

# NCI Adult Consumer Survey Outcomes

Kern Regional Center

2011-2012 Data



**NATIONAL CORE  
INDICATORS**

A Collaboration of  
the National Association of State Directors of  
Developmental Disabilities Services  
and Human Services Research Institute

# Table of Contents

Quality Assessment Project and National Core Indicators .....	7
What is the NCI Adult Consumer Survey? .....	7
What topics are covered by the survey? .....	7
TABLE 1. NCI ADULT CONSUMER SURVEY INDICATORS – DOMAINS AND SUB-DOMAINS.....	8
How were people selected to participate? .....	9
Proxy Respondents.....	9
Limitations of Data .....	9
What is contained in this report?.....	10
<b>Results: Demographics .....</b>	<b>11</b>
GRAPH 1. GENDER .....	12
GRAPH 2. AGE.....	12
GRAPH 3. RACE AND ETHNICITY* .....	13
GRAPH 4. PRIMARY LANGUAGE.....	13
GRAPH 5. PRIMARY MEANS OF EXPRESSION .....	14
GRAPH 6. CA QUALIFYING CONDITIONS* .....	14
GRAPH 7. LEVEL OF ID.....	15
GRAPH 8. OTHER DISABILITIES* .....	15
GRAPH 9. TYPE OF RESIDENCE.....	16
<b>Choice.....</b>	<b>17</b>
GRAPH 10. CHOSE HOME* .....	18
GRAPH 11. CHOSE ROOMMATES* .....	18
GRAPH 12. CHOSE HOME STAFF.....	19
GRAPH 13. CHOSE PAID COMMUNITY JOB* .....	19

GRAPH 14. CHOSE JOB STAFF* .....	20
GRAPH 15. CHOSE DAY ACTIVITY OR PROGRAM.....	20
GRAPH 16. CHOSE DAY ACTIVITY OR PROGRAM STAFF .....	21
GRAPH 17. CHOOSES HOW TO SPEND FREE TIME.....	21
GRAPH 18. CHOOSES WHAT TO BUY .....	22
GRAPH 19. CHOOSES DAILY SCHEDULE .....	22
GRAPH 20. CHOSE SERVICE COORDINATOR .....	23

## **Work..... 24**

GRAPH 21. HAS A PAID JOB IN THE COMMUNITY .....	25
GRAPH 22. WORKED 10 OF THE LAST 12 MONTHS IN COMMUNITY EMPLOYMENT .....	25
GRAPH 23. AVERAGE MONTHS EMPLOYED AT CURRENT COMMUNITY EMPLOYMENT .....	26
GRAPH 24. WANTS A JOB IN THE COMMUNITY* .....	26
GRAPH 25. HAS INTEGRATED EMPLOYMENT AS A GOAL IN IPP .....	27
GRAPH 26. DOES VOLUNTEER WORK.....	27

## **Community Inclusion ..... 28**

GRAPH 27. WENT OUT SHOPPING IN THE PAST MONTH .....	29
GRAPH 28. AVERAGE TIMES WENT SHOPPING IN THE PAST MONTH.....	29
GRAPH 29. WENT OUT ON ERRANDS IN THE PAST MONTH .....	30
GRAPH 30. AVERAGE TIMES WENT OUT ON ERRANDS IN THE PAST MONTH .....	30
GRAPH 31. WENT OUT FOR ENTERTAINMENT IN THE PAST MONTH.....	31
GRAPH 32. AVERAGE TIMES WENT OUT FOR ENTERTAINMENT IN THE PAST MONTH .....	31
GRAPH 33. WENT OUT TO EAT IN THE PAST MONTH .....	32
GRAPH 34. AVERAGE TIMES WENT OUT TO EAT IN THE PAST MONTH .....	32
GRAPH 35. WENT OUT FOR EXERCISE IN THE PAST MONTH.....	33
GRAPH 36. AVERAGE TIMES WENT OUT FOR EXERCISE IN THE PAST MONTH .....	33
GRAPH 37. WENT OUT TO A RELIGIOUS OR SPIRITUAL SERVICE IN THE PAST MONTH.....	34
GRAPH 38. AVERAGE TIMES WENT OUT TO A RELIGIOUS OR SPIRITUAL SERVICE IN THE PAST MONTH .....	34
GRAPH 39. WENT ON VACATION IN THE PAST YEAR.....	35
GRAPH 40. AVERAGE TIMES WENT ON VACATION IN THE PAST YEAR.....	35

