

NEW YORK STATE INDEPENDENT LIVING COUNCIL, INC.



## **NYSILC 2017 SPIL Evaluation Report**

Consultant's Report on the First Year of the 2017-2019  
State Plan for Independent Living (SPIL)

Submitted by Alan Krieger

Krieger Solutions, LLC

April 12, 2018

## **Table of Contents**

Background .....	1
2017 SPIL Evaluation Findings.....	2
Summative Analysis – How well were the objectives and targets met?.....	2
Overview: .....	2
Summary of the evaluation of each of the objectives and consultant observations. ....	5
Goal # 1: NYSILC will be an effective coordinating, monitoring, and evaluating entity for the SPIL.....	5
GOAL # 2: People with disabilities will be actively involved in promoting disability rights in New York State. ....	7
Goal # 3: Members of the IL network will have their technical assistance and training needs met through a statewide event or initiative. ....	10
Goal # 4: The IL network effectively promotes IL philosophy through systems advocacy and services. ....	12
Overall Summary .....	14
Recommendations.....	15
Monitoring and Evaluation Committee Report <a href="#">- NYSILC 2017 SPIL Objectives/Evaluation Summaries</a> .....	19
Goal # 1: NYSILC will be an effective coordinating, monitoring, and evaluating entity for the SPIL.....	19
GOAL # 2: People with disabilities will be actively involved in promoting disability rights in New York State. ....	24
Goal # 3: Members of the IL network will have their technical assistance and training needs met through a statewide event or initiative. ....	30
Goal # 4: The IL network effectively promotes IL philosophy through systems advocacy and services. ....	33

## **Background**

This evaluation covers the activities from October 1, 2016 through September 30, 2017 related to the six objectives in the statewide plan for independent living. This is the first year of the plan and two objectives (#4 statewide database and #6 capacity building grants) were carried over from the prior plan. Objective # 5 is a new demonstration project and was delayed to provide enough time to develop an RFP and select the grantee. Therefore, the final (actual third) year of the project will be extended into the next SPIL using unspent Part B funds.

In this past year, the NYS Independent Living Council established a Monitoring and Evaluation Committee. The Committee's job is to conduct on-going monitoring of all projects supported by the Council and the Statewide Plan, and to conduct the evaluation at the end of the year. The evaluation consultant provided some training and orientation to committee members when they first formed and again prior to the start of the evaluation process. Having a dedicated committee seems to be an effective strategy. One committee can specialize and focus on evaluation, leaving the other committees to focus on the policy or operational issues they are addressing.

NYSILC staff, as always, did a great job pulling together the data and working with the committee to finalize the assessments. The evaluation consultant provided some comments and issues for the committee to consider in reaching their decisions. Some of these comments are recommendations for the committee developing the next Statewide Plan for Independent Living (SPIL) to consider as they draft the objectives and performance targets. The evaluation consultant did not review any of the original data, only what the Council staff pulled from reports and other documentation.

As noted in previous reports, the Council has come a long way with writing a more specific and measurable plan. The objectives and targets are more outcome or impact oriented; vague terms and standards have been defined more clearly to make the evaluation more objective. The new monitoring protocol will enable the Council to take a more active role in assessing success and to get an early awareness if issues arise, so they can be addressed during the program year rather than after the fact.

This year's evaluation consulting activities included helping develop the monitoring protocol and working with the committee to clarify the difference in their role as monitors and evaluators. We continued to look at "value added" components for each objective that focused more on outcomes and results. This will be developed into recommendations for the development of the next plan.

At the June 2017 Council meeting, additional training was provided for Council members on the evaluation process, as there were many new Council members. The training focused on developing outcome based goals and objectives to further the transition from process/activity objectives to outcome objectives. The outcome evaluation training materials developed by the

evaluation consultant are also included in the new member orientation manual.

The Monitoring and Evaluation Committee developed a process that relies on the NYSILC staff gathering relevant data:

1. From records for projects being conducted by NYSILC
2. From the DSE for projects that were handled through RFP's.

Some additional work was done to document some of the “value added” components. Continuing the trend from earlier years, the committee is paying more attention to the *actual impact* of the projects, not just the amount of effort that was expended.

NYSILC staff compiled the data late in 2017. The Monitoring and Evaluation Committee members reviewed the compilation in early January 2018. This committee had 3 members, at that point, including the NYSILC Executive Director who was serving as the committee chair. Written comments and assessments by the committee were transmitted to the SPIL evaluator who then drafted an evaluation report based on those comments. The small size of the committee was a concern, but additional members have been recruited and more active discussions are now taking place. However, the data reflected in this report is based on the initial discussions with a very small committee. The full summaries are appended to this report.

## **2017 SPIL Evaluation Findings**

### **Summative Analysis – How well were the objectives and targets met?**

Overview:

Most of the objectives in the SPIL are written more like goals than objectives. Most of the objectives are not written in measurable terms, but they have measurable indicators or performance targets that are specific and measurable. However, many of these indicators relate to whether or not certain *activities* took place or how many people *participated* in the activity, not what the impact was of the activity or how that furthers the Council's mission. Coming up with a final “score” for how well the objectives were achieved can be challenging.

This new plan has done a much better job of writing more realistic targets that are not too narrowly defined, and has shifted more of the targets to an outcome focus. However, in some cases, performance targets can be fully met, i.e. the number of activities/people served were achieved, but there may be no clear *impact* or *outcome* of these activities. The reverse is also true, some of the targets that the committee felt were “not fully met” due to data problems or technicalities were actually met when looking at the *intention* or *desired outcome* of the objective.

This evaluation report tries to show both sides:

- targets that were technically met, but may not result in any change or outcome; and

## NYSILC SPIL Evaluation Report 2017

- targets that were technically not met, but overall the objective was very well addressed.

The report is generally based on the technical rating – did the objective and indicators, as written, literally get met. In addition, the consultant added comments where a different rating would actually be more accurate.

There were 6 objectives active this year in the new 2017-2019 SPIL. Two of the objectives (#4 and #6) were carried over from the prior SPIL. #6 related to the last year of the unserved/underserved capacity building grants and #4 the statewide database project. The six objectives had 31 specific measurable performance targets set for this year. The Council has adopted a scale or range for rating each target and objective. The scale includes: Exceeded, Fully Met (100%), Substantially Met (at least 60%), Partially Met, Not Met/No Progress. This reflects the understanding that even when an objective or indicator is not fully met, if there was substantial progress, that has substantial impact and is worth noting.

Overall, based on strictly numbers, the Council fully met and exceeded the measures for one objective (#2) for the Statewide Systems Advocacy Network (SSAN). The other five objectives were substantially met. The fully completed rate of 20% is lower than any previous year. Four of the five (67%) were at least substantially met, which is slightly lower than previous years, but overall, the SPIL was substantially met for the past year.

Of the 31 performance targets, 14 exceeded the target (45%) and seven met the target (23%), so 21 out of 31 active targets were accomplished, a rate of 68%, which is similar to the past two years. For the first time, there were no targets that were Not Met or had No Progress. This reflects, in part, the Council's increased skill in developing more realistic plans that take into account the delays built into working with a large state operational process.

As noted in the introduction, these numbers do not tell the whole story. The reported results often show the extent of the activities that were conducted, but don't always reflect the intention of the objective or the target in terms of impact or outcomes.

The following table lists the six objectives addressed in the state plan, indicates how well they were met and shows how well the individual performance targets in each objective were met. The table uses the Council's rating scale that ranges from "exceeded" the target to a low of "not met".

