



NYSILC 2011 SPIL Evaluation Report

Consultant's Report on First Year of Project to Assist NYSILC in Developing an Outcome-Based Evaluation System for the State Plan

Background

The first year's activities included working with each of the committee chairs and their committees to develop the methodology they'd need to evaluate the objectives assigned to their committees in the first year of the plan. In addition, we had discussions to explore ways to refine and/or expand the objectives to focus more on bottom line outcomes or impacts as well as on measurable activities. Since we are still going through the process of amending the plan, and the language is only going to be related directly to unspent Part B initiatives, these revisions were viewed as "value added" changes we could make to the existing objectives, not replace them.

As written in the plan, most of the objectives were fairly straight forward to evaluate. They were written in measurable and specific terms and generally related to whether or not certain activities took place and how many people participated in the activity and/or how often or to what degree the activity was accomplished. Each committee developed an evaluation process that generally relied on the NYSILC staff gathering the relevant data from NYSILC records for projects being conducted by NYSILC, or from the DSU for projects that were handled through RFP's.

Through these discussions, the Council developed forms and incorporated responsibilities into their committee structure to produce a SPIL evaluation report by January of each year. The three-month lag time is required to give committees time to acquire data and information, perform their duties, report back, and then have the SPIL Subcommittee review the total information before sending it to the SPIL evaluator who prepares the report.

The notes that follow detail the evaluation process each committee followed and what their results were.

We also developed some draft language for the "value added" components of the objective that were designed to look more at the impact of the activities measured by the objective. The "value added" elements were designed to answer the "so what" question. What was the impact of the activities that were in the plan? Were they worth doing and was the investment in them returned in value?

The notes that follow detail some of this language as well. More needs to be done with the "value added" material and it will be the focus of year two. 2012 is a transition year for the Council; nine new members are coming on board and some long

NYSILC Evaluation Report, FY 2010-2011

time leaders are leaving. As a result, there are many new committee chairs and the evaluation revision will be held back until the committee chairs fully settle into their new responsibilities.

In addition to the informal training and coaching provided to NYSILC staff and Council members through the committee discussions, I conducted two formal training programs for Council members, both focusing on outcome based objectives and evaluation. The first, held at the Council's September meeting was a review of what constituted an outcome based objective, how to develop one, and how to evaluate it. Each committee was given a short time to work on one of their objectives to make them more outcome-based. It solidified the evaluation process and responsibilities ahead for the committees. The feedback from the Council members was positive, however due to the press of other Council business, not a lot was done with the objectives following that session. This was also right before the end of the contract yearend.

Therefore, we scheduled a second session for the next Council meeting in November. That session included a brief review of the key concepts, and a longer chunk of time for the committees to actually work on their individual objectives to make them more outcome oriented and to think about an evaluation methodology. That session was somewhat more successful, with each of the objectives being edited and some new ideas developed to answer the "so what" or outcome question.

At the same time (September through November), the committees were working to complete their evaluation of their year one objectives. This has been completed and compiled and the results are attached.

Over the next two years, I will work with the committees and the Council overall to continue to strengthen the evaluation process to produce even stronger outcome based results. This will be done with an eye towards the next SPIL wherein we hope to have the objectives written in even more of a measurable, outcome-based language, each with its own evaluation methodology.

2011 SPIL Evaluation Summary

Overall

There were eleven objectives in the 2011-2014 SPIL. Overall, the Council fully met 3 of the objectives, partially met 3 of the objectives and did not meet 5 of the objectives.

However, of the 5 objectives that were not met, four were under the management of the DSU and were dependent upon RFP's being issued. Some of these RFP's were issued late in the first year and the rest were not issued at all. Therefore, there was no way the Council could have successfully accomplished these outcomes. The primary lesson learned from this process is that any projects or objectives that will require the issuance of an RFP should anticipate that the first year of the plan will be a development and contracting cycle with the second and third years being operational. It may also be

possible to have these projects continue into the first year of the next planning cycle so that activities and outcomes can be occurring in the first year of the plan, while planning is underway for new projects and RFP's.

The 5th objective that was not met was an objective related to meeting the other 10 objectives. Since 4 of the 10 did not even get started, this 5th objective could not be met. A sixth objective was only partially implemented in this first year due to an error in contracting. This objective was partially met.

Of the 5 objectives that were under the direct control of the Council or were fully operational in FY 2010/11, the Council fully met 3, and met 50% of more of the 2 remaining objectives. A very solid first year performance for tackling outcome based objectives.