<b>Relationships.....</b>	<b>36</b>
GRAPH 41. HAS FRIENDS.....	37
GRAPH 42. HAS A BEST FRIEND .....	37
GRAPH 43. ABLE TO SEE FRIENDS .....	38
GRAPH 44. ABLE TO SEE FAMILY.....	38
GRAPH 45. ABLE TO GO ON A DATE .....	39
GRAPH 46. FEELS LONELY*.....	39
GRAPH 47. GETS TO HELP OTHERS .....	40
<b>Satisfaction.....</b>	<b>41</b>
GRAPH 48. LIKES HOME.....	42
GRAPH 49. LIKES NEIGHBORHOOD .....	42
GRAPH 50. WANTS TO LIVE SOMEWHERE ELSE .....	43
GRAPH 51. LIKES PAID COMMUNITY JOB* .....	43
GRAPH 52. WANTS TO WORK SOMEWHERE ELSE .....	44
GRAPH 53. LIKES DAY ACTIVITY OR PROGRAM.....	44
GRAPH 54. WANTS TO DO SOMETHING ELSE DURING THE DAY.....	45
<b>Service Coordination .....</b>	<b>46</b>
GRAPH 55. HAS MET SERVICE COORDINATOR.....	47
GRAPH 56. SERVICE COORDINATOR ASKS WHAT PERSON WANTS.....	47
GRAPH 57. SERVICE COORDINATOR HELPS GET WHAT PERSON NEEDS .....	48
GRAPH 58. SERVICE COORDINATOR CALLS BACK RIGHT AWAY.....	48
GRAPH 59. HELPED MAKE IPP .....	49
<b>Health.....</b>	<b>50</b>
GRAPH 60. HAS A PRIMARY CARE DOCTOR .....	51
GRAPH 61. POOR HEALTH* .....	51
GRAPH 62. HAD AN ANNUAL PHYSICAL EXAM IN THE PAST YEAR.....	52
GRAPH 63. HAD A DENTAL EXAM IN THE PAST YEAR.....	52
GRAPH 64. HAD A VISION SCREENING IN THE PAST YEAR.....	53

GRAPH 65. HAD A HEARING TEST IN THE PAST 5 YEARS.....	53
GRAPH 66. HAD A PAP TEST IN THE PAST 3 YEARS (WOMEN) .....	54
GRAPH 67. HAD A MAMMOGRAM IN THE PAST 2 YEARS (WOMEN 40 AND OVER).....	54
GRAPH 68. HAD A PSA TEST IN THE PAST YEAR (MEN 50 AND OVER).....	55
GRAPH 69. HAD A COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING (PEOPLE 50 AND OVER) .....	55
GRAPH 70. HAD A FLU VACCINE IN THE PAST YEAR.....	56
GRAPH 71. EVER HAD A PNEUMONIA VACCINE .....	56
<b>Medication.....</b>	<b>57</b>
GRAPH 72. TAKES MEDICATION FOR MOOD DISORDERS, ANXIETY, BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS AND/OR PSYCHOTIC DISORDERS .....	58
<b>Wellness .....</b>	<b>59</b>
GRAPH 73. ENGAGES IN MODERATE PHYSICAL ACTIVITY.....	60
GRAPH 74. OVERWEIGHT OR OBESE .....	60
GRAPH 75. USES TOBACCO.....	61
<b>Respect and Rights .....</b>	<b>62</b>
GRAPH 76. HAS ENOUGH PRIVACY AT HOME .....	63
GRAPH 77. BEDROOM ENTERED WITHOUT PERMISSION.....	63
GRAPH 78. HOME ENTERED WITHOUT PERMISSION .....	64
GRAPH 79. CAN BE ALONE AT HOME WITH VISITORS .....	64
GRAPH 80. MAIL OR EMAIL OPENED WITHOUT PERMISSION .....	65
GRAPH 81. CAN USE PHONE AND INTERNET WITHOUT RESTRICTIONS .....	65
GRAPH 82. STAFF AT HOME ARE NICE AND POLITE .....	66
GRAPH 83. STAFF AT PAID COMMUNITY WORK ARE NICE AND POLITE* .....	66
GRAPH 84. STAFF AT DAY PROGRAM OR ACTIVITY ARE NICE AND POLITE .....	67
GRAPH 85. PARTICIPATED IN A SELF-ADVOCACY GROUP OR MEETING.....	67
<b>Safety .....</b>	<b>68</b>
GRAPH 86. NEVER FEELS SCARED AT HOME .....	69
GRAPH 87. NEVER FEELS SCARED IN NEIGHBORHOOD .....	69
GRAPH 88. NEVER FEELS SCARED AT WORK OR DAY PROGRAM OR ACTIVITY .....	70

GRAPH 89. HAS SOMEONE TO GO TO FOR HELP IF AFRAID OR SCARED.....	70
<b>Access .....</b>	<b>71</b>
GRAPH 90. HAS ADEQUATE TRANSPORTATION.....	72
GRAPH 91. GETS NEEDED SERVICES.....	72
GRAPH 92. STAFF HAVE ADEQUATE TRAINING .....	73

## Quality Assessment Project and National Core Indicators

This report contains regional center level results from California's second statewide National Core Indicators (NCI) Adult Consumer Survey conducted in Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-2012 (CS2), in accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC), Section 4571. WIC, Section 4571 directs the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) to collect accurate, reliable, and valid consumer and family satisfaction measures as well as consumer outcome data. In California, data from this project will be used to review and benchmark statewide and regional center developmental disability service system performance.<sup>1</sup> This report compares findings between CS2 to the Adult Consumer Survey conducted in FY 2010-2011(CS1) which is considered baseline data. Regional centers can use this report to help guide strategic planning and monitor systemic changes.

