. 53-58.
- Smith, G. and Ashbaugh, J. *Core Indicators Project: Project Overview and Workplan*, Center for Managed Long-Term Supports for People with Disabilities, National Association of State Directors of Developmental Disabilities Services (NASDDDS) and Human Services Research, Inc (HSRI), November, 19, 1996.
- Spanhel, C. L., Sigelman, C. K., Schoenrock, C. J., Winer, J. L., and Hromas, S. G., 1978, *The Feasibility of Interviewing The Mentally Retarded: Responsiveness, Reliability, and Response Bias*. Lubbock, Texas: Research and Training Center in Mental Retardation, Texas Tech University.
- State of Colorado, *Colorado Revised Statutes*, Article 27-10.5, "Care and Treatment of the Developmentally Disabled".
- Wolfensberger, W. W., 1972, *Normalization. The Principle Of Normalization In Human Services*, National Institute on Mental Retardation.
- Wright, B. and King, M. P. and the NCSL Task Force on Developmental Disabilities, 1991, *Americans with Developmental Disabilities: Policy Directions for the States*, National Conference of State Legislatures, 444 North Capitol Street, N. W., Suite 500, Washington, C.C. 20001, February.