Here's a brief summary of the 11 objectives and their status at the end of year one:

- Objective 1: Support the Basic Operation of the Council. Substantially met; 3 of the targets were fully met and the 4th was at 86%.
- Objective 2: CBVH will provide services on a fee-for-service basis to eligible individuals who are legally blind to enable them to meet independent living goals. One of the three targets was fully met (actually exceeded); the others were partially met.
- Objective 3 - Support a Statewide Systems Advocacy Network (SSAN) by developing local partnerships and coalitions, and engaging in community education about issues impacting people with disabilities, resulting in increased visibility about Independent Living, and at least one significant statewide system change. This objective was partially met. The RFP was delayed and once issued, the requirements did not match the plan, and so the outcomes in the RFP did not line up with the targeted outcomes in the plan.
- Objective 4 - Support direct consulting services and coaching to the statewide network of centers. The RFP for this was never issued, so the objective was not met.
- Objective 5 - Support youth leadership by providing sponsorships for youth to attend and participate in IL conference, national disability and youth leadership trainings. The three performance targets for this objective were all met and exceeded.
- Objective 6 - Support an annual training opportunity to promote the implementation of the Nursing Facility Transition and Diversion waiver in a manner consistent with the Independent Living philosophy, including best practices and technical assistance. The RFP for this was never issued, so the objective was not met.
- Objective 7 - Support a statewide consumer-controlled, non-partisan Get Out The Vote (GOTV) network for voters with disabilities to promote voter registration, voter education and use of the new accessible voting systems. The RFP for this

NYSILC Evaluation Report, FY 2010-2011

was issued, but no one responded to it due to some burdensome requirements, so the objective was not met, although some voter registration/education activities did take place.

- Objective 8 - Support statewide strategic media services and promote public awareness about IL in multiple media markets. This objective had three performance targets and all were met and exceeded.
- Objective 9 - Support a statewide consumer satisfaction survey for the CIL network. This objective had 3 performance targets and all were met and/or exceeded.
- Objective 10 - Support a consultant to establish an outcome-based evaluation SPIL plan that the council can implement and operationalize, including its use and development towards the next SPIL. While the intent of the objective was actually met, the performance targets that the Council had written into this objective were not met. The learning here is that the performance targets need to relate directly to the outcome.
- Objective 11 - Provide four \$30,000 capacity building grant opportunities for three years in a competitive RFP to Centers for Independent Living (CILs) and Service Centers for Independent Living (SCILs). The RFP for this was issued, but was issued late, and so the four projects were just getting underway near the end of the first year, so there is very little year one data and the objective was not met.

2011 SPIL Evaluation Details for Each of the Eleven Objectives:

- **OBJECTIVE 1:** Support the Basic Operation of NYSILC each year through September 30, 2013.

This objective is designed to measure the effective operation of NYSILC's administration. NYSILC met three of the four outcomes for this objective. The fourth outcome is not really a measure of NYSILC's management and should be folded into Objective 9 which addresses the consumer satisfaction survey. With that change, NYSILC would have fully met this objective.

Outcomes/Measurable Indicators with 2011 Performance Targets:

- A. Hold 3 council meetings.
 - B. 100% of the time NYSILC will complete its annual financial audit and file its 990.
 - C. 100% of the time NYSILC will submit its 704 report with the DSU to RSA.
 - D. 15% of surveyed consumers will respond to the CIL satisfaction survey.
- A. Council meetings are only considered to be those meetings where a quorum is present. At three of the four meetings a quorum was present, so this objective was met. This was documented by Council meeting minutes.

For next year, we recommend continuing the practice of only counting as full council meetings those where a quorum is present. This evaluation highlights the need to continually address inactive council members and strictly enforce

attendance policy and remove inactive members.

- B. 100% of the time NYSILC will complete its annual financial audit and file its 990
This outcome was met as the Finance Committee held meetings, finalized and approved the 2009-2010 audit (documentation is available in WORD and PDF formats) prior to the March 11th Full Council Meeting. This was documented in Finance Committee minutes of April 14, 2011 and the May full Council meeting minutes. Electronic copies of the reports were sent to the Council members on March 18, 2011.

Next year we recommend confirming with the CPA that the 990 process we use to approve it through the Finance Committee is appropriate versus going to the full council.

- C. Completed 704 report posted on website:
This outcome was met as the completed 704 report was posted to the website at www.nysilc.org/archives.htm and is further documented in an email sent on December 1, 2010.
- D. 15% of surveyed consumers will respond to the CIL satisfaction survey:
This outcome was not fully met. For the thirty-six CILs in the statewide network that participated in this survey, a total of 29,246 surveys were sent out and 3,707 consumers responded, corresponding to a response rate of 12.7%, or 85% of the targeted goal. While a response of 12.7% exceeds the typical rate for mailed surveys, the Council wants to keep the target at 15% and find ways to increase the response in the next cycle.