- "Exceeded" means that a target was exceeded
- "Met" means the target was met exactly
- "Substantially Met" means greater than 60% and less than 100% of the target was achieved
- "Partially Met" means greater than 0 but less than 60% was achieved
- "Not Met" means nothing was achieved
- "No Progress" means the project was delayed or not started

NYSILC SPIL Evaluation Report 2017

<b>List of Objectives:</b>	<b>Exceeded</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Substantially Met</b>	<b>Partially Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>	<b>N/A or Other</b>
1: NYSILC will demonstrate its effectiveness and capability to manage the SPIL.			X			
<i>9 total targets.</i>	3	5		1		
2: New Yorkers with disabilities will be actively engaged in promoting disability rights through SSAN.	X					
<i>7 total targets.</i>	7					
3: Increase the attendance and involvement of attendees by providing support for a statewide independent living training conference.			X			
<i>5 total targets.</i>	3		2			
4: Designate funds to develop and establish a statewide database and interface.			X			
<i>2 total targets.</i>		1	1			
5: Address priority unserved and underserved populations and issues by providing one (1) \$72,000 demonstration grant opportunity.			X			
<i>3 total targets.</i>		2	1			
6: Improve the capacity of the IL network to address priority unserved and underserved populations identified in the statewide needs assessments.			X			
<i>5 total targets.</i>	1	1	1	2		

As noted, one objective was Exceeded, and the remaining 5 were Substantially Met. Therefore, overall, the Council Substantially Met the objectives for the first year of the plan. While the goal is always to meet and exceed where possible, if the objectives are written with some “reach” as many of these were, “substantially meeting” them is a strong outcome. In addition, one objective (#4) was fully met except for the processing required by NYS which takes some time, but is likely to be fully approved.

**Summary of the evaluation of each of the objectives and consultant observations.**

(For more detail see the SPIL committee's full report on page 19, which follows the consultant's report)

**Goal # 1: NYSILC will be an effective coordinating, monitoring, and evaluating entity for the SPIL.**

**Objective # 1: NYSILC will demonstrate its operational effectiveness and capability to develop, monitor, and evaluate the SPIL.**

This objective had nine targets, eight of which were Met or Exceeded. One was only Partially Met, so overall, the objective was Substantially Met.

An objective should show some change, an increase, decrease, etc. This objective states that the Council will continue to be effective. Since the Council has had this objective for many years and it has increased its effectiveness, especially in regard to monitoring and evaluation, this may not be as valid an objective going forward. This objective had nine performance targets or measurable indicators for success. Five of the targets are simply maintaining operational status, the other four are more outcome oriented and could be stated as objectives. Six of the targets were related to general operation of the Council and three related to program activities undertaken by the Council. Going forward, the council should focus the SPIL on fewer objectives that reflect measurable impact.

Of the six related to operation, five were routine and a sixth is a measurable change. As the Monitoring and Evaluation Committee noted in their review, there is no outcome for the routine indicators. They were accomplished... but the result was the continued operation of the Council. These should only be listed if there were problems in the past that needed to be rectified going forward, or could be combined into a single measure.

The five routine indicators were all Met, which simply means the Council conducted its administrative responsibilities:

- Hold four Council meetings with a quorum
- Annual financial audit completed "unqualified" and 990 forms filed fully, accurately.
- Annual 704 Report completed with partners and submitted to ACL fully, accurately.
- Annual SPIL evaluation and report completed by evaluator and committees
- CIL statewide consumer satisfaction survey and report completed by committee, network, and consultant

The sixth indicator was an increase in fund development. This is a new area for the Council and does show a change and increase as the objective. This was set at a very modest 1% increase and was Exceeded. This could continue to be an outcome objective in future plans as the Council continues to build this capacity. The Council may want to set a

more ambitious target for future years.

The remaining 3 indicators are more related to achieving the Council's mission than maintaining its administrative capacity and so are grouped under "program related" measures. They are also outcome related and could continue to be objectives in future plans.

1. Number of issues addressed by NYSILC committees: This is three targets in one.
  - The overall target was set at 12 issues and 13 were addressed, so this was Exceeded.
  - There was also a target to complete at least 4 of them and ten were completed, so this was also Exceeded.
  - Finally, there was a target to leave no more than four unresolved issues and only two were unresolved, so this too was exceeded.

This indicator has been strengthened from previous statewide plans. In the past it simply said a specific number of issues needed to be addressed. It wasn't clear what was meant by "addressed" – it could have been a single discussion. Now "addressed" means discussed and resolved through some clear action. This is a much stronger measure.

2. Number of young adults participating in a training sponsorship. Target: 12; results: 4 young adults participated this year. Partially Met.

NYSILC committees discussed this and agreed the Council needs to take proactive measures to market the scholarship given the decline in participation. The recommended measures were all created and implemented, and the Council hopes to meet this target next year.

The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) committee noted that simply participating in a training program is not an outcome, but only a process. The Council has added to its application the expectation that participants will do something following the training to increase their community involvement and/or take on leadership roles. Nothing was reported about the results of these four scholarships. Another possible outcome measure could be a demonstrated increase in advocacy skills. The (M&E) committee added two suggestions, that participants should:

- Give a presentation to the Council or a local group which could help document and demonstrate what they've learned
- Help recruit youth to participate in future years

The Council may want to talk with past recipients about what they gained from the experience and how that might be documented without being overly cumbersome. They could also explore with these recipients the idea of recruiting

youth in future years. For now, the Council can highlight these additional outcomes as “value added” elements and consider including language about this in the next SPIL. The key is to define the outcome the Council hopes to achieve from these sponsorships and how to measure this.

3. Number of young adults actively participating in NYSILC’s youth leadership subcommittee. Target: 5; Results: 8. Exceeded. (Note: “young adult” is defined as ages 18-28)

This has been a long-term objective of the Council and the Council has steadily increased its youth participation. Since there are a limited number of seats on the Council itself, the Council expanded this from youth being “Council members” to youth being “Council members or participating in the youth subcommittee”. The Council may want to adjust this measure to retain the focus on having a minimum number of young adults on the Council itself, perhaps with a target of two, and three additional youth serving on the youth subcommittee.

While the target of “participating” in the previous measure related to a training program was cited as not a true outcome, “participating” on a Council committee is by definition a leadership role and therefore an outcome of expanded youth empowerment. The catch here, is what “participating” means. Just showing up is a leadership experience, actively participating is much more powerful. I have observed young adults on the Council and they actively participate in Council discussions. A statement from the chair of the youth subcommittee confirming the active participation of the youth members would help document and strengthen this measure. Other indicators can also be identified, such as participation on other NYSILC committees, becoming a chair of a committee, or an officer of the council.

**GOAL # 2: People with disabilities will be actively involved in promoting disability rights in New York State.**

Objective # 2: New Yorkers with disabilities will be actively engaged in promoting disability rights through the support of a Statewide Systems Advocacy Network (SSAN) and a statewide coordinator working with priorities identified in the NYSILC statewide needs assessment.

This is an outcome objective in that it calls for a specific outcome: people actively engaged in advocacy efforts. The objective had seven targets and all were Exceeded, so the objective overall was Exceeded.

The seven Measurable Indicators/Performance Targets were:

1. Number of SSAN significant statewide systems changes. Target: 2, Results 7.

The Council has worked to tighten this measure by defining a “system change” as enactment of a law or regulation promoted by the network, or preventing enactment of a law or regulation opposed by the network. While the network can’t take full credit for these decisions, they can document that they contributed to these successful outcomes. This is the only true “outcome” measure of the seven. The remaining six all measure the activity the network undertook to help achieve this outcome.

2. Number of local partnerships and coalitions established by the SSAN network Target: 75, Results 119. Exceeded.

“Coalitions established,” while an outcome, is not nearly as impactful as saying local partnerships and coalitions who are “actively engaged” in promoting disability rights, or some other measure that shows the partnerships actually produce something. It’s also unclear if these are partnerships/coalitions newly established this year, or if these are active groups that may have been established in prior years. It might be interesting to show how many previously established partnerships continued and for how many years. That would show greater depth than establishing new ones each year.

