

**Citizens for the Developmentally Disabled  
Outcome Based Measurement System**

**Annual Program Evaluation Management Report**

September 23, 2013  
(Report for fiscal year ending June 30, 2013)

**INTRODUCTION**

The **Outcome Based Evaluation System** implemented by Citizens for the Developmentally Disabled (CDD) measures targeted outcomes for persons being served, their families and concerned stakeholders in the community. This system is part of CDD's **Continuous Quality Improvement Plan** (see CQIP – CDD Policy #1.17) to assess program satisfaction, effectiveness, and efficiency, as well as to identify concerns, trends and barriers to the provision of quality services on an ongoing basis for consumers, families and communities served by CDD.

**Outcomes** are defined as resulting from services provided by CDD for individuals and their families. They may vary widely and range from being concrete in nature, e.g. exercising three hours per week or obtaining an individualized communication device, to being quite abstract and difficult to measure, e.g. developing a sense of belonging or inclusion in the community or making one's surroundings more positive. These outcomes may be specific to the individual or more general in nature - such as increasing skill development, the degree of community access or of program satisfaction. In line with the standards of the New Mexico Department of Health and the Council for the Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF), each of the program outcomes was assessed in terms of efficiency, effectiveness and degree of consumer satisfaction.

Specifically, this evaluation report addresses the program services of Supported Employment, Respite and Substitute Care, Community/Family Living, Assisted and Supported Living, Adult Day Habilitation Services, Personal Support Services, and Community Access for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2013 for consumers and families served by CDD in Colfax, Union, Mora, and San Miguel Counties. The surveys were conducted during interviews with consumers and/or their families and a total of 40 interviews were conducted. Of this number, 26 were tabulated

and scored. Satisfaction surveys and progress reports completed by staff were compiled and reported for 31 of the 40 CDD program participants. This procedure has resulted in an approximate 77.5% response rate, which though it is less than the 90% sampled in 2012, it is still a significant and meaningful sample size for the population considered. These surveys were from clients in the Colfax and Union County areas being served by the Raton Office of CDD and from clients and families in the catchment area being served by the Las Vegas Office of CDD.

### **Results and Recommendations --- Review of recommendations made in the 2012 Management Report**

There were three recommendations made in the 2012 Management Report that is stated below. The current status of each recommendation is updated and follow-up is provided in italics in the concluding parentheses.

- Greater attention should be paid to the effectiveness in providing **Community Access Services** as it fell short of the minimal goal established of 75%.

*(The 2013 report shows a combined effectiveness score for both Raton and Las Vegas of 86% based on the four program participants surveyed. This reflects an 11% improvement and more than reaches the minimal program goal of 75% effectiveness).*

- Similarly, greater focus should be given to the issue of **accessing health care** as 7% of the respondents had some issue with this service, and it is considered a priority area of service by CDD.

*(Only 4% of those surveyed, i.e. one out of 26, reported difficulty in accessing health care, according to the 2013 survey and report. This reflects what is thought to be a significant level of improvement. This appears to reflect a greater focus on access to health care as per last year's recommendation.)*

- Program questionnaires for all program areas should be revised to reflect the process of State Amendments due to Service Standards change effective August, 2012 that occurs with the new DD Waiver Service Standards being promulgated. A summary of these proposed changes are as follows:
  - Adult Habilitation will become **Customized Community Supports – Group;**
  - Community Access will become **Customized Community Supports – Individual;**
  - Independent Living will become **Customized In-Home Supports;**

- Group Supported Employment will become **Customized Integrated Employment – Group**;
- Individual Supported Employment will become **Customized Integrated Employment – Individual**;
- Family Living will become **Living Supports – Family**;
- Supported Living will become **Living Supports – Supported Living**.

*(This recommendation was finalized on September 20, 2012 with a complete revision of all program questionnaire surveys that reflect an updating of program service standards and nomenclature for DD Waiver Services. An additional update was made on July 16, 2013 to more clearly measure the priority areas of health care access and safety.)*

The above noted changes were made in response to last year’s recommendations along with updating of goals and objectives for the **Outcome Based Evaluation System**. The objectives and measurements were modified to take consumer and family ratings and perspectives more fully into account. The **Continuous Quality Improvement Plan** policy and procedures were updated and revised in 2011 to reflect a more thorough, ongoing process of evaluation and identification of trends and issues in service quality on a quarterly basis by management. Additionally, the priority for health care access and safety issues has been highlighted and incorporated into the evaluation system, most recently updated on July 16, 2013.