The undeliverable figures for surveys in 2010 were 1,595 or 5.59%, as compared to 578 in 2008 or 2.21%. It should be noted, however, that the much higher 2010 return rate includes dozens of surveys which were first returned to NYSILC with a forwarding address, and resent. All or most of the envelopes which NYSILC sent out were also returned unopened to NYSILC, and are included in the aggregate number and percentage of undeliverables. In the next cycle, these should be tracked and not counted twice since they were sent to the same respondents each time and thus distorted the figures.

Discussions have taken place within the Consumer Satisfaction Survey Subcommittee and at SILC Congress to revise the survey and methodology to increase the response rate. Some suggestions include:

- Increase the number of ways someone can respond (e.g. add in telephone or email responses)
- Review the questions and format of the survey to make it easier to respond
- Conduct a sample instead of sending to the full population, this would allow for a more intensive follow up protocol
- Use the media and/or local CILS warm up letters to promote the value of the survey and the data - show consumers how it benefits them in the long run to reply.

NYSILC Evaluation Report, FY 2010-2011

- Conduct a webinar with CILS staff prior to the survey to emphasize to them the value of this data and the importance of a strong reply. Encourage them to reach out to consumers (but not selectively!) to encourage a strong response.

It should be mentioned that NYSILC also met other deliverables associated with its annual contract with ACCES VR that were not specifically noted in the objective. They include:

- Maximizing cooperative, working relationships
 - Developing, distributing and posting a quarterly newsletter and Annual Report
 - Maintaining a website with timely information (www.nysilc.org)
 - Developing mechanisms to solicit and recruit new council members
 - Look into the feasibility of a statewide needs assessment
- **OBJECTIVE 2** - CBVH will provide services on a fee-for-service basis to eligible individuals who are legally blind to enable them to meet independent living goals each year through Sept. 30, 2013.

Two of the three outcomes for this objective were met. Solid progress was made on this objective, even for the measures that were not fully met, establishing a baseline for the outcomes and providing issues to follow through on to develop a better understanding about the objective and program.

Outcomes/Measurable Indicators with 2011 Performance Targets:

- A. 350 legally blind consumers receiving CBVH Independent Living Fee for Services.
 - B. 180 legally blind consumers receiving CBVH Independent Living Fee for Services will meet their independent living goals.
 - C. 3 additional CILs will be providing CBVH Independent Living Fee for Services.
- A. 350 legally blind consumers receiving CBVH Independent Living Fee For Services:
Based on information received from CBVH and their central database, 434 individuals received CBVH IL FFS during the past year, therefore this outcome was exceeded.
 - B. 180 legally blind consumers receiving CBVH Independent Living Fee For Services will meet their independent living goals:
Based on information received from CBVH and their central database, out of the 434 individuals who received CBVH IL FFS during the past year, 126 met their IL goals; therefore we did not meet this outcome.

Overall, 126, or 70% of our target of 180, consumers met their goals. Our goal had been for slightly over 50% of consumers to meet their goals. Due to the higher rate of consumers than expected, only 30% of them met their goals.

Further discussion with CBVH may help us understand more about these services and what would be realistic outcomes. We might want to review what is being measured, the duration of goals, what is considered successful and what is not. One idea is to build into the CBVH consumer satisfaction survey due in year two, questions about what services the recipients received, utilized or would want to use, and what barriers they faced in achieving their independent living goals. Another question might ask, of the services provided to these individuals, how many were provided by CILs.

It might also be helpful to survey providers about these questions as well, especially about barriers to achieving goals (besides lack of funding). The committee also plans to examine the 704 report data to see what trends develop.

- C. 3 additional CILs will be providing CBVH Independent Living Fee For Services: Based on information received from CBVH and their central and regional databases, SILO in Long Island was identified as the only new center providing CBVH IL FFS during the past year, therefore this outcome was not met. (33% completion)

This outcome could also benefit from further discussion. A list could be created of the CILs that currently provide CBVH services including IL FFS, and they can be surveyed to identify reasons why they continue to participate. Those who do not participate can also be surveyed to identify barriers to participation. NYSILC could then work with CBVH to promote incentives and remove barriers. It is believed that SILO was added based on ARRA funds which ended as of 9/30/11. We need to see if their funding will continue forward. In order to encourage better progress on this outcome, perhaps a communication, training, or technical assistance could be provided. It was shared that there is push back from some in the visually impaired and blind community to not have centers as providers of these services. This is another matter that NYSILC and CBVH may need to work through.

- **OBJECTIVE 3** - Support a Statewide Systems Advocacy Network (SSAN) by developing local partnerships and coalitions, and engaging in community education about issues impacting people with disabilities, resulting in increased visibility about Independent Living, and at least one significant statewide system change each year through September 30.