This target and the ones that follow, are more activities than outcomes. The purpose of these activities is to promote disability rights and effect system change, which is the first target for this objective. These additional targets are activities in support of that objective. The committees have discussed in the past that specific outcomes resulting from these activities is very difficult to measure, but there are some indicators that could be used to show that these activities produced tangible movement forward. I would recommend adding that into future SPILs or recasting these targets as activities in support of the ultimate outcome of system change.

Using the target below as an example: “disseminating education alerts”, a way to measure if real change is produced could be that “as a result of these alerts, X# of consumers/families communicated concerns to an elected official.” This would be expensive and difficult to measure for all 600 alerts, but centers could be asked to choose several alerts each year and ask people to respond with what action they have taken. Since few will actually take action and then take the time to reply, this target will have to be set at a conservative level. The responses will show that the activity (alerts), led to some measurable change (consumers contacting elected officials). From that

sample, a reasonable conclusion could be drawn as to whether the alerts impact change.

3. Number of educational alerts disseminated to local volunteers by the SSAN network: Target 660; Results: 881. Exceeded

While the target was exceeded, the impact of the target is difficult to measure. There were 881 alerts sent, but were they about 881 different issues? The same issue? How many people received them and what did they do as a result? The same comment applies to most of the remaining targets below.

4. Number of local public education activities engaged in by the SSAN network: Target 300; Results: 483. Exceeded.
5. Number of grassroots organizing activities engaged in by the SSAN network: Target 90; Results 168. Exceeded.

The Monitoring and Evaluation Committee raised the question as to how many people were actually involved in the activities for the two above measures. This would be relatively easy to document and while it doesn't show impact, it would give a better sense of how substantive these events were. This could also show how many partners played a significant role in leading these events.

6. Number of oral or written public testimonies statements or letters provided, in response to a documented request, by the SSAN network: Target 90; Results 136. Exceeded.

The Monitoring and Evaluation Committee raised questions about what topics the testimony addressed and what the impact was of this testimony. It would be interesting to see if this lines up with the issues addressed by the State Council, and/or the issue alerts issued by SSAN. Impact will be difficult to measure, but if the testimony focused on a very limited number of issues, the progress made on each issue could be to a small extent a result of the testimony. This target may in fact be a result of the activities described above.

7. Number of CILs or SCILs without a SSAN contract voluntarily involved in the participation of the network: Target 2; Results 3.

It would be more meaningful to have a definition of what "involved" means. Also are these new to the network or continuing from previous years? What is the Council's goal regarding SSAN? Is it to continually grow the network by adding new CILs or is it to just have a small

number of additional CILs/SCILs involved? Objectives should usually relate to change, not maintaining.

**Goal # 3: Members of the IL network will have their technical assistance and training needs met through a statewide event or initiative.**

Objective # 3: Increase the attendance and involvement of attendees from the IL network, including affiliated stakeholders, by providing support for a statewide independent living training conference.

There were five performance targets for this objective. Three were Exceeded and two were Substantially Met, so overall this objective was Substantially Met.

This is a substantial investment of resources. The Council hopes to gain more than attendance and involvement at the conference. They hope attendees will return home and be more effective in their work. This should be reflected in the objective statement.

There have been several discussions as to how to measure this. An interim measure was to create a survey to be completed at the end of the conference to assess how much participants felt they learned or other measurable benefits of attending the conference. It also asked for their intention – how did they think they might implement these new learnings or use them back in their community.

An even stronger measure would be a survey sent two or three months after the conference asking people about what they've actually done. If email addresses are gathered as part of the registration process, sending out a short online survey is a very easy and low-cost activity. It's important to keep in mind when setting targets for this, that there will be a low response and of those who do respond, not everyone will take action within a three-month period. Therefore, the targets should be conservative and realistic.

Measurable Indicators/Performance Targets:

1. Number of people attending the IL conference with reduced registration costs: Target 200, Result: 369. Exceeded. Significant increase from prior conference.
2. Number of people attending the IL conference with reduced registration costs sorted by IL involvement: staff, board members, advocates, stakeholders, other: Target 100 staff, 25 board members 25 advocates, 25 stakeholders, and 25 other; Results: Substantially Met

The Council and NYAIL (conference sponsor) had difficulty measuring this outcome last conference. During this cycle, it was not addressed during the online registration process. Instead, it was assessed during the post-conference evaluation

process. Of the 375 people who attended the conference, 156 completed post-conference evaluations, or 42%. Of this group, the following results were achieved: 115 staff, 2 board members, 21 advocates, 1 stakeholder, and 17 other. This gives a mixed result on the range of targets (one exceeded, two partially met, and two substantially met). Overall, the outcome was substantially met so, these numbers represent a sample of the potential total number.

As stated in earlier evaluations, this measure is poorly structured. It would be nearly impossible to exactly meet this mix of numbers. A better measure would be to say that the goal is to have a diverse mix of staff, board members, etc., with approximately equal size groupings.

The next three measures were assessed by self-reporting through the post-conference evaluation (156 of the 375 people at the conference - 42%). The results below are a percent of the 156.

3. Percentage of attendees satisfied with their overall experience at the statewide IL conference: Target 90% Results 87%. Substantially Met.  
82 responded excellent, 40 good, and 14 satisfactory, total 136 or 87%.

Comment: As noted in previous evaluations, 90% is a very high bar. 80 or 85% would seem more reasonable.

4. Percentage of attendees who learned something useful at the statewide IL conference: Target 70%; Results: 75%. Exceeded.
5. Percentage of attendees who intend to implement a best practice or other idea at the local level: Target 40%; Results 70%. Exceeded.

While this only measures intention and not actual implementation, 70% is a strong result. Again, a follow up survey would help measure what actually occurred.

**The following objective was carried over from the previous SPIL 2014-2016 with unspent Title VII, Part B funds.**

**Objective # 4: Designate funds to develop and establish a database and interface that will compile, analyze, and interpret data from the statewide network.  
(Goal # 3)**

The objective here is not really to “designate funds”... but to develop and establish a statewide database for the IL network. The objective should focus on the outcome, not the process to get there. The two measurable

indicators below measure the process of developing and establishing the data base. Since this is a multi-year project, the measurable indicators for this initial year are related to getting the project started. (This a restart of a prior effort that was unsuccessful.)

Measurable Indicators/Performance Targets:

1. Vendor selection process identifies a viable candidate capable of developing product: Target 100% (i.e. Vendor identified). Results: Vendor identified and selected. Met.
2. Partners confirm resource commitment necessary to support project: Target 100% (i.e. funding is secured for the project); Result – funds have been designated and are awaiting final NYS contracting approval. Substantially Met.

**Goal # 4: The IL network effectively promotes IL philosophy through systems advocacy and services.**

**Objective # 5: Address priority unserved and underserved populations and issues by providing one (1) \$72,000 demonstration grant opportunity that can be evaluated by the council, be held to its own unique set of deliverables (outcomes), and subsequently provide a best practices manual for the benefit of the statewide IL network.**

Recognizing that it takes a year to develop and issue an RFP and award the project and execute a contract, this first year of the objective is really an administrative processing year. Similar to many of the targets in Objective 1, this has little value and is more of a place holder. In subsequent years, there will be more substantive targets based on the executed contract and these will be more relevant to the evaluation.

This objective has three performance targets that are all administrative in nature. Two were Met and one was Substantially Met, so overall, the objective was Substantially Met.

Measurable Indicators/Performance Targets:

1. RFP issued to CILs and SCILs for priority population and issue demonstration project: Target 100%; Results: RFP was issued. Met
2. Award recipient notified of selection to receive a grant: Target 100%; Results: Award made and recipient notified. Met

3. Contract executed for grant recipient: Target 100%; Result: contract in process. Substantially Met. (Note the contract was subsequently finalized and the project will focus on veterans with disabilities.)