### What is the NCI Adult Consumer Survey?

The NCI Adult Consumer Survey is an interview conducted with a person who is receiving services from a regional center. The NCI Survey is used to gather data on approximately 60 consumer outcomes and is regularly refined and tested to ensure it is valid and reliable. In California, interviewers hired by the area boards met with individuals and asked them questions about where they live and work, the kinds of choices they make, the activities they do in the community, their relationships with friends and family, and their health and well-being. Interviews were conducted between July 2011 and June 2012.

### What topics are covered by the survey?

The National Core Indicators are organized by "domains" or topics. These domains are further broken down into sub-domains, each of which has a statement that indicates what concerns are being measured. Each sub-domain includes one or more "indicators" of how the state is performing in this area. The table on the following page lists the domains and sub-domains covered by the NCI Adult Consumer Survey indicators.

---

<sup>1</sup> Refer to the California Adult Consumer Survey Report FY 2011-2012 for detailed information about Quality Assessment Project implementation, the NCI, and California's Statewide results.

TABLE 1. NCI ADULT CONSUMER SURVEY INDICATORS – DOMAINS AND SUB-DOMAINS

Domain	Sub-Domain	Outcome Statement
<b>Individual Outcomes</b>	Work	People have support to find and maintain community integrated employment.
	Community Inclusion	People have support to participate in everyday community activities.
	Choice and Decision-Making	People make choices about their lives and are actively engaged in planning their services and supports.
	Self Determination	People have authority and are supported to direct and manage their own services.
	Relationships	People have friends and relationships.
	Satisfaction	People are satisfied with the services and supports they receive.
<b>Health, Welfare, and Rights</b>	Safety	People are safe from abuse, neglect, and injury.
	Health	People secure needed health services.
	Medications	Medications are managed effectively and appropriately.
	Wellness	People are supported to maintain healthy habits.
	Respect/Rights	People receive the same respect and protections as others in the community.
<b>System Performance</b>	Service Coordination	Service coordinators are accessible, responsive, and support the person's participation in service planning.
	Access	Publicly-funded services are readily available to individuals who need and qualify for them.



## How were people selected to participate?

Based on the total number of adults (age 18 and over) who are receiving regional center services, it was determined that a target number of 400 surveys per regional center would provide a valid sample for this analysis.<sup>2</sup> People who were presently living in a developmental center were not part of the sample.

An additional group of people who had moved from developmental centers to the community in the past five years was selected so that their results could be looked at separately.<sup>3</sup> Overall, the total number of surveys completed across the State of California was 8,691.

## Proxy Respondents

Proxy responses are allowed only for the background information and Section II of the survey, which are based on objective measures: Community Inclusion, Choices, Rights, and Access to Needed Services. Proxy respondents are used only when the individual cannot complete the survey or chooses to have a proxy respondent. Only people who know the individual well (such as family, friends, or staff) are acceptable proxy respondents, and to avoid conflict, service coordinators are not allowed to respond for individuals on their caseloads.

## Limitations of Data

The NCI Adult Consumer Survey tool is not intended to be used for monitoring individuals or providers, but rather for assessing system-wide performance. The NCI Statewide Average should not be interpreted to necessarily define “acceptable” levels of performance or satisfaction, nor does it provide benchmarks for acceptable or unacceptable levels of performance for each indicator. Instead, it describes average levels of performance or satisfaction across the State. It is up to public managers, policy-makers, and other stakeholders to decide whether the differences in results suggest that quality improvement efforts or further investigations are necessary.

---

<sup>2</sup> A randomly selected group of 400 people meets the accepted standard for a representative sample with a +/-5% margin of error and a 95% confidence level. For additional details on sampling and administration methods, please see the California Adult Consumer Survey Report FY 2011-2012.

<sup>3</sup> A supplemental Movers report will be produced by UC Davis and made available on the DDS website.

## What is contained in this report?


This report illustrates CS2 demographic and individual outcome results from Kern Regional Center (KRC) compared to the CS2 California Statewide NCI Average, and the Kern Regional Center average from CS1. All results are shown in chart form along with descriptive text to the right of each chart. Statewide results for the NCI Adult Consumer Survey can be found online at <http://www.dds.ca.gov/QA/index.cfm>.

**Please Note:** Items marked with an asterisk (\*) were analyzed differently for the CS2 data collection cycle. Year-to-year comparisons should be made with caution.

## Results: Demographics


*ILLUSTRATES THE DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF SURVEY PARTICIPANTS*

GRAPH 1. GENDER




This graph illustrates of people surveyed in Kern Regional Center in CS2, 56% were males and 44% were females.

GRAPH 2. AGE




This graph illustrates that in Kern Regional Center the average age of people surveyed in CS2 was 39.1 years old.

**GRAPH 3. RACE AND ETHNICITY\***



This graph illustrates the race of people surveyed in Kern Regional Center in CS2 was: 0% American Indian or Alaska Native, 2% Asian, 8% Black or African American, 0% Pacific Islander, 55% White, 33% other, 0% two or more, and 0% don't know; 32% were identified as Hispanic.


**GRAPH 4. PRIMARY LANGUAGE**



This graph illustrates the primary language of people surveyed in Kern Regional Center in CS2 was: 81% English and 19% other.