Outcomes/Measurable Indicators with 2011 Performance Targets:

- A. 1 SSAN significant statewide system change.
- B. 70 local partnerships and coalitions established by the SSAN network.
- C. 616 educational alerts disseminated to local volunteers by the SSAN network.
- D. 280 local public education activities engaged in by the SSAN network.
- E. 84 local grassroots organizing activities engaged in by the SSAN network.
- F. 70 oral or written public testimonies statements or letters provided, in response to a documented request, by the SSAN network.

NYSILC Evaluation Report, FY 2010-2011

Two of the six outcomes were fully met, and another two were very close to being met. This limited result is due in large part to the RFP and resulting contracts not aligning with the SPIL targets and therefore the work of the local sites and their reporting did not reflect some of these outcomes. In addition, there was no statewide coordinator for this project in the first year, further reducing the effectiveness of the reporting and the alignment with the SPIL. These have both been corrected for years two and three.

Overall, the activity of the SSAN sites took place despite the lack of an SSAN coordinator and the objective was substantially addressed. The activity is documented by data and deliverables identified in state contract. For the outcomes not met, activity did occur and in fact could reflect more the difference in contract deliverables and SPIL outcomes and the lack of a statewide SSAN coordinator along with a reporting system in place to document the new SPIL outcomes. As a result, it is recommended that when the new statewide SSAN coordinator gets started, the council works with them to support efforts to communicate the SPIL outcomes to them, makes sure that contract deliverables reflect them, and that reporting mechanisms are in place to document and capture the information.

The reported data reflects the contract requirements and not the SPIL outcomes. After the data was tabulated based on the contract requirements, it was converted over (when applicable) toward the current SPIL outcomes. Whenever possible, anecdotal information was utilized to apply towards these requirements as well. It should be recognized that there were a few situations where a site could have qualified for greater numbers under the SPIL outcomes (based on known performance), but did not reflect the information in their report because it was not required and not a deliverable under the contract. In these instances, there was no choice but to record a zero. Therefore, the fact that the outcome numbers fell short of their goals this year was due more to this reporting situation as opposed to any SSAN site's performance.

A. 1 SSAN significant statewide system change:

Two significant statewide system changes were achieved:

- 1) In June 2011, the network responded to educational alerts for state "complete streets" legislation. It eventually passed given the wide interests that were behind the issue. Governor Cuomo signed the bill into law in August 2011. It is designed to make streets and roadways across the State safe and accessible to all New Yorkers (pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists), including people with disabilities and considerations such as ramps, curb cuts, raised cross walks, and pedestrian cross signals, etc.
- 2) In addition, as a result of community organizing and a rally in Albany on March 15, 2011, the Community First Choice Option was acknowledged by the Governor and formally by the DOH Commissioner via a press release that the State would pursue the option going into the next Federal fiscal year. Therefore we exceeded this outcome.

NYSILC Evaluation Report, FY 2010-2011

It is important to remember that as statewide systems change results are achieved, effort must be put in to monitor their implementation, including enforcement.

B. 70 local partnerships and coalitions will be established by the SSAN network:

This wasn't a contract deliverable under the RFP, and so was not fully targeted or reported. A few sites commented on these in their reports. Others made mention of them indirectly or in an anecdotal way. Given these circumstances, to the best extent possible, it was determined that the network developed 61 partnership or coalitions during the year. In spite of the obstacles, the outcome was met 87%.

Next year, the ACCES VR contracts will match the SPIL outcomes and the reporting process should clearly identify this requirement and instruct SSAN sites to document the activity. Training should take place to verify that the sites are aware of the change. We anticipate a better result with more attention focused on this and with improved reporting.

C. 616 educational alerts will be disseminated to local volunteers by the SSAN network:

This was reflected in a contract deliverable, and therefore was directly addressed and reported on. They were referred to as "action alerts" in the contracts and the network responded collectively to 559 educational alerts during the year. The outcome was met 91%.

Next year, the contract will reflect the slight change in language to better match the SPIL outcome, and the reporting process should clearly identify this requirement and instruct SSAN sites to document the activity as restated. It may be helpful to conduct training to verify that the sites are aware of this change. NYAIL was recently awarded the SSAN statewide coordination contract. In February 2012, they have set up trainings with the sites to address reporting and other issues. Once the coordination contract is executed, then the site contracts will be amended to match the SPIL.

D. 280 local public education activities will be engaged in by the SSAN network:

These matched up with two contract deliverables that were referred to as "media hits" related to independent living and disability issues and "trainings" on these topics that were provided to local advocacy groups. This is different from the mandatory trainings of the SSAN or professional workshops that staff might attend. The network engaged in a total of 316 public education activities during the year. The outcome was exceeded by 13%.

Next year, the contract will reflect the language change to match the SPIL outcome and the reporting process will clearly identify this requirement and instruct SSAN sites to document the activity as stated. Training should take place to verify that the sites are aware of this change.