**The following objective was carried over from the previous SPIL 2014-2016 with unspent Title VII, Part B funds.**

Objective # 6: Improve the capacity of the IL network to address priority unserved and underserved populations identified in the statewide needs assessment by providing ten (10) \$25,000 capacity building self-sustaining grant opportunities that can be evaluated by the council, disseminated, and documented for replication for the benefit of the network.

*This objective changed from 10 to 9 active programs so all targets were reduced by 10% to reflect this change.*

There were five performance targets for this objective:

1. **Number of people served** in identified target unserved/underserved population: (target 600/adjusted to 540). 353 new consumers were actually served (65% of target) so, Substantially Met. Comment: Simply by working with this population it does contribute to the objective of increasing capacity for service. An even better measure might be that the service resulted in a measurable change: e.g. an increase in ability to live independently.
2. **Number of community organizations contacted** related to targeted populations that are developed as a result of outreach efforts: (target 50/adjusted to 45) 114 contacts were made, so target Exceeded. Again, building a network of providers could well enhance the system's capacity, but since there is no indication of what these contacts amounted to, it could be a hollow accomplishment. A better measure would be: "XX agencies referred targeted consumers to the program and/or provided needed services to these consumers." That would truly enhance the capacity of the system.
3. **Amount of new funding secured** toward self-sustaining programs: (target \$166,664). During the past year, \$94,046 in new funding was secured, or 56% of the target, so Partially Met.
4. **Number of self-sustaining programs:** (target 8 out of 9, or 89%). Four projects became "self-sustaining" (44% of the programs, and 50% the target.) Partially Met.

The target for self-sustaining was set unrealistically high at 8 of initially 10 and then 9 programs. Four are self-sustaining which is a very solid outcome, but due to

the unrealistic measure, the target is only partially met.

5. **Number of “how to” technical assistance manuals submitted** to NYSILC: (target 10/adjusted to 9); 9 were submitted. Target Met. Again, there is no quality control here. “Submitted” is the standard. A better standard would be “manuals that provide sufficient information to guide replication” or something along that line.

Objective 6 was an ambitious objective and the primary purpose was to find better ways to serve unserved and underserved populations. All programs produced “how to” technical assistance manuals so the lessons learned could be documented and available to other centers to try to replicate this. There is no indication about the quality of the manuals, but if they are of a high quality the overall objective could be considered “fully met”.

While this target is a slight move towards outcome/impact evaluation in that a product had to be produced, not just a service rendered, there are no criteria for assessing the quality of the products produced. There could have been a statement that the products were of sufficient quality to enable other agencies to successfully replicate the programs and/or more effectively serve this unserved/underserved population.

Overall, this objective is technically only Substantially Met, but if the manuals are of a high enough quality, that would be a solid outcome that truly addressed the objective of increasing the IL system’s capacity to serve underserved/underserved populations. If that were the case, this could have merited being Fully Met.

## **Overall Summary**

Overall the SPIL had very strong results this year, even if only one objective was fully met. The M&E committee has added new strength to the evaluation process and has streamlined it as well. Terms are better defined and targets are more realistic and meaningful, although there is room for improvement.

When setting targets, it would be helpful to think carefully about the *intention* of the objective and what are some meaningful and measurable indicators that could show that progress is being made for the objective. Objectives and targets should indicate progress towards a desired change which is stated in the goal statements. The Council has come a long way from the start in developing outcome based objectives and indicators. Continued attention to this will create better and better plans and evaluations that measure meaningful results and impacts.

The SPIL should clearly state where the Council wants to be (goals) and how to get there (allocation of resources and measurable objectives).

## Recommendations

The above analysis of the results of each objective focuses on “summative” evaluation, or evaluation strictly of numerical results. Formative evaluation looks at using the data to inform and improve the operation of the projects. In the new state plan, the Council made an effort to continue the shift from objectives that were more activity based (measuring numbers served, numbers of events) to those that are more impact or outcome based (how the situation was overall improved). Some targets in the old plan were overly specific and detailed and were changed in the new plan to focus more on outcomes rather than specific outputs or activities – they indicate how things might change as a result of the plan’s efforts, not just what was done or what was produced. There is more to be done.

One helpful concept with this is the logic model that was presented in the training at the June 2017 Council meeting. The logic model asks:

*If the measurable indicators are accomplished, does it follow that the objective will be achieved and progress towards the goal will be made?*

It’s also important to ask if there are any other critical indicators that would help document this progress?

This is a very challenging shift to make and the Council should be applauded for the progress made. From initially having no objectives, to in an earlier SPIL having 14 objectives, each with multiple performance targets that were mostly activity oriented, to now having a smaller number of objectives that are more outcome focused, is a large step forward. Prioritizing the objectives to a smaller number reflects a better sense of the Council’s role in the SPIL, an effort to maximize impact in light of reduced funding. Continuing to add more elements that focus on outcomes will help promote the move to a more outcome based evaluation.

Developing a SPIL is a very large and challenging undertaking. The process rightly focuses primarily on how resources should be allocated. The time for writing objectives and performance targets is at the end when there is little time for reflection and revision. The involvement of the M&E Committee in writing the plan, could help add this focus to the plan development process. In addition, once the new plan is submitted, the M&E Committee can look at each objective and performance target and discuss with other related committees and staff, what they could do to further tighten the evaluation process and make it more meaningful. If the objectives are not specific enough, the committee may want to develop a more specific set of targets and negotiate these with the contractors involved, so everyone is clear what will be evaluated right from the start.

The Council’s evaluation process focuses more on assessing “yes” or “no,” was the objective met or not – the summative evaluation. It could be helpful to also look at “why” an objective was met, exceeded or fell short – the formative evaluation. Was failure due to poor planning, poor implementation, or unexpected factors, or influences outside the control of those running that program? What was the reasons for success? Were the targets too low, were the providers exceptionally effective, or were additional resources made available? Whatever the

reasons, the Council should look at what can be done in the following year to address these issues and continue to build on successes.

As these questions are answered, successes and failures can be analyzed and future plans can have more accurate targets. This can include lowering unrealistic targets or objectives, or increasing those that were understated. It can also include looking to reallocate resources or change program designs based on results of the prior year.

In several of these cases, adding quality criteria to the target (e.g. action alerts *that are responded to*), will bring down the number of “successful” outcomes, but will show outcomes that have a measurable impact, not just an activity.

The Council’s establishment of the M&E Committee and the development of the monitoring protocol will provide earlier and more detailed information that can help the committee answer some of these questions.

In previous years, a number of objectives had “value added” components. In some cases, these components measured additional outcome results, and in some cases, they dug deeper to measure impact oriented outcomes. As these questions were answered, more clarity could be seen as to the true impact of the programs and initiatives. This is the primary area for continued growth for the Council in terms of evaluation: how to evaluate whether the programs and initiatives they support are making a difference in furtherance of the mission.

Learning from the prior SPIL, the Council has built in more development time for some of the objectives. This may need to be expanded to all the objectives. All new initiatives need time not only for the RFP process, but for establishing the program, developing tools and procedures, building networks, etc. One strategy discussed earlier is to consider year 1 of the plan a startup phase and then extend the project into the following plan to allow it time to gear up and operate for 3 years.

The officers serve on the Executive Committee. These members also tend to chair and serve on other key committees. In prior years, many of the committees were involved in the evaluation, so the Executive Committee was tasked with evaluating the evaluation process overall and the work of the evaluation consultant. That was not done for the past two years. This may be another responsibility given to the new Monitoring and Evaluation Committee.

## Recommendations for Specific Objectives/Performance Targets

Objective 1: Performance Target: Youth training sponsorship:

The Council may want to talk with past recipients about:

- How to document/demonstrate what they learned
- Recruiting youth in future years

The Council may also want to consider adding in a mentoring component to this effort.

Objective 1: Performance Target: Youth involved with the Council:

Find a way to document the active involvement of youth on the Council and on committees. A brief statement from the chair of the youth subcommittee or of the individual committees on which youth serve confirming their active participation would strengthen this measure. The Council may also want to consider other potential targets.