## **Report Outline**

This report concentrates on the special population served in Northeastern New Mexico by the Citizens for the Developmentally Disabled in the counties served of Union, Colfax, Mora and San Miguel. The seven programs currently administered by CDD and identified below were evaluated in relation to program **effectiveness**, **efficiency** and expressed level of family and consumer **satisfaction** with agency services. This report is divided into the seven program areas examined, as well as reporting on the supplemental agency priorities of health and safety. The rating scale for the evaluation surveys consisted of a four-point Likert scale, ranging from an agreement of “all of the time” to one of disagreement, i.e. “needs work.” For the purposes of this report, the iconic rating key developed is as follows:

## Rating Key

A program objective was developed to measure each outcome. The degree to which each outcome was achieved will be noted as follows:



## Measures of Program Effectiveness, Efficiency & Satisfaction

### Community Inclusion

#### I. Program Area: **Supported Employment Services**

**Effectiveness Objective:** Consumers will maintain work stability and show skill maintenance and/or progress in meeting their respective program goals and objectives. (Minimal Goal – 75%, Goal – 80%, Optimal Goal – 95%)



**Right on Target** – A 93.5% rate was found for effectiveness in meeting program goals and objectives on the service plans for program participants involved. This is a 1.5% decrease in effectiveness from last year’s rate but this is probably not of statistical significance and almost reaches the optimal goal of 95%. All program participants made substantial gains of at least 87% in meeting their objectives with the support of program staff at the Raton Center. There were no program participants at the Las Vegas Center.

**Efficiency Objective:** Supported Employment Service participants will be provided services in a timely and efficient manner as measured by consumer/family report and documentation of service implementation within one month of plan development. (Goal – implementation within 1 month, Optimal Goal – less than 1 month)



**Much Better than Expected** - 100% - All service participants in the Raton Office received service implementation within the one month goal and transitioned smoothly.

**Satisfaction Objective:** Defined as the percentage of consumers reporting general satisfaction with program services and support (Minimal Goal – 80%, Goal – 90%, Optimal Goal – 100%).



**Much Better than Expected** – 100% of consumers served by the Supported Employment Program reported that they were fully satisfied with services.

Only two participants were surveyed that were actively participating in the SE program. All were supervised from the Raton office, and all respondents were employed and responded positively to the survey. They indicated that their program was working for them and services were being provided on a timely basis. There were no complaints voiced and only positive comments were made.

## II. Program Area: **Community Access**

**Effectiveness Objective:** The percentage of service plans in place showing improvement in relation to program goals and objectives (Minimal Goal – 75%, Goal – 85%, Optimal Goal – 95%).



**Right on Target** - The minimal goal of 75% was exceeded with a combined average score of 80.5% effectiveness for the 4 participants surveyed.

**Efficiency Objective:** Provision of services in a timely manner as measured by consumer/family reports and the documented elapsed time between IDT meeting and implementation of services. (Minimal Goal – 1 month, Goal – 3 weeks, Optimal Goal – 2 weeks)



**Much Better than Expected** – 86% of program participants in Las Vegas and Raton reported receiving services in a timely manner.

**Satisfaction Objective:** The percentage of persons served reporting general satisfaction with program services and supports. (Minimal Goal – 80%, Goal – 90%, Optimal Goal – 100%)



**Much Better than Expected** – All four of the program participants surveyed, i.e. 100%, indicated that they were satisfied all or most of the time with program services and support they received.

There were no comments recorded by the survey participants concerning program strengths, weaknesses, or suggestions for improvement.

### III. Program Area: **Day Habilitation Program**

**Effectiveness Objective:** Maintenance or improvement in personal functioning as measured by maintenance or improvement in reaching program goals and objectives. (Minimal Goal – 70%, Goal – 85%, Optimal Goal – 90%)



**Right on Target** - There was an 82% average improvement rate reported for the 26 survey participants. This reflects a 2% improvement over the results from last year. Only 2 of the 26 consumers surveyed, i.e. 7%, reported that they were failing to achieve program goals.