E. 84 local grassroots organizing activities will be engaged in by the SSAN network:

NYSILC Evaluation Report, FY 2010-2011

This wasn't stated as a contract deliverable. A few sites commented on these in their reports. Others made mention of them indirectly or in an anecdotal way. Given these circumstances, to the best extent possible, it was determined that the network developed 65 partnership or coalitions during the year. The outcome was met 77%.

Next year, the contract will match the SPIL outcome and the reporting process should clearly identify this requirement and instruct SSAN sites to document the activity. Training should take place to verify that the sites are aware of the change.

- F. 70 oral or written public testimonies statements or letters will be provided, in response to a documented request, by the SSAN network:
This aligned with a contract deliverable, referred to as "public testimony". The network provided 59 oral or written testimonies during the year. The outcome was met 84%.

Next year, the contract should reflect the slight change in language to match the SPIL outcome and the reporting process should clearly identify this requirement and instruct SSAN sites to document the activity as restated. Training should take place to verify that the sites are aware of this change.

- **OBJECTIVE 4** - Support direct consulting services and coaching to the statewide network of centers.

Outcomes/Measurable Indicators with 2011 Performance Targets:

- A. 5 CILs will use consulting/coaching service.
- B. 90% of CILs will have unqualified financial audits.
- C. 70% of CILs will have boards engaged in developing or monitoring strategic plans.
- D. 40% of CILs will have at least 50% non-IL funding.

During the 2010-2011 FY, the RFP wasn't issued, so no competition occurred, award granted, and as a result no data or information is available. This outcome not met.

The committee had wide-ranging comments. Recommendations for next year: The indicators are broad for the funding to be received by the 5 centers. It was noted that some measures for a different consulting objective had performance tied to the entire network. This was seen as somewhat inconsistent with other objectives. Discussion revealed that it was a way to measure impact related to center performance without singling out the situations that occurred at these centers. Perhaps consultant could recommend a qualitative way to measure performance? Last cycle, to protect confidentiality of centers receiving service, the vendor providing the service identified centers receiving the service, their need areas, and satisfaction with the consultation service. Also, the group asked is if should be sole sourced or put out to RFP. The peer-to-peer model was structured after APRIL. Brad will provide background information about their model to help describe the uniqueness of the model.

NYSILC Evaluation Report, FY 2010-2011

- **OBJECTIVE 5** - Support youth leadership by providing sponsorships for youth to attend and participate in IL conference, national disability and youth leadership trainings.

Outcomes/Measurable Indicators with 2011 Performance Targets:

- A. 6 youth will apply for youth sponsorships.
 - B. 4 youth will attend and participate in IL conferences or national youth disability trainings.
 - C. 0 youth will be appointed to NYSILC.
- A. 6 youth will apply for youth sponsorships:
This was implemented within a six month time frame, and 267% of the targeted outcome was achieved. Sixteen young adults applied for sponsorships across the state. Ages ranged from 17 to 28. While these represented a good geographical diversity, there was only one in New York City and none from Long Island or Western New York.

NYSILC will look at different ways to promote availability of young adult sponsorship next year in New York City, Long Island, and Western New York, including possibly increasing the groups they work with to accomplish this. This could include an expanded outreach to SUNY/CUNY, community colleges, regional work training programs (youth), University of Rochester grant (youth with Developmental Disabilities), Council for Exceptional Children meetings, comprehensive training centers (regional), BOCES programs.

- B. 4 youth will attend and participate in IL conferences or national youth disability trainings:
This was implemented within a six month time frame. All sixteen youths were approved, and fifteen attended. 375% of the targeted outcome was reached.

My Medicaid Matters, Washington DC - 13 attended
UNH 13th Annual Autism Summer Internship - 1 attended
Mobility International US: Spain Exchange - 1 attended

- C. 0 youth will be appointed to NYSILC:
Five youths indicated an interest in the NYSILC Subcommittee and three in possible appointment to the council. We will follow up with them next year. Independent of the group of sixteen youth, one other youth was appointed as the official youth representative in the first year to NYSILC as of January 2012. A second council member is also within the age range of youth representative. NYSILC therefore substantially exceeded the expected outcome.

For next year NYSILC will have the incoming youth representative on the Council be chair of the NYSILC young adult subcommittee and follow up with the youth indicating interest in the Council on the sponsorship questionnaires.

NYSILC Evaluation Report, FY 2010-2011

- **OBJECTIVE 6** - Support an annual training opportunity to promote the implementation of the Nursing Facility Transition and Diversion waiver in a manner consistent with the Independent Living philosophy, including best practices and technical assistance

Outcomes/Measurable Indicators with 2011 Performance Targets:

- A. 50 people participating in the NFTD waiver training.
- B. 10 CILs participating in the NFTD waiver training.
- C. 80% of participants which reported that they benefited from the training.