**\*In the California data, Hispanic is considered a race category. NCI uses the U.S. Census model, which defines ethnicity separately as Hispanic vs. Non-Hispanic.**

**GRAPH 5. PRIMARY MEANS OF EXPRESSION**



This graph illustrates the primary means of expression of people surveyed in Kern Regional Center in CS2 was: 75% spoken, 23% gestures or body language, 0% sign language, 0% communication aid or device, 0% other; 0% did not know.


**GRAPH 6. CA QUALIFYING CONDITIONS\***



This graph illustrates of people surveyed in Kern Regional Center in CS2, who were diagnosed with conditions that qualify them for services – intellectual disability ID 74%, autism spectrum disorder ASD 14%, cerebral palsy CP 12%, and/or epilepsy 40%.


**\*CA Qualifying Conditions and Other Disabilities are not mutually exclusive.**

GRAPH 7. LEVEL OF ID



This graph illustrates levels of intellectual disability (ID) of people surveyed in Kern Regional Center in CS2 was: 26% had no ID diagnosis, 36% mild, 20% moderate, 9% severe, 8% profound ID, 1% unspecified or unknown.


GRAPH 8. OTHER DISABILITIES\*



This graph illustrates the types of disability of people surveyed in Kern Regional Center in CS2, other than ID were: mental illness 33%, brain injury 0%, chemical dependency 0%, limited or no vision 1%, hearing loss 1%, Alzheimer's or dementia 0%, Down Syndrome 4%, Prader-Willi Syndrome 0%, other 6%, and 8% had no other disability.

\*Individuals with results reflected in the graph and table above may have been diagnosed with a Qualifying Condition as well (see proceeding Graph: 'Qualifying Conditions').

GRAPH 9. TYPE OF RESIDENCE




This graph illustrates the types of residences of people surveyed in Kern Regional Center in CS2 was: 10% intermediate care facility, 19% community care facility, 24% independent living skills (ILS)/supported living services (SLS), 44% parent or relative's home, 3% family home agency, 0% skilled nursing facility (SNF), 0% other.



## Choice


*PEOPLE MAKE CHOICES ABOUT THEIR LIVES AND ARE ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN PLANNING THEIR SERVICES AND SUPPORTS.*

**GRAPH 10. CHOSE HOME\***



This graph illustrates 54% of respondents from CS1 compared to 56% of respondents from CS2 reported they chose or had some input in choosing their where they live. The CS2 statewide average was 52%.


**GRAPH 11. CHOSE ROOMMATES\***



This graph illustrates 52% of respondents from CS1 compared to 50% of respondents from CS2 reported they chose or had some input in choosing their roommates. The CS2 statewide average was 37%.


\*CS2 survey did not ask this question to individuals living in the family home.

**GRAPH 12. CHOSE HOME STAFF**



This graph illustrates 69% of respondents from CS1 compared to 45% of respondents from CS2 reported they chose or were aware they could request to change their home staff. The CS2 statewide average was 56%.


**GRAPH 13. CHOSE PAID COMMUNITY JOB\***



This graph illustrates 84% of respondents from CS1 compared to 81% of respondents from CS2 reported they chose or had some input in choosing their paid community job. The CS2 statewide average was 86%.


**\*CS2 results based on those determined to have a job in the Background Information (BI) section.**

**GRAPH 14. CHOSE JOB STAFF\***



This graph illustrates 67% of respondents from CS1 compared to 20% of respondents from CS2 reported they chose or were aware they could request a change in job staff. The CS2 statewide average was 55%.


**GRAPH 15. CHOSE DAY ACTIVITY OR PROGRAM**



This graph illustrates 71% of respondents from CS1 compared to 41% of respondents from CS2 reported they chose or had some input in choosing their day activity or program. The CS2 statewide average was 54%.


\*CS2 results based on those determined to have a job in the Background Information (BI) section.

**GRAPH 16. CHOSE DAY ACTIVITY OR PROGRAM STAFF**




This graph illustrates 63% of respondents from CS1 compared to 37% of respondents from CS2 reported they chose or could request a change in day activity or program staff. The CS2 statewide average was 49%.

**GRAPH 17. CHOOSES HOW TO SPEND FREE TIME**




This graph illustrates 87% of respondents from CS1 compared to 83% of respondents from CS2 reported they choose or have input in choosing how to spend free time. The CS2 statewide average was 90%.

**GRAPH 18. CHOOSES WHAT TO BUY**




This graph illustrates 86% of respondents from CS1 compared to 84% of respondents from CS2 reported they choose or have input in choosing how to spend their money. The CS2 statewide average was 85%.

**GRAPH 19. CHOOSES DAILY SCHEDULE**



This graph illustrates 85% of respondents from CS1 compared to 78% of respondents from CS2 reported they choose or have input in choosing their daily schedule. The CS2 statewide average was 84%.

GRAPH 20. CHOSE SERVICE COORDINATOR




This graph illustrates 59% of respondents from CS1 compared to 55% of respondents from CS2 reported they chose or were aware they could request to change their service coordinator. The CS2 statewide average was 58%.