Objective 2: SSAN

Find ways to document the impact of all the education and grassroots efforts using reasonable samples.

Objective 3: IL conference:

The objective should state the desired outcome – increased training for IL leaders, not increase attendance.

The survey should be carefully reviewed prior to the conference to be sure it addresses all key measures.

An even stronger measure would be a survey sent two or three months after the conference asking people about what they've actually done. Providing an incentive would increase response rates. This could include a discount on the next conference for those who reply to the survey.

Objective 4: Database

The objective here is not really to “designate funds”... but to develop and establish a statewide database for the IL network. The objective should focus on the desired outcome.

## NYSILC SPIL Evaluation Report 2017

### Objective 5: Unserved/underserved

This is a new project. Rather than list the RFP process, it would be better to say the objective is not active this year, pending start up.

### Objective 6: Unserved/underserved

Performance Target: Number of people served

An even better measure might be that the service resulted in a measurable change: e.g. an increase in ability to live independently.

Performance Target: Number of coalitions / partnerships

A better measure would be to indicate what these partners did to build the capacity of the network (the objective)

Performance Target: Number of “how to” technical assistance manuals submitted

A better standard would be “manuals that provide sufficient information to guide replication.”

The full Monitoring and Evaluation Committee report follows including detailed evaluations of each objective and performance target.

## Monitoring and Evaluation Committee Report

### NYSILC 2017 SPIL Objectives/Evaluation Summaries

**Goal # 1: NYSILC will be an effective coordinating, monitoring, and evaluating entity for the SPIL.**

**Objective # 1: NYSILC will demonstrate its operational effectiveness and capability to develop, monitor, and evaluate the SPIL.**

○ Measurable Indicators/Performance Targets:

1. Number of full council meetings held during the year with a quorum: 4.

- Preliminary Assessment: NYSILC successfully held all four full council meetings with a quorum during the year at the Troy Hilton Garden Inn on the following dates: November 4, 2016, March 17, 2017, June 9, 2017, and September 12, 2017. Outcome met.
- Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
Exceeded target/**Met target**/Substantially met target (more than 60%), Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other

2. Number of issues addressed by NYSILC committees: 12.

- Preliminary Assessment: Based on the information from the July-September 2017 NYSILC quarterly contract report (which also reflects the end of the contract year), thirteen issues were addressed by NYSILC committees during the past year. Outcome exceeded.

a) Action successfully completed by committees (target 4) Ten actions were completed. Outcome exceeded. A few examples included:

- Recruitment and Executive Committees Recommend New Candidates for Appointment for 2018: The Recruitment Committee vetted candidates and recommended the top candidates for the council in 2018. The Executive Committee recommended an action to expand the council to include all eight highly qualified candidates. The full council discussed and accepted the position to improve the viability and skill sets of the council. These candidates were reviewed with ACCES-VR. They created a Regents item and will submit them for action in December 2017.
- The Executive Committee worked between council meetings to promote and find replacement officers to successfully recommend a candidate slate for 2018-2020.
- The Development Committee successfully worked for eight months to discuss and plan the logistics to launch the NYS Disability rights Hall of Fame. Announcement press release:

<https://www.nysilc.org/news-announcements/79-nysilc-establishes-nys-disability-rights-hall-of-fame>.

b) Unresolved Issues: faced by committees: (target 4) Two issues were unresolved at the end of the contract year: 1) The statewide database issue (SPIL objective 4) and action on the Governor's Employment First Policy (the Commission's report). Since having fewer issues than the target is more desirable, Outcome exceeded.

- Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
**Exceeded target**/Met target/Substantially met target (more than 60%), Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other

3. Annual financial audit completed "unqualified" and 990 forms filed fully, accurately as documented: 100%.

- Preliminary Assessment: Based on the information from the January-March 2017 NYSILC quarterly contract report, the NYSILC independent fiscal audit was successfully conducted and presented to the Finance Committee on 2/7/17. Certified Public Accountant (CPA) Tom Hosey of Lubbe and Hosey reviewed the statement on the call with members and answered questions. He noted that NYSILC had an "unqualified" audit, which is the desired outcome. The Finance Committee formally accepted the audit and presented it at the full council meeting on March 17, 2017. The NYSILC 2015 990 was posted online at the following link:  
[http://www.nysilc.org/images/2015\\_990\\_Filing.pdf](http://www.nysilc.org/images/2015_990_Filing.pdf). Outcome met.
- Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
Exceeded target/**Met target**/Substantially met target (more than 60%), Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other

4. Annual 704 Report completed with partners and submitted to ACL fully, accurately as documented: 100%.

- Preliminary Assessment: Based on the information from the January-March 2017 NYSILC quarterly contract report, NYSILC worked with its partners to help complete Part I of the annual 704 Report. This included the NYS Commission for the Blind since they were still a state plan partner for FFY 2016. The partners successfully completed the report before the end of year deadline, but had to wait until the Administration on Community Living's (ACLs) new Management Information System (MIS) was functional to transmit the information. NYSILC and ACCES-VR received notification in March 2017 about the ACL MIS and submitted the 704 Report information. Staff had to connect with ACL to work through some technical issues. However, the report was finally accepted on March 22, 2017. The NY 2016 Part I 704 Report was posted on the NYSILC website at:

[http://www.nysilc.org/images/Final\\_NY\\_704\\_report\\_2016.doc](http://www.nysilc.org/images/Final_NY_704_report_2016.doc). Outcome met.

- Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
Exceeded target/**Met target**/Substantially met target (more than 60%),  
Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other
5. Annual SPIL evaluation and report completed by evaluator and committees as documented: 100%.
- Preliminary Assessment: Alan Krieger of Krieger Solutions provided support as the council’s SPIL evaluator. He worked with NYSILC staff and committees with SPIL objective responsibilities to guide the council through the 2016 evaluation, which is the last year of the previous SPIL 2014-2016. The 2016 SPIL Evaluation report was completed, reviewed and approved at the June 9, 2017 full council meeting. The full report is available at: [https://nysilc.org/images/2016 SPIL Evaluation Report .docx](https://nysilc.org/images/2016_SPIL_Evaluation_Report_.docx). Outcome met.
  - Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
Exceeded target/**Met target**/Substantially met target (more than 60%),  
Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other
6. CIL statewide consumer satisfaction survey and report completed by committee, network, and consultant as documented: 100%.
- Preliminary Assessment: NYSILC was the lead coordinator on the New York Statewide Consumer Satisfaction Survey project. Support was provided prior to surveying and during the process. Centers conducted surveys with varied methods between January to May 2017. NYSILC developed reports for each center, which were shared with centers and the DSE. The council then pulled together the collective data for consultant Alan Krieger of Krieger Solutions, who worked on a draft report. The final report was presented and accepted at the November 2017 council meeting. The consumer satisfaction survey committee will take the recommendations and consider what items will be implemented going into the next cycle. The 2017 NY IL Statewide Consumer Satisfaction Survey Report is available at this link: <https://www.nysilc.org/resources/key-documents/reports/260-2017-nysilc-statewide-consumer-satisfaction-survey-report>. Outcome met.
  - Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
Exceeded target/**Met target**/Substantially met target (more than 60%),  
Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other
- Number of young adults participating in a training sponsorship: 12.

## NYSILC SPIL Evaluation Report 2017

- Preliminary Assessment: Four scholarship opportunities were provided to young adults during the year. One young adult received a \$250 scholarship to assist with the cost to attend the Philadelphia Transgender Health Conference September 7-9, 2017. They are connected through Youth Power! and really appreciated the opportunity. Families Together in NYS, which still provides support to Youth Power, paid for the remainder of the costs. In a follow up on survey monkey, they wrote about the experience:
  - There was a great panel workshop that highlighted the various experiences of those within the trans disabled community. I will be putting together some information to share with the YOUTH POWER! team.
  - Thank you SO much for your support and making it possible for me to attend this conference. I really appreciate it. I have already told some other young people about this opportunity.