All but two of the twenty-six participants involved with Day Habilitation Services in both Raton and Las Vegas reported maintaining or making significant improvements in their program goals and objectives with an 82% rate of meeting program goals and objectives. **This indicates that approximately 93% of the consumers' surveyed reported clear progress toward program goals and objectives.**

**Efficiency Objective:** Provision of structured and constructive services in a timely and efficient manner as measured by consumer report and documentation of service implementation within one month of plan development. (Minimal Goal – 75%, Goal – 80%, Optimal Goal - 95%)



**Right on Target** – There were only two reports of clients not meeting their program goals and objectives in regard to efficiency. That is, 93% of the twenty-six program participants met the efficiency objective in the provision of services

**Satisfaction Objective:** Expressed as the percentage of persons served reporting general satisfaction with program services and supports. (Minimal Goal – 90%, Goal – 95%, Optimal Goal – 100%)



**Much Better Than Expected** – 100% of surveyed participants, i.e. 26 of the 26 program participants surveyed, responded to this query and reported that they were generally satisfied with program services and supports. No complaints were voiced although one participant noted that there was an occasional lapse in services due to a lack of staff.

Twenty-six of the twenty-six surveyed participants served by the programs in Raton and Las Vegas all agreed that they were satisfied with the services and supports they were receiving.

**Comments from Raton included:**

Great staff that treats her as an equal. They respect her wishes. Very happy, she's always there for her. Makes extra money. It does a lot for the family. Client feels CDD offers a good program and family member is doing excellent. At times there is a lapse in services due to lack of staff. They help families with everything.

**Comments from Las Vegas included:**

“Very comfortable with program and very pleased. Thankful for services. He is very happy with DHAB and enjoys being out in the community. CDD has a great program. Doing excellent. Best progress ever.

## Community Living

### IV. Supported & Assisted Living Programs

**Effectiveness Objective:** Increase knowledge and skills of personal self-care and community living as measured by consumer performance on program goals and objectives. (Minimal Goal – 70%, Goal – 80%, Optimal Goal – 90%)



**Right on Target** – 74.8% of the 8 program participants in Raton and Las Vegas reported maintenance or improvement in knowledge and skills due to program participation. This is a slight decrease (about 3%) from the previous year.

**Efficiency Objective:** Provide services on a timely and efficient basis as measured by consumer and family reports of delays in the implementation of service plans following the IDT meeting. (Minimal Goal – 1 month, Goal – 3 weeks)



**Much Better Than Expected** – There were no reported delays occurring in the provision of services in an efficient manner, i.e. 100% efficiency level.

**Satisfaction Objective:** The percentage of persons served reporting general satisfaction with program services and supports. (Minimal Goal – 80%, Goal – 90%, Optimal Goal – 100%)



**Much Better Than Expected** - Of the 8 participants surveyed who were enrolled in Supported & Assisted Living, all expressed satisfaction with the program, i.e., 100% reported program satisfaction.

A sampling of **comments** from Supported and Assisted Living participants and their families included: "It's going great. Most of the time there are no problems. Staff is excellent. Doesn't like crowds and prefers quiet activities.

V. Program Area: **Community/Family Living**

**Effectiveness Objective:** Maintain and/or increase knowledge and skills of personal self-care and community living as measured by consumer performance on program goals and objectives. (Minimal Goal – Maintenance of Functioning, Goal – 80%, Optimal Goal – 90%)



**Right on Target** – The scoring of surveys found that the Minimal Goal of Maintenance of functioning was met by 100% of program participants and a 79% rate of improvement was shown for the 19 program participants persons surveyed.

All participants met the minimal goal of maintaining their level of functioning noteworthy and commendable. Two of the 19 participants, i.e. about 10%, made only marginal progress toward their personal goals.

**Efficiency Objective:** Provide services on a timely and efficient basis as measured by consumer and family reports of delays in the implementation of service plans following the IDT meeting. (Minimal Goal – 1 month, Goal – 3 weeks)



**Right on Target** – Only one reported delay occurred with the provision of services in an efficient manner, i.e. 95% efficiency rate.