## Work

*PEOPLE HAVE SUPPORT TO FIND AND MAINTAIN COMMUNITY INTEGRATED EMPLOYMENT.*




**GRAPH 21. HAS A PAID JOB IN THE COMMUNITY**




This graph illustrates 4% of respondents from CS1 compared to 9% of respondents from CS2 were reported to have a paid job in the community. The CS2 statewide average was 13%.

**GRAPH 22. WORKED 10 OF THE LAST 12 MONTHS IN COMMUNITY EMPLOYMENT**




This graph illustrates of people employed in the community, 77% of respondents from CS1 compared to 89% of respondents from CS2 were reported to have a paid job in the community and worked 10 of the last 12 months at their current job. The CS2 statewide average was 83%.

**GRAPH 23. AVERAGE MONTHS EMPLOYED AT CURRENT COMMUNITY EMPLOYMENT**



This graph illustrates of people employed in the community, people from CS1 worked in their current job for an average of 54.4 months compared to CS2 who worked for an average of 49.4 months. The CS2 statewide average was 64.5 months.


**GRAPH 24. WANTS A JOB IN THE COMMUNITY\***



This graph illustrates of those not in community employment, 29% of respondents from CS1 compared to 25% of respondents from CS2 reported they wanted a job in the community. The CS2 statewide average was 39%.


**\*CS2 results based on those determined not to have job in the Background Information (BI) section.**

**GRAPH 25. HAS INTEGRATED EMPLOYMENT AS A GOAL IN IPP**



This graph illustrates 13% of respondents from CS1 compared to 20% of respondents from CS2 have integrated employment as a goal in their IPP. The CS2 statewide average was 27%.

**GRAPH 26. DOES VOLUNTEER WORK**




This graph illustrates 16% of respondents from CS1 compared to 20% of respondents from CS2 reported they do volunteer work. The CS2 statewide average was 24%.

## Community Inclusion


*PEOPLE HAVE SUPPORT TO PARTICIPATE IN EVERYDAY COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES.*

**GRAPH 27. WENT OUT SHOPPING IN THE PAST MONTH**




This graph illustrates 91% of respondents from CS1 compared to 89% of respondents from CS2 reported they went out shopping in the past month. The CS2 statewide average was 88%.

**GRAPH 28. AVERAGE TIMES WENT SHOPPING IN THE PAST MONTH**




This graph illustrates, on average, respondents from CS1 reported shopping 3.8 times in the past month, and respondents from CS2 reported they went shopping 3.6 times in the past month. The CS2 statewide average was reported as 3.9 times during the past month.

**GRAPH 29. WENT OUT ON ERRANDS IN THE PAST MONTH**




This graph illustrates 72% of respondents from CS1 compared to 74% of respondents from CS2 reported they went out on errands in the past month. The CS2 statewide average was 76%.

**GRAPH 30. AVERAGE TIMES WENT OUT ON ERRANDS IN THE PAST MONTH**




This graph illustrates on average, respondents from CS1 reported they went on errands 2.2 times in the past month, and respondents from CS2 reported they went 1.8 times in the past month. The CS2 statewide average was reported as 2.2 times during the last month.

**GRAPH 31. WENT OUT FOR ENTERTAINMENT IN THE PAST MONTH**




This graph illustrates 60% of respondents from CS1 compared to 53% of respondents from CS2 reported they went out for entertainment during the past month. The CS2 statewide average was 70%.

**GRAPH 32. AVERAGE TIMES WENT OUT FOR ENTERTAINMENT IN THE PAST MONTH**




This graph illustrates on average, respondents from CS1 reported they went out for entertainment 2.0 times in the past month, and respondents from CS2 reported they went an average of 1.4 times during the past month. The CS2 statewide average was reported as 2.3 times during the past month.

**GRAPH 33. WENT OUT TO EAT IN THE PAST MONTH**



This graph illustrates 77% of respondents from CS1 compared to 76% of respondents from CS2 reported they went out to eat in the past month. The CS2 statewide average was 83%.


**GRAPH 34. AVERAGE TIMES WENT OUT TO EAT IN THE PAST MONTH**



This graph illustrates on average, respondents from CS1 reported they went out to eat 3.1 times in the past month, and respondents from CS2 reported they went 3.0 times during the past month. The CS2 statewide average was reported as 3.6 times in the past month.




**GRAPH 35. WENT OUT FOR EXERCISE IN THE PAST MONTH**




This graph illustrates 18% of respondents from CS1 compared to 16% of respondents from CS2 reported they went out for exercise during the past month. The CS2 statewide average was 41%.

**GRAPH 36. AVERAGE TIMES WENT OUT FOR EXERCISE IN THE PAST MONTH**




This graph illustrates on average, respondents from CS1 reported they went out for exercise 2.1 times in the past month, and respondents from CS2 reported they went 1.6 times during the past month. The CS2 statewide average was reported as 5.2 times during the past month.

GRAPH 37. WENT OUT TO A RELIGIOUS OR SPIRITUAL SERVICE IN THE PAST MONTH




This graph illustrates 33% of respondents from CS1 compared to 33% of respondents from CS2 reported they went out to a religious or spiritual service during the past month. The CS2 statewide average was 38%.