A second individual, who has utilized the scholarship before, attended the NYAIL statewide conference September 18-19, 2017 in Troy, NY. He is extremely active with the Rochester youth leadership group, "Youth Own." The Center for Disability Rights provided funds up front for him for the reimbursement. NYAIL's "Open Doors" Peer Outreach and Referral Program, a part of the Money Follows the Person (MFP) demonstration project, reimbursed other costs. He did not respond to the survey monkey link, but expressed his appreciation later in the week.

Earlier in the year, a young adult from Long Island was provided a scholarship opportunity to assist with costs to attend November NCIL board meeting, which was held just outside of San Francisco, CA. She participated in the online survey and voiced her appreciation for the funds, but also provided feedback about the possibility of expanding the parameters of the opportunity.

Another scholarship opportunity was provided to an individual from the Capital District to attend the 2017 Democratic National Committee (DNC) Winter Meeting in Atlanta, GA between February 23<sup>rd</sup>-24<sup>th</sup>. She was looking to get connected and work with individuals on the Disability Council. This would help her to be more proactive and to work with local individuals on common issues as an advocate.

One additional application was approved for an individual to attend the University of Youth Power in June of 2017. However, after follow-up, it never happened. He did not attend the event. No funds were transacted (since it is a reimbursement). So, it will be counted as an application considered and not as a youth attending/participating in a training.

The four scholarships are down from previous years. The decline began last year. As a result, NYSILC obtained feedback on the utilization of the scholarship from the Monitoring & Evaluation Committee and the Youth Leadership

Subcommittee. It was felt that NYSILC needs to take proactive measures to market the scholarship given the decline in participation. A set of steps were identified:

- First, it was noted that the opportunity should be renamed the Pat Figueroa Scholarship. They found the word “sponsorship” confusing.
- Create a concise Pat Figueroa Scholarship marketing opportunity in Constant Contact in time for the NYAIL Conference that can be used in the future and sent out monthly.
- Create a listing of youth groups at Independent Living Centers in the statewide network (and Youth Power!) with contact names and email addresses.
- Create an opportunity for local youth groups to apply for a stipend by completing a simple form capturing contact information with background information about their group if they agree to actively market the Pat Figueroa Scholarship.
- Update the Pat Figueroa Scholarship webpage (<https://www.nysilc.org/programs/pat-figueroa-program>) and create a YouTube video (<https://youtu.be/FKdjtFDCE8A>) to market the Pat Figueroa Scholarship.

The recommended measures were all created and implemented. Outcome partially met.

- Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
Exceeded target/Met target/Substantially met target (more than 60%), **Partially met target (less than 59%),** Target not met  
N/A or Other

2. Number of young adults actively participating in NYSILC’s youth leadership subcommittee: 5.

- Preliminary Assessment: There are currently eight members of the NYSILC Youth Leadership Subcommittee. They were actively engaged in online discussions in July and August to review and approve the two scholarship opportunities during the quarter. They also were active in helping to identify and provide feedback and producing some of the work relating to the new Constant Contact marketing email notice. Members also assisted with the local youth group contact listing, helped to distribute the local youth group application form opportunity, and participated in the filming of the YouTube video. Outcome exceeded.
- Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
**Exceeded target**/Met target/Substantially met target (more than 60%), Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other

3. Percentage increase of resource development efforts above contract (all other

sources): 1%.

- Preliminary Assessment: The council now has the capacity to develop resources per authority (B) in the new SPIL. The SILC can use operating funds to ideally support its primary operations and identified programs, such as the Leadership Development and Civic Engagement Program (LDCEP), Pat Figueroa young adult scholarships, the NYS Disability Rights Hall of Fame, and other opportunities as defined and supported. During the past year, NYSILC developed (all sources) \$18,067. \$2,354 came from fee for service/consulting revenue. Brad Williams provided services at SILC Congress, for a SILC-net webinar, and to speak at a ADA anniversary. \$4,834 was received in the form of unrestricted donations. \$2,000 came at the end of the year from Honorary Committee members for the hall of Fame. The rest were individual and business donations to the yearend appeal. The Association Development Group (ADG) gave an in-kind donation of \$10,075 for the cosmetic redesign of the NYSILC website. \$779 in interest and \$25 in miscellaneous revenue was also realized. Outcome exceeded.
- Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
**Exceeded target**/Met target/Substantially met target (more than 60%), Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other

**GOAL # 2: People with disabilities will be actively involved in promoting disability rights in New York State.**

**Objective # 2: New Yorkers with disabilities will be actively engaged in promoting disability rights through the support of a Statewide Systems Advocacy Network (SSAN) and a statewide coordinator working with priorities identified in the NYSILC statewide needs assessment.**

○ Measurable Indicators/Performance Targets:

1. Number of SSAN significant statewide systems changes: 2.

- Preliminary Assessment: The SSAN participated in the following significant systems changes, which were achieved during the past year:
  - **Kendra's Law Extended for Additional Five Years** Kendra's Law was due to sunset this year, which forces certain people with mental illness into assisted outpatient treatment. The NYS Office of Mental Health and the Senate were pushing to make Kendra's Law permanent and expand it. The disability community feels strongly that the State must continue to fund and expand voluntary, community based services for people facing mental illness. NYAIL and the SSAN agreed to support this bill because it was a far preferable option and would ensure the State continues to fund community based options. As such, NYAIL and several centers submitted memos of support for the bill and NYAIL issued an alert to ensure the bill passed by the end of session. A.7688 / S.6726 was passed by the Senate and Assembly this session and signed into law on June 29, 2017.
  - **Advanced Home Health Aide Bill Enacted!** NYAIL and the SSAN have

been advocating in support of the creation of Advanced Home Health Aides (AHHAs) for several years. This legislation created a new class of home care worker which would allow AHHAs to perform certain advanced tasks under the supervision of a registered nurse. Having this class of home care worker available will allow many more people, who were unable to perform these tasks on their own and who were not able or willing to self-direct, to live in the community with appropriate supports and services. NYAIL and SSAN providers worked with a wide cross-section of impacted stakeholders in support of AHHA. Governor Cuomo has supported AHHA legislation for the past few years and signed it into law in November 2016.

- **Step Therapy Bill Enacted!** Step therapy, also known as fail first, is a priority which NYAIL has supported for the past couple years. This new policy puts an appeal process in place for consumers whose prescriptions are denied by insurance companies due to high costs. For too long, insurance companies have forced patients to fail first on less expensive options, against the wishes and direction of their doctors. This new protection puts an appeals process in place in which insurance companies will have to respond within 72 hours to an appeal, and within 24 hours in the case of an emergency. While this practice has negatively impacted many people with different disabilities and health conditions, it has had a negative impact on people with auto-immune disorders and mental health disabilities. NYAIL issued a memo of support, which was circulated among the network during the legislative session. NYAIL also encouraged the network to participate in a rally at the Capitol in support in which at least one SSAN provider participated. NYAIL also issued alerts – both during the legislative session so it would be passed by the legislature and again geared toward the Governor. Ultimately, Governor Cuomo signed the bill into law.
- **Infant Protection Act Enacted!** The Infant Protection Act was intended to resolve problems with the Medical Indemnity Fund (MIF). The MIF helps children with neurological disabilities to live at home and out of institutions by providing needed supports and services. There were some provisions which were preventing the MIF from working as intended. This bill resolved many of those concerns. Now, the MIF will cover things like medical related transportation, habilitation, and respite – none of which were previously covered. It also asserts that it will cover health related costs that have a direct benefit to the consumer, even if others in the household will benefit from it. In the past, the MIF has denied things such as wheelchair ramps because others in the house may use the ramp. These provisions should help ensure that children have the supports and services they need to remain at home, as the MIF was originally intended to do. NYAIL issued an action alert asking people to call Governor Cuomo and urge him to sign this bill into law. In addition, NYAIL and many centers in the SSAN sent Governor Cuomo letters of support for this bill.