**Satisfaction Objective:** The percentage of persons served reporting general satisfaction with program services and supports. (Minimal Goal – 90%, Goal –95%, Optimal Goal – 100%)



**Much Better Than Expected** – One hundred Percent (100%) of the nineteen participants surveyed reported that they were satisfied all or most of the time with the services and supports received through CDD.

**Comments included:** “CDD has great services.” Is happy with all staff. Helps family with everything. Happy with staff and program; Happy with work and exercises regularly. At times lapse in DayHab for lack of staff. Doing great. Happy with provider. Happy with the service; Enjoys her freedom; suggests more FL providers needed and need to do more training to prepare families to be providers..

## VI. **Respite and Substitute Care Services**

There were only two participants surveyed from the Respite & Substitute Care Program, both of whom are served by the Raton Center. Neither voiced complaints concerning their program and both reported general satisfaction with their program.

**Effectiveness Objective:** Maintain a sufficient number of quality care providers. (Minimal Goal – 80%, Goal – 90%, Optimal Goal – 100%)



**Right on Target** – The evaluation showed that the two program participants surveyed were making an average of 93.5% progress on their program goals and both were satisfied with the quality of care being received.

**Efficiency Objective:** Provide services on a timely and efficient basis as measured by consumer and family reports of delays in the implementation of service plans following the IDT meeting. (Minimal Goal – 1 month, Goal – 3 weeks)



**Much Better Than Expected** – No reported delays occurred with the provision of services in an efficient manner, i.e. 100% accomplishment.

**Satisfaction Objective:** The percentage of persons served reporting general satisfaction with program services and supports. (Minimal Goal – 90%, Goal –95%, Optimal Goal – 100%)



**Much Better Than Expected** - Both participants surveyed reported that they were satisfied with the services provided through CDD either all or most of the time, i.e. 100% satisfaction expressed.

**Comments** included: No complaints – exercises and gets out, takes trips. “Happy with service.” “Provider is nice, no complaints.” “Respite provider very on time.”

## VII. **Personal Support Services**

Only one participant, a Raton resident, was surveyed and they reported program effectiveness in meeting personal goals as 92% effective, 100% efficient with no reported delays or complaints about the timeliness of services and 100% satisfaction with their program all or most of the time.

**Comments:** Very happy with staff of 7 years... really helps her. Provider is very helpful.

## VIII. **General Program Satisfaction: All Agency Programs**

**Objective:** Maximize Family and Guardian Satisfaction with all agency programs (expressed as the percentage of families reporting general satisfaction with all program services and supports provided their family member(s). (Minimal Goal – 80%, Goal – 90%, Optimal Goal – 100%)



**Much Better Than Expected** – 100% of respondents (26) surveyed expressed satisfaction with all program services and supports provided to them or to members of their family either all or most of the time. This goes beyond the moderate goal of 90% but far exceeds the minimal goal of 80% expressing satisfaction.

Twenty-six consumers and families participated in the survey of general program satisfaction. This includes thirteen consumers and their families served out of the Las Vegas Center and thirteen consumers and their families served out of the Raton Center. As occurred during the last two surveys, dissatisfaction was limited to the availability of staff and providers for specific services. The quality of services when provided appears to be met with a high level of satisfaction.

## VII. **General Programming Priorities (Health & Safety: All Agency Programs)**

Expressly, during the past two years with the continuous quality management program it has been the desire of CDD management that particular attention would be paid to any

issues raised in the survey concerning **health** and **safety**. Two specific questions were identified in the survey that concerned these general programming priorities. Namely, one question concerned perceived safety in relation to staff, e.g. "The staff helps to keep me safe". There was also a question dealing with access to health care, i.e. "Gets needed assistance for accessing health services".

When these two queries were tabulated it was found that 26 out of 26 respondents affirmed that the assigned staff helped to keep them safe. This means that **a total of 100% of consumers and their families served perceived that staff was helping them to stay safe.**

Concerning access to health services, 25 of the 26 respondents (i.e. **96%**) **affirmed that they got the assistance needed from staff for accessing health services.** This represents a 3% improvement over last year. The only exception concerned the Las Vegas Center of CDD where one client noted that there was sometimes a problem with accessing care.