During the 2010-2011 FFY, the RFP wasn't issued, so no competition occurred, no award was granted, and as a result no data or information is available. This outcome was not met.

NYSILC will work with the DSU to develop a timeline for release of the RFP. This opportunity is still relevant despite the emergence of managed care waivers. NYSILC's role is to make sure that the training is consistent with Independent Living (IL) philosophy and measured in the evaluation by attendees. An evaluation question could be on a scale of 1-5, "I have a better understanding of IL philosophy following the training." NYSILC may also consider combining this training opportunity with IL conference to maximize training dollars, not duplicate training funds on hotel costs, and get the most from large group process.

- **OBJECTIVE 7** - Support a statewide consumer-controlled, non-partisan Get Out The Vote (GOTV) network for voters with disabilities to promote voter registration, voter education and use of the new accessible voting systems.

Outcomes/Measurable Indicators with 2011 Performance Targets:

- A. 15 network partners within the GOTV.
- B. 2,000 people with disabilities registered to vote within the GOTV network.
- C. 6 voter education issues addressed through the GOTV network.

During the 2011-2012 FY, the RFP was issued and nobody responded to the RFP. As a result, no award was could be granted. No data or information is available, and the outcome was not met. The RFP will be reissued in 2012. Informal word indicated that centers didn't apply for the RFP because of issues related to the RFP. It was finally determined that, given the lack of data for the objective in 2011, the Public Policy Committee would conduct a survey to determine the issues with the RFP. ACCES-VR agreed that based on the center feedback in the survey, the Public Policy Committee could recommend revisions to the GOTV RFP to be reissued in 2012.

While no network was set up this year, anecdotal data indicates that local centers did register some people with disabilities to vote.

- **OBJECTIVE 8** - Support statewide strategic media services and promote public awareness about IL in multiple media markets

Outcomes/Measurable Indicators with 2011 Performance Targets:

- A. 6 media hits that appear in statewide media markets.
 - B. 40 media hits that appear in statewide media markets, either purchased or PSA, as part of a statewide campaign to promote Independent Living.
 - C. 12 media hits that appear in local media markets by providing support to CILs.
-
- A. 6 media hits will appear in statewide media markets:
11 media statewide media were documented by NYSILC staff as being distributed to list serves. 183% of target.

In one instance, stories about the problems people with disabilities faced related to Hurricane Irene were posted, and ended up connecting New York City and upstate advocates. TK Small, NYSILC NY City liaison made contact with Disability Rights Advocates (DRA). They are a legal firm based in Berkeley with an office in New York City. Conference calls were set up to address how the City of New York and State (who was later dropped) have been remiss in the planning and provision of emergency preparedness services for people with disabilities. The City centers along with consumers and NYSILC are in a complaint filed in Federal Court regarding these issues.

This strategy of taking existing (which could include media generated) disability news and distributing it to statewide lists via email (62), Facebook (135), twitter (11), and LinkedIn (161) is a valuable and time intensive service. There were a total of 369 news stories broadcast this way. This has the potential of further redistribution. This strategy is based on the fact that news already exists, and you find it and promote it, making "spin" off of its further distribution.

This outcome was exceeded. We will proceed as planned.

For B and C the following process was utilized. A solicitation was put out to the IL network that inquired about interest in participating in this media initiative. Tim Cronin of Communication Concepts, worked with interested centers to help them develop a basic media plan. Before an effective targeted strategy could begin, a center would have to identify what its priorities were and what it ultimately wanted to market: programs and services, events and activities, fund raising, issues, connect to branding of the center, etc. Once this was identified, the most effective type(s) of media for their area to reach their audiences(s) and promote their message was then identified (old media - television, newsprint, and radio; as well as new media - social media such as Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, etc.). The media consultant would then help to negotiate and leverage the best plan based on the feedback from the center. The process would receive final approvals through the NYSILC office. The Centers located in Cortland, Albany, Troy, Oneonta, and Plattsburgh participated and created plans. The White Plains Center was added near contract yearend.

- B. 40 media hits that appear in statewide media markets, either purchased or PSA, as part of a statewide campaign to promote Independent Living:

NYSILC Evaluation Report, FY 2010-2011

Total: 414 media hits statewide consisting of leveraged radio ads. These efforts were directed for the Albany and Oneonta Centers. Planning was provided for the Plattsburgh Center. Their activity will happen at the start of next contract year. The White Plains Center will also have activity at the start of the next contract year. 1035% of target.

This was part of a statewide campaign to promote Independent Living. The strategy of the ad campaign at the local, regional, or statewide level focused on leveraging media buys, having impacts in markets across state. These ads provided awareness about local programs and increased center visibility. One measure was that Facebook activity increased.