GRAPH 38. AVERAGE TIMES WENT OUT TO A RELIGIOUS OR SPIRITUAL SERVICE IN THE PAST MONTH




This graph illustrates on average, respondents from CS1 reported they went out to a religious or spiritual service 1.4 times in the past month, and respondents from CS2 reported they went 1.2 times during the past month. The CS2 statewide average was reported as 1.4 times during the past month.

GRAPH 39. WENT ON VACATION IN THE PAST YEAR



This graph illustrates 40% of respondents from CS1 compared to 35% of respondents from CS2 reported they went on vacation during the past year. The CS2 statewide average was 40%.

GRAPH 40. AVERAGE TIMES WENT ON VACATION IN THE PAST YEAR




This graph illustrates on average, respondents from CS1 reported they went on vacation 0.8 times in the past year and respondents from CS2 reported they went an average of 0.8 times during the past year. The CS2 statewide average was reported as 0.7 times in the past month.

## Relationships


*PEOPLE HAVE FRIENDS AND RELATIONSHIPS.*

**GRAPH 41. HAS FRIENDS**




This graph illustrates 74% of respondents from CS1 compared to 79% of respondents from CS2 reported they have friends other than staff and family. The CS2 statewide average was 74%.

**GRAPH 42. HAS A BEST FRIEND**




This graph illustrates 73% of respondents from CS1 compared to 78% of respondents from CS2 who reported they have a best friend (who may be staff or family). The CS2 statewide average was 75%.

**GRAPH 43. ABLE TO SEE FRIENDS**




This graph illustrates 95% of respondents from CS1 compared to 91% of respondents from CS2 reported they are able to see their friends when they wanted. The CS2 statewide average was 85%.

**GRAPH 44. ABLE TO SEE FAMILY**




This graph illustrates 87% of respondents from CS1 compared to 91% of respondents from CS2 reported they are able to see their family when they wanted. The CS2 statewide average was 81%.

GRAPH 45. ABLE TO GO ON A DATE



This graph illustrates 97% of respondents from CS1 compared to 96% of respondents from CS2 who reported they are able to go on a date, or date with some restrictions, if they choose. The CS2 statewide average was 90%.


GRAPH 46. FEELS LONELY\*



This graph illustrates 25% of respondents from CS1 compared to 35% of respondents from CS2 who reported they feel lonely at least half of the time. The CS2 statewide average was 34%.

\*Lower percentages indicate a positive outcome (fewer people reported feeling lonely).

GRAPH 47. GETS TO HELP OTHERS




This graph illustrates 51% of respondents from CS1 compared to 73% of respondents from CS2 reported they get to help others. The CS2 statewide average was 87%.



## Satisfaction


*PEOPLE ARE SATISFIED WITH THE SERVICES AND SUPPORTS THEY RECEIVE.*

**GRAPH 48. LIKES HOME**




This graph illustrates 86% of respondents from CS1 compared to 91% of respondents from CS2 reported they like where they live. The CS2 statewide average was 90%.

**GRAPH 49. LIKES NEIGHBORHOOD**




This graph illustrates 82% of respondents from CS1 compared to 85% of respondents from CS2 reported they like their neighborhood. The CS2 statewide average was 86%.

**GRAPH 50. WANTS TO LIVE SOMEWHERE ELSE**



This graph illustrates 18% of respondents from CS1 compared to 20% of respondents from CS2 reported they want to live somewhere else. The CS2 statewide average was 19%.


**GRAPH 51. LIKES PAID COMMUNITY JOB\***



This graph illustrates 88% of respondents from CS1 compared to 87% of respondents from CS2 reported they like their paid community job. The CS2 statewide average was 93%.


**\*CS2 results on those determined to have a job in the Background Information (BI) section.**

**GRAPH 52. WANTS TO WORK SOMEWHERE ELSE**




This graph illustrates 25% of respondents from CS1 who have a paid community job compared to 26% of respondents from CS2 who have a community job reported they want to work somewhere else. The CS2 statewide average was 20%.

**GRAPH 53. LIKES DAY ACTIVITY OR PROGRAM**



This graph illustrates 90% of respondents from CS1 compared to 91% of respondents from CS2 reported they like their day activity or program. The CS2 statewide average was 92%.

GRAPH 54. WANTS TO DO SOMETHING ELSE DURING THE DAY




This graph illustrates 18% of respondents from CS1 compared to 22% of respondents from CS2 reported they want to do something else during the day. The CS2 statewide average was 23%.

## Service Coordination


*SERVICE COORDINATORS ARE ACCESSIBLE, RESPONSIVE, AND SUPPORT THE PERSON'S PARTICIPATION IN SERVICE PLANNING.*

**GRAPH 55. HAS MET SERVICE COORDINATOR**




This graph illustrates 97% of respondents from CS1 compared to 96% of respondents from CS2 reported they have met their service coordinator. The CS2 statewide average was 95%.

**GRAPH 56. SERVICE COORDINATOR ASKS WHAT PERSON WANTS**




This graph illustrates 75% of respondents from CS1 compared to 70% of respondents from CS2 reported their service coordinator asks what they want. The CS2 statewide average was 84%.