## **Summary and Conclusions**

This is the third consecutive year in which there has been a highly positive evaluation of all programs offered through **Citizens for the Developmentally Disabled**. No clear deficiencies or failures to reach at least minimal levels for effectiveness, efficiency and satisfaction were noted. While a small deficiency was noted in the last survey of 2012 concerning the community access program, **this survey showed no deficiencies.** The number of respondents noting a problem with accessing health care decreased from three last year to only one this year. This constitutes clear progress in meeting agency goals and objectives, as well as progress with the priority areas of health and safety.

Of the seven agency programs and services examined in this report by measures of effectiveness, efficiency and satisfaction, all were found to be reaching at least their minimal program goals. In nearly all occasions, agency performance far exceeded the minimal level. This marks the third consecutive year in which steady improvement has been shown and documented over the results from the previous evaluation. The summary results from this survey are presented in tabular and graphic form below:

## Effectiveness, Efficiency and Satisfaction Measures across Program Areas 2012

	Sup. Emp	Com. Ac	Sup Living	Day Hab	Com/Fam Liv	Respite & Sub Care	Av Total
<b>Effectiveness</b>	94%	80%	75%	82%	79%	93%	84%
<b>Efficiency</b>	100%	86%	100%	93%	95%	100%	96%
<b>Satisfaction</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

As it was witnessed during the past two evaluation cycles, it still holds true that a general finding is that when criticisms were offered concerning agency programs and supports they tended to be criticisms concerning either program cuts to frequency or total hours of service offered --- or those concerning the availability of staff and services. This evaluation also continues the trend of the past two years in that effectiveness, rather than efficiency, was the area with the lowest average scores, e.g. 84% vs. 96%. This survey shows an average of a 96% rating on efficiency across all program areas, which is considerably better than that recorded five years ago. Therefore, it is clear that management has been able to respond effectively to the issue of efficiency.

### Recommendations

- Because of low program enrollments in the Supported Employment, Respite/Substitute Care and Personal Support Services, it is recommended that all program participants be surveyed in future evaluations. It will make the results from the data analysis more meaningful and enhance any current or future statistical analysis.
- It is recommended that all efficiency objectives and goals be reviewed in light of the inconsistent reporting of efficiency data. Management is aware of this issue as delays in implementing approved programs are discouraged by legal mandates and requirements. As an alternative, it is recommended that a complaint log be developed that focuses on timeliness and efficiency in responding to any delays in providing requested and approved services. At the time of the annual evaluation, consulting this complaint log would facilitate timely data collection as not all cases would need to be reviewed. That is, it would be a more efficient way of collecting needed data on efficiency.

The remainder of program information from the evaluation study provides graphic representation of the measures of effectiveness, efficiency, and satisfaction. They are presented graphically to enhance the ease of accessing the information and ease in identifying trends in program services.




---

Ronald Oliver, Ed.D. Program Evaluator

## Appendix I

### Comparison across program areas for 2011- 2013 on three measures

#### Program Trends in Satisfaction

##### Comparison of results from 2011 - 2013

	<b>Sup. Emp</b>	<b>Com. Living</b>	<b>Day Hab.</b>	<b>Com. Acc</b>
<b>Satis-2011</b>	100%	93%	91%	100%
<b>Satis-2012</b>	100%	100%	96%	85%
<b>Satis-2013</b>	100%	100%	100%	100%

#### Program Trends in Effectiveness

	<b>Sup. Emp</b>	<b>Com. Living</b>	<b>Day Hab.</b>	<b>Com. Acc</b>
<b>Effect 2011</b>	84%	87%	81%	77%
<b>Effect 2012</b>	95%	71%	87%	72%
<b>Effect 2013</b>	93%	79%	82%	80%

## Program Trends in Efficiency

	<b>Sup. Emp</b>	<b>Com. Living</b>	<b>Day Hab.</b>	<b>Com. Acc</b>
<b>Effic 2011</b>	100%	100%	95%	88%
<b>Effic 2012</b>	100%	96%	100%	100%
<b>Effic 2013</b>	100%	95%	93%	86%