This outcome was exceeded and we will continue as planned.

- C. 12 media hits that appear in local media markets by providing support to CILs:
Total: 16 local media hits supporting CILs. 133% of target

There were 15 ads in local newspapers including 8 front page banner ads, one banner ad on a newspaper's website, and a video for a Facebook page (103 views) were produced. (Documentation acquired by the center and forwarded by the media consultant to the NYSILC office). These had further spin offs in that the awareness raised in the media led to an article about women with disabilities, increased awareness of centers and their locations and services, and increased activity on a center's Facebook page. These efforts were directed for the Cortland and Troy Centers.

Six of the centers who received media services were surveyed. Five responded that all were positive.

- **OBJECTIVE 9** - Support a statewide consumer satisfaction survey for the CIL network.

Outcomes/Measurable Indicators with 2011 Performance Targets:

- A. 100% of CILs will receive the materials and participate in the survey.
- B. 95% of CILs will achieve a total consumer satisfaction survey rating above 90%.
- C. 90% of consumers will report that they are satisfied.

The following results are documented in the statewide report on this survey.

- A. 100% of CILs will receive the materials and participate in the survey:
2010 Consumer Satisfaction Survey: There are 42 CILs in the state and all 42 participated = 100%.
- B. 95% of CILs will achieve a total consumer satisfaction survey rating above 90%:
2010 Consumer Satisfaction Survey: All 42 of the CILs participating in the survey received ratings above 90%, so this outcome was met 100%. The lowest score was 91.13%, the highest was 98.77, and the average was 94.41%

NYSILC Evaluation Report, FY 2010-2011

- C. 90% of consumers will report that they are satisfied:
95.21% consumers statewide report they are satisfied. The range for each question was between 93% and 96%.

Overall: Objective met 100%.

While NYSILC works on survey results with the CILs in the statewide network, it should find a way to comment on the federal network that it is primarily responsible for via the State Plan.

As noted in the discussion of Objective 1, there is a need to increase the response rate in the next round of the survey. As a “value added” component, the data developed from the survey can be compiled into a report and sent to the CILs about actions they can take to further improve consumer satisfaction.

- **OBJECTIVE 10** - Support a consultant to establish an outcome-based evaluation SPIL plan that the council can implement and operationalize, including its use and development towards the next SPIL.

Outcomes/Measurable Indicators with 2011 Performance Targets:

- A. 90% SPIL objectives that are successfully completed on an annual basis.
- B. 90% SPIL objectives that meet performance targets.

As stated earlier, these outcomes do not measure the consultant’s work, but measure how well the overall SPIL plan was crafted and how effective the implementation was. As noted in discussions of other objectives, some were fully met, some partially and some not at all.

Those that had no results were generally due to the lack of an RFP or lack of contracts, not due to the work of NYSILC or the consultant. This reflects on overly ambitious estimates in the plan of how fast the RFP’s can be processed and also unanticipated barriers in the actual RFP documents/requirements.

Those that had partial results were generally due to either the late start and/or problems with the RFP’s and contracts, or with the goals not being achieved due to unforeseen situations, poor performance on the part of the implementors, or overly ambitious targets set in the plan. Further study is needed to ascertain which of these factors played a part and how adjustments may need to be made for years two and three. This is the “formative” part of the evaluation process. The goals as stated, focus on “summative” evaluation, or evaluation strictly of results. Formative evaluation looks at using the data to inform and improve the operation of the projects. NYSILC can use the data for both purposes.

For outcomes that were fully met or exceeded, again the same questions need to be asked from another perspective: were the targets too low, were the providers exceptionally effective, were additional resources made available? As these questions

NYSILC Evaluation Report, FY 2010-2011

are answered, successes can be capitalized upon and future plans can possibly have more ambitious targets.

- Only objectives # 5 (young adult sponsorships), # 8 (targeted media initiative), and # 9 (consumer satisfaction survey) successfully met or exceeded their outcomes, or 27% of the objectives.
- Objective # 1 (NYSILC operations) successfully met three of four outcomes and had a very active year. It was acknowledge that perhaps the one outcome they didn't meet wasn't an appropriate match to their duties or responsibilities.
- Objective # 2 (CBVH IL FFS) fulfilled its usual activity and purpose and met one of three outcomes, but could benefit from more information to help encourage participation and growth for the two areas that fell short of their goals.
- Objective # 3 (SSAN) was partially implemented (SSAN sites) and had issues due to the lack of a SSAN coordinator and the fact that the initial contract language did not match the SPIL in terms of targeted outcomes. In the end, the SSAN coordinator RFP was reissued. The net effect was contracts where data didn't quite match up to SPIL outcomes.
- Objective # 10 (this objective) was very actively addressed with significant progress made on the primary purpose of the objective. However, based on the situations and the way the outcomes were structured, it gives the impression that not much was accomplished.
- Last, objectives # 4 (CIL coaching), # 6 (NFTD waiver training), # 7 (GOTV), and # 11 (Capacity Building) either did not have RFP issued, had an RFP issued with no respondents, or the RFP was issued and awards granted in July 2011 leaving only a couple of months to execute contracts before the end of the year resulting in no data. These outcomes were not met.