**GRAPH 57. SERVICE COORDINATOR HELPS GET WHAT PERSON NEEDS**



This graph illustrates 74% of respondents from CS1 compared to 71% of respondents from CS2 reported their service coordinator helps get what they need. The CS2 statewide average was 81%.


**GRAPH 58. SERVICE COORDINATOR CALLS BACK RIGHT AWAY**



This graph illustrates 55% of respondents from CS1 compared to 43% of respondents from CS2 reported their service coordinator calls back right away. The CS2 statewide average was 63%.



GRAPH 59. HELPED MAKE IPP




This graph illustrates 52% of respondents from CS1 compared to 70% of respondents from CS2 reported they helped make their individual program plan (IPP). The CS2 statewide average was 81%.

## Health


*PEOPLE SECURE NEEDED HEALTH SERVICES.*

**GRAPH 60. HAS A PRIMARY CARE DOCTOR**



This graph illustrates 95% of respondents from CS1 compared to 87% of respondents from CS2 were reported to have a primary care doctor. The CS2 statewide average was 96%.


**GRAPH 61. POOR HEALTH\***



This graph illustrates 4% of respondents from CS1 compared to 5% of respondents from CS2 were reported as being in poor health. The CS2 statewide average was 4%.


**\*A lower percentage indicates a positive outcome (fewer people were reported to be in poor health).**

**GRAPH 62. HAD AN ANNUAL PHYSICAL EXAM IN THE PAST YEAR**




This graph illustrates 90% of respondents from CS1 compared to 88% of respondents from CS2 were reported as having an annual physical exam in the past year. The CS2 statewide average was 85%.

**GRAPH 63. HAD A DENTAL EXAM IN THE PAST YEAR**




This graph illustrates 65% of respondents from CS1 compared to 63% of respondents from CS2 were reported as having a dental exam in the past year. The CS2 statewide average was 70%.

**GRAPH 64. HAD A VISION SCREENING IN THE PAST YEAR**




This graph illustrates 34% of respondents from CS1 compared to 41% of respondents from CS2 were reported as having a vision screening in the past year. The CS2 statewide average was 47%.

**GRAPH 65. HAD A HEARING TEST IN THE PAST 5 YEARS**




This graph illustrates 37% of respondents from CS1 compared to 38% of respondents from CS2 were reported as having a hearing test in the past five years. The CS2 statewide average was 50%.

**GRAPH 66. HAD A PAP TEST IN THE PAST 3 YEARS (WOMEN)**




This graph illustrates of female respondents, 51% from CS1 compared to 50% from CS2 were reported as having a pap test in the past three years. The CS2 statewide average was 58%.

**GRAPH 67. HAD A MAMMOGRAM IN THE PAST 2 YEARS (WOMEN 40 AND OVER)**




This graph illustrates of female respondents 40 and over, 54% from CS1 compared to 72% from CS2 were reported as having a mammogram in the past two years. The CS2 statewide average was 73%.

**GRAPH 68. HAD A PSA TEST IN THE PAST YEAR (MEN 50 AND OVER)**




This graph illustrates of male respondents 50 and over, 16% from CS1 compared to 38% from CS2 were reported as having a PSA Test in the past year. The CS2 statewide average was 34%.

**GRAPH 69. HAD A COLORECTAL CANCER SCREENING (PEOPLE 50 AND OVER)**




This graph illustrates of respondents 50 and over, 14% from CS1 compared to 14% from CS2 were reported as having a colorectal cancer screening in the past year. The CS2 statewide average was 14%.

**GRAPH 70. HAD A FLU VACCINE IN THE PAST YEAR**



This graph illustrates 52% of respondents from CS1 compared to 54% of respondents from CS2 were reported as having a flu vaccine in the past year. The CS2 statewide average was 67%.

**GRAPH 71. EVER HAD A PNEUMONIA VACCINE**




This graph illustrates 22% of respondents from CS1 compared to 19% of respondents from CS2 were reported as ever having a pneumonia vaccine. The CS2 statewide average was 27%.



## Medication

*MEDICATIONS ARE MANAGED EFFECTIVELY AND APPROPRIATELY.*

**GRAPH 72. TAKES MEDICATION FOR MOOD DISORDERS, ANXIETY, BEHAVIORAL PROBLEMS AND/OR PSYCHOTIC DISORDERS**




This graph illustrates 39% of respondents from CS1 compared to 36% of respondents from CS2 were reported to take at least one type of medication for mood disorders, anxiety, behavioral problems, and/or psychotic disorders. The CS2 statewide average was 38%.

## Wellness


*PEOPLE ARE SUPPORTED TO MAINTAIN HEALTHY HABITS.*

**GRAPH 73. ENGAGES IN MODERATE PHYSICAL ACTIVITY**




This graph illustrates 21% of respondents from CS1 compared to 17% of respondents from CS2 were reported to engage in moderate physical activity. The CS2 statewide average was 37%.