A. 90% SPIL objectives that meet performance targets:

Out of thirty-six possible performance targets or outcomes, only 16 met or exceeded their goals, or 40%.

Citing the same rationales mentioned above, this lack of performance is not mostly due to objectives not being implemented on an administrative level or in some instances could be a matter of an outcome measure not reflecting appropriate language or criteria and needing to be reworked. It should also be noted that the SPIL evaluator commented that 40% isn't a bad outcome in the first year given the initial attempt at an outcome based SPIL, and the fact that one-third of the outcomes (12), were not acted on due to administrative problems outside the control of the SPIL. With these deleted, NYSILC fully met 67% of the performance targets, which is a pretty good initial result. Most of the outcomes not met (12) did not have funding expended - so money was not wasted. The rest had outcomes, some as high as 70 or 80% of the target, so again, funds were not wasted.

NYSILC committees need to pursue each of the outcomes in year two as noted

above to see whether the targets are appropriately set, resources appropriately allocated, systems effectively in place, etc, to ensure the best use of funds and the greatest impact on plan goals. Reworking some of these objectives into more outcome based language will help with this process, as will conducting conversations with providers and consumers to gather more detailed data in areas where performance fell short. In some cases timelines simply need to be reestablished to identify when objectives can be expected to be implemented and accomplished. In other cases clarifying language may be helpful to improving or documenting performance.

The committee asked, "What was the root of the problem in not meeting this objective?" The objectives that were successfully completed were under the control of the council. Two were new this year (young adult sponsorships and media) and had to have new outreach, time, budget, and program systems to set them up. The consumer satisfaction survey was also conducted, very time intensive, and successfully met. The NYSILC and SPIL consultant objective produced a lot of results (see below), but did not achieve the performance targets, which as noted above, didn't really measure the consultant's work. Even the SSAN which was challenged and did not have a statewide coordinator and inconsistent data had significant activity and respectable results despite all the issues. The real problem was with the issuing of RFPs. RFPs that either didn't get issued were issued and nobody responded, or was challenged. The SILC used to have a greater part in the implementation of the SPIL. It was reversed. This is having a negative impact on the SPIL. The group recommended that the consultant consider this and look into what the Developmental Disabilities Planning Council (DDPC) does because it is a Federally-mandated state council, responsible for a State Plan, and has the authority to issue their own RFPs. What can be done differently? The consultant will report back on this in year two.

As noted in the introduction to this report, there was a lot of work completed in the development of the evaluation system and strengthening the Council's ability to evaluate the plan. These include:

- Supporting, teaching, coaching each of the committee chairs and their committees to develop the methodology they'd need to evaluate the objectives assigned to their committees
- Facilitated discussions to explore ways to refine and/or expand the objectives to focus more on bottom line outcomes or impacts as well as on measurable activities. Drafts of these "value added" components were developed to be looked at in year two.
- Each committee developed an evaluation process that included identifying and gathering the relevant data, and developing a review and reporting process for the evaluation of each objective
- Conducting two formal training sessions at Council meetings to help members strengthen skills and understanding related to developing outcomes in relation to the plan priorities, refining the language and structure of the outcome to make it more measurable and relevant, and measuring the outcomes and objectives and working with the results.

- **OBJECTIVE 11 (Outreach Subcommittee)** - Provide four \$30,000 capacity building grant opportunities for three years in a competitive RFP to Centers for Independent Living (CILs) and Service Centers for Independent Living (SCILs).

Outcomes/Measurable Indicators with 2011 Performance Targets:

- A. 60 people served by identified target unserved/underserved population, at each site, or 240 in total.
 - B. 0 self-sustaining programs.
-
- A. 240 people served by identified target unserved/underserved population:
The RFP was issued and four CILs were awarded capacity building grants very late in the year (July). The projects are in different stages of development and start up, so there is minimal data available for the past year. Therefore, this outcome was not met.
 - B. 0 self-sustaining programs:

Since no projects were expected to be self-sustaining in the first year, this outcome was met.

In 2012 data will become available for evaluation of year 2. It may be helpful to invite projects to come to a full council meeting and present their projects and obtain descriptions about them for inclusion on the NYSILC website.

Overall: Objective met 50%.