**GRAPH 74. OVERWEIGHT OR OBESE**



This graph illustrates 64% of respondents from CS1 compared to 65% of respondents from CS2 were reported to be overweight or obese. The CS2 statewide average was 60%.

GRAPH 75. USES TOBACCO




This graph illustrates 5% of respondents from CS1 compared to 7% of respondents from CS2 were reported to chew or smoke tobacco. The CS2 statewide average was 6%.

## Respect and Rights


*PEOPLE RECEIVE THE SAME RESPECT AND PROTECTIONS AS OTHERS IN THE COMMUNITY.*

**GRAPH 76. HAS ENOUGH PRIVACY AT HOME**




This graph illustrates 97% of respondents from CS1 compared to 95% of respondents from CS2 reported they have enough privacy at home. The CS2 statewide average was 93%.

**GRAPH 77. BEDROOM ENTERED WITHOUT PERMISSION**




This graph illustrates 10% of respondents from CS1 compared to 8% of respondents from CS2 reported their bedroom is entered without permission. The CS2 statewide average was 13%.

**GRAPH 78. HOME ENTERED WITHOUT PERMISSION**



This graph illustrates 3% of respondents from CS1 compared to 1% of respondents from CS2 who reported people enter their home without their permission. The CS2 statewide average was 5%.


**GRAPH 79. CAN BE ALONE AT HOME WITH VISITORS**



This graph illustrates 80% of respondents from CS1 compared to 88% of respondents from CS2 reported they can be alone at home with visitors. The CS2 statewide average was 87%.




**GRAPH 80. MAIL OR EMAIL OPENED WITHOUT PERMISSION**




This graph illustrates 10% of respondents from CS1 compared to 7% of respondents from CS2 reported their mail or email is opened without permission. The CS2 statewide average was 8%.

**GRAPH 81. CAN USE PHONE AND INTERNET WITHOUT RESTRICTIONS**




This graph illustrates 90% of respondents from CS1 compared to 96% of respondents from CS2 reported they can use the phone and internet without restrictions. The CS2 statewide average was 96%.

**GRAPH 82. STAFF AT HOME ARE NICE AND POLITE**



This graph illustrates 95% of respondents from CS1 compared to 97% of respondents from CS2 reported their staff at home are nice and polite. The CS2 statewide average was 96%.


**GRAPH 83. STAFF AT PAID COMMUNITY WORK ARE NICE AND POLITE\***



This graph illustrates 95% of respondents from CS1 compared to 90% of respondents from CS2 reported their staff at their paid community work are nice and polite. The CS2 statewide average was 94%.


\*CS2 results based on those determined to have a job in the Background Information (BI) section.

**GRAPH 84. STAFF AT DAY PROGRAM OR ACTIVITY ARE NICE AND POLITE**



This graph illustrates 95% of respondents from CS1 compared to 91% of respondents from CS2 reported their staff at their day program or activity are nice and polite. The CS2 statewide average was 95%.

**GRAPH 85. PARTICIPATED IN A SELF-ADVOCACY GROUP OR MEETING**




This graph illustrates 14% of respondents from CS1 compared to 14% of respondents from CS2 reported they participated in a self-advocacy event, or had the opportunity but chose not to. The CS2 statewide average was 18%.

## Safety


*PEOPLE ARE SAFE FROM ABUSE, NEGLECT, AND INJURY.*

**GRAPH 86. NEVER FEELS SCARED AT HOME**




This graph illustrates 91% of respondents from CS1 compared to 88% of respondents from CS2 reported they never feel scared in their home. The CS2 statewide average was 87%.

**GRAPH 87. NEVER FEELS SCARED IN NEIGHBORHOOD**




This graph illustrates 87% of respondents from CS1 compared to 87% of respondents from CS2 reported they never feel scared in their neighborhood. The CS2 statewide average was 85%.

**GRAPH 88. NEVER FEELS SCARED AT WORK OR DAY PROGRAM OR ACTIVITY**



This graph illustrates 92% of respondents from CS1 compared to 91% of respondents from CS2 reported they never feel scared at their work or day program or activity. The CS2 statewide average was 92%.

**GRAPH 89. HAS SOMEONE TO GO TO FOR HELP IF AFRAID OR SCARED**




This graph illustrates 95% of respondents from CS1 compared to 94% of respondents from CS2 reported they have someone to go to if they feel scared. The CS2 statewide average was 92%.

## Access


*PUBLICLY-FUNDED SERVICES ARE READILY AVAILABLE TO INDIVIDUALS WHO NEED AND QUALIFY FOR THEM.*

**GRAPH 90. HAS ADEQUATE TRANSPORTATION**



This graph illustrates 94% of respondents from CS1 compared to 88% of respondents from CS2 reported they always have access to adequate transportation. The CS2 statewide average was 87%.


**GRAPH 91. GETS NEEDED SERVICES**



This graph illustrates 85% of respondents from CS1 compared to 90% of respondents from CS2 reported they get all needed services. The CS2 statewide average was 77%.



GRAPH 92. STAFF HAVE ADEQUATE TRAINING



This graph illustrates 91% of respondents from CS1 compared to 89% of respondents from CS2 reported their staff have adequate training. The CS2 statewide average was 93%.