In addition, the following systems change actions prevented negative activity

from occurring:

- **Blocked American Health Care Act (AHCA), Better Care Reconciliation Act (BCRA), and the Graham-Cassidy Amendment!** Much of the spring and summer, the SSAN was consumed advocating against the repeal of the Affordable Care Act and drastic cuts to Medicaid. These proposals would have had a drastic and devastating impact on people with disabilities. While the SSAN does not typically spend so much time on federal issues, these health proposals were so harmful that NYAIL and the SSAN dedicated significant time to opposing these proposals in local Congressional Districts. New York State was identified as a key state which could stop the AHCA due to our more moderate Republicans which may be swayed to vote against it. NYAIL shared information on how the AHCA would impact people with disabilities, Medicaid, and the NYS budget. NYAIL also shared different webinars on the subject and issued several action alerts. In addition, NYAIL had an op-ed published on how the BCRA would harm people with disabilities in New York. NYAIL worked with a coalition of health care advocates around the State to protect Medicaid and fight against cuts to the program, the repeal of the ACA, and in opposition to the AHCA. We strongly encouraged advocates to join the organizing efforts being made locally and many centers were very involved in these advocacy activities. As a result, two NYS Republican members of Congress committed to voting against the AHCA – Katko and Donovan. Some advocates in the SSAN also organized their own, disability specific protests during the summer which received a good amount of media attention. A few advocates in the SSAN also participated with ADAPT in direct action in D.C. Outcome exceeded.

- Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
**Exceeded target**/Met target/Substantially met target (more than 60%), Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met, N/A or Other

2. Number of local partnerships and coalitions established by the SSAN network (target 75)

- Preliminary Assessment: The SSAN centers established 119 new partnerships and coalitions, exceeding the goal by 44 – a decrease from last year, but still far exceeding the annual target. A few examples of the partnerships and coalitions include:
  - AIM (Corning) helped found a committee of local disability providers that is working to ensure disability priorities are acknowledged in the DSRIP project.
  - WDOMI (Yonkers) has worked with Community Voices Heard (CVH), a statewide member led grassroots organization. Currently WDOMI is part of a CVH led coalition of organizations planning a Candidates Forum on Housing Issues for the Westchester County Executive Race.

- ILCHV (Troy) is a partner in a collaboration addressing sexual assault and domestic violence committed against people with disabilities. As part of this collaboration ILCHV is working with Unity House of Troy (the DV provider) and Samaritan Hospital (sexual assault provider). During August ILCHV conducted accessibility surveys of the offices and the DV shelter.
  - WILC (White Plains) joined the Hudson Valley Housing Alliance and attended a meeting with Westchester stakeholders to brainstorm increasing/promoting housing options for I/DD population; meetings will be held quarterly.  
Outcome exceeded.
  - Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
**Exceeded target** Exce /Met target/Substantially met target (more than 60%), Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met, N/A or Other
3. Number of educational alerts disseminated to local volunteers by the SSAN network: (target 660).
- Preliminary Assessment: Distribution of alerts is one of the areas in which SSAN centers are most active with a total of 881 alerts distributed to local volunteers. This was an increase compared to last year and exceeded the annual target. The NYAIL office disseminated 11 action alerts and the SSAN advocates collectively sent out disseminated 160 alerts to their local volunteers. Examples include:
    - Call-in Day to Protect Medicaid and the ACA!
    - Your Call Can Stop a Bad Budget!
    - Ask Your Representative to Co-sponsor the TIME Act!
    - Urge Congress to Fully Fund Affordable Housing Programs in FY18
    - Markup Tomorrow: Call House Judiciary Members to Oppose H.R. 620!
    - Provide Comments Today to Preserve Disability Protections!
    - Call Now to Oppose Graham-Cassidy Repeal Proposal!  
Outcome exceeded.
  - Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
**Exceeded target**/Met target/Substantially met target (more than 60%), Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other
4. Number of local public education activities engaged in by the SSAN network: (target 300).
- Preliminary Assessment: The SSAN Centers exceeded this goal by engaging in 483 public education activities in the past year. This exceeded last year's activity. Examples of local public education include:
    - The New York Times covered the BCID (Brooklyn)lawsuit against Uber, which charges the company discriminates against riders with

disabilities who use wheelchairs. Link: <http://dralegal.org/press/ubers-lack-accessible-vehicles-shuts-wheelchair-users-five-boroughs/>.

- ATI (Cortland) facilitated an ADA Celebration Event that featured Brad Williams of NYSILC and elected officials, including Senator James Seward.
- The RCAL (Utica) Systems Advocate participated in a radio interview with WOR/NBC Radio (A statewide affiliate) following a health care rally organized by the Governor's Office. The Systems Advocate discussed health issues facing people with disabilities in Ulster County, and the proposed Faso-Collins Amendment.
- The Systems Advocate for Independent Living, Inc. (Newburgh) spoke during a focus group hosted by the Orange County Department of Planning for the Coordinated Public Transit / Human Service Transportation Plan (CPTHSTP) on the need for a consolidated county-wide transportation network and the need for that network to be fully accessible for all.
- CDR's Systems Advocate (Rochester) coordinated a Legislative Breakfast at CDR's Geneva office. Invited was local legislators and local consumers to discuss disability issues. Outcome exceeded.

- Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
**Exceeded target**/Met target/Substantially met target (more than 60%), Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other

5. Number of grassroots organizing activities engaged in by the SSAN network: (target 90).

- Preliminary Assessment: SSAN sites reported a total of 168 grassroots organizing activities for the year. This was a decrease from last year, but still far exceeding the annual target. Examples of grassroots organizing activities include:
  - ILCHV (Troy) helped develop a consumer run transportation committee which will be meeting regularly to address transportation issues within the Capital District.
  - ATI (Cortland) organized a group of advocates to attend a Coffee with Claudia Tenney (R-NY) event and advocate for Disability Integration Act, TIME Act and against cuts to Medicaid and repeal / replacement of the Affordable Care Act.
  - RCAL (Kingston) organized a group to attend the Senator's Town Hall Meeting in the City of Kingston.
  - ARISE (Syracuse) helped to organized press conference with NY State Senator John DeFrancisco, AARP and the MS Society to urge Governor Cuomo to sign Visitability Tax Credit Bill.  
Outcome exceeded.

- Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:

**Exceeded target**/Met target/Substantially met target (more than 60%),  
Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other

6. Number of oral or written public testimonies statements or letters provided, in response to a documented request, by the SSAN network: (target 90).
- **Preliminary Assessment**: SSAN sites collectively provided 136 public testimonies during the past year. This was a slight decrease from last year, but still far exceeding the annual target. Examples of public testimony include:
    - Independent Living Inc. (Newburgh) provided written comments to the NY State Board Of Elections (SBOE) on their proposed changes to their administrative complaint process for Help America Vote Act (HAVA) administrative complaints.
    - STIC (Binghamton) submitted comments on proposed priorities for Disability Rights NY, PADD, PAIMI, and PAVA.
    - WDOMI (Yonkers) submitted testimony on proposed changes to Access-VR's policies involving self-employment and home modification/adaptive equipment.
    - ARISE (Syracuse) submitted written comments to NY Homes and Community Renewal on their 2017 Draft Action Plan.
    - AIM (Corning) submitted comments on the proposed P3I changes in the federal budget.
    - RCAL (Rochester) provided public testimony on the Graham-Cassidy US Senate Bill while in the Senate Finance Committee and explained its harmful impacts on the disability community. A copy was emailed to the Senate Democrats on the Committee in partnership with the Citizens Consortium on Disability and a copy was mailed to appear in the official Committee record. **Outcome exceeded.**
  - **Confirmation/Evaluation Rating**:  
**Exceeded target**/Met target/Substantially met target (more than 60%),  
Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other
7. Number of CILs or SCILs without a SSAN contract voluntarily involved in the participation of the network: (target 2).
- **Preliminary Assessment**: Three non-SSAN centers participate at various levels in the SSAN. Bronx Independent Living Services (BILS) regularly participates in NYAIL's Housing Committee and attended NYAIL's Legislative Day. They also attended the rally on March 7<sup>th</sup>. Taconic Resources was very active, participating regularly on NYAIL's Employment Committee and other advocacy activities. Western New York Independent Living (WNYIL) was active on NYAIL's Housing Committee, attended the SSAN training and participated on Legislative Day and the rally. **Outcome exceeded.**
  - **Confirmation/Evaluation Rating**:

Exceeded target/Met target/Substantially met target (more than 60%),  
Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other

**Goal # 3: Members of the IL network will have their technical assistance and training needs met through a statewide event or initiative.**

**Objective # 3: Increase the attendance and involvement of attendees from the IL network, including affiliated stakeholders, by providing support for a statewide independent living training conference.**

○ Measurable Indicators/Performance Targets:

1. Number of people attending the IL conference with reduced registration costs: (target 200).
  - Preliminary Assessment: Based on the documentation from registration forms, the total number of attending the IL statewide conference with a reduced registration was 369. This was a significant increase from two years ago (222) and far exceeded the target. Outcome exceeded.
  - Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
**Exceeded target**/Met target/Substantially met target (more than 60%),  
Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other
2. Number of people attending the IL conference with reduced registration costs sorted by IL involvement: staff, board members, advocates, stakeholders, other: (target 100 staff, 25 board members 25 advocates, 25 stakeholders, and 25 other)
  - Preliminary Assessment: The SILC and NYAIL had difficulty measuring this outcome last conference. During this cycle, it was not addressed during the online registration process. Instead, it was assessed during the post-conference evaluation process. So, these numbers represent a sample of the potential total number. There were 375 total individuals who attended the conference (369 had reduced registration). Out of these individuals, 156 completed post-conference evaluations, or 42%. For this outcome, the following results were achieved: 115 staff, 2 board members, 21 advocates, 1 stakeholder, and 17 other. This gives a mixed result on the range of targets (one exceeded, two partially met, and two substantially met). Outcome substantially met.
  - Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
Exceeded target/Met target/**Substantially met target (more than 60%)**,  
Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other
3. Percentage of attendees satisfied with their overall experience at the statewide IL conference: (target 90%).
  - Preliminary Assessment: There were 375 total individuals who attended the conference (369 had reduced registration). Out of these individuals, 156 completed post-conference evaluations, or 42%. For this outcome, the

following results were achieved:

- In their responses to overall satisfaction, 82 responded excellent, 40 good, and 14 satisfactory.
- Combined, these three satisfactory responses amount to 136. 136 divided by the total responses of 156 achieves a satisfaction rate of 87%.

Outcome substantially met.

- Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
Exceeded target/Met target/**Substantially met target** (more than 60%),  
Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other

4. Percentage of attendees who learned something useful at the statewide IL conference: (target 70%).

- Preliminary Assessment: There were 375 total individuals who attended the conference (369 had reduced registration). Out of these individuals, 156 completed post-conference evaluations, or 42%. For this outcome, the following results were achieved:

- 75% indicated that they learned something useful at the statewide conference.

Outcome exceeded.

- Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
**Exceeded target**/Met target/Substantially met target (more than 60%),  
Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other

5. Percentage of attendees who intend to implement a best practice or other idea at the local level: (target 40%).

- Preliminary Assessment: There were 375 total individuals who attended the conference (369 had reduced registration). Out of these individuals, 156 completed post-conference evaluations, or 42%. For this outcome, the following results were achieved:

- 70% indicated they intended to implement a best practice or other idea at the local level.

Outcome exceeded.

- Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
**Exceeded target**/Met target/Substantially met target (more than 60%),  
Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other

**Objective # 4: Designate funds to develop and establish a database and interface that will compile, analyze, and interpret data from the statewide network. (Goal # 3)**

- Measurable Indicators/Performance Targets:

## NYSILC SPIL Evaluation Report 2017

1. Vendor selection process identifies a viable candidate capable of developing product: (target 100%).
  - Preliminary Assessment: The NYSILC Database Workgroup met in May 2017 to review two final vendor proposals for the database project. During the 5/4/17 meeting, the group decided to end consideration of the proposal initially considered by Jeremy McGowan Enterprise Corporation (JMEC) for a short list of reasons. A new proposal was received by local vendor ES11 and partner Rocco Semeraro. There was a positive reaction, but the group wanted to interview ES11 like previous vendors to ask questions. During the 5/9/17 meeting, Rocco Semeraro of ES11 joined the call to review his proposal and respond to questions. Members felt satisfied with his proposal. Brad did background checks with his references, which came back positive. The council has used his services before. Brad submitted the ES11 vendor proposal to ACCES-VR for review in early June 2017.  
Outcome met.
  - Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
Exceeded target/**Met target**/Substantially met target (more than 60%),  
Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other
  
2. Partners confirm resource commitment necessary to support project: (target 100%).
  - Preliminary Assessment: In late August 2017, after ACCES-VR had an internal meeting about the issue, Brad Williams was instructed to submitted budget amendment materials to the DSE for the NYSILC contract to accommodate an additional \$125,000 in funding over two years to address the long awaited SPIL statewide database project. NYSILC and ACCES-VR spoke about the budget amendment, and other issues, at an October 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. NYSILC and ACCES-VR staff are finalizing the budget amendment materials. When it receives internal approval, the budget amendment will be submitted to the Office of State Comptroller for review and approval, which could take up to three months. The amendment seeks \$50,000 to address two phases of the project over six months in 2018 and \$75,000 to complete four phases of the project over nine months in 2019.  
Outcome substantially met.
  - Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
Exceeded target/Met target/**Substantially met target** (more than 60%),  
Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other

The following objective was carried over from the previous SPIL 2014-2016 with unspent Title VII, Part B funds.

**Goal # 4: The IL network effectively promotes IL philosophy through systems advocacy and services.**

**Objective # 5: Address priority unserved and underserved populations and issues by providing one (1) \$72,000 demonstration grant opportunity that can be evaluated by the council, be held to its own unique set of deliverables (outcomes), and subsequently provide a best practices manual for the benefit of the statewide IL network.**

- Measurable Indicators/Performance Targets:
  - RFP issued to CILs and SCILs for priority population and issue demonstration project: (target 100%).
    - Preliminary Assessment: The RFP was sent out to the center network in the spring of 2017 before Bob Gumson retired from the DSE/IL Unit. In our communication with ACCES-VR, there was a good response with approximately seven competitive applications received for the demonstration project. The DSE convened a review panel in the summer to review the applications and select a recipient. Outcome met.
    - Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
Exceeded target/**Met target**/Substantially met target (more than 60%), Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other
  - Award recipient notified of selection to receive a grant: (target 100%).
    - Preliminary Assessment: ACCES-VR communicated in late August 2017 that they knew the recipient of the demonstration project. Internal review, approvals, and communication with the recipient would need to occur first before making announcement to the council and the public. In early October 2017, it was shared that Taconic Resources for Independence, Inc (TRI) located in Poughkeepsie was the recipient of the demonstration project. They developed a brief description of their project to provide a “Special Populations/Housing and Transportation Demonstration Project” to reach unserved/underserved Veterans with disabilities. They will have a full-time veteran’s specialist to provide engagement in independent living services to obtain affordable and accessible housing and to help support and stabilize people in their homes and community. Outcome met.
    - Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
Exceeded target/**Met target**/Substantially met target (more than 60%), Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other
  - Contract executed for grant recipient: (target 100%).
    - Preliminary Assessment: Rookmini Mangal, new staff person in the IL Unit at

ACCES-VR, has been working with TRI to execute the demonstration project contract. The contract should be completed before the end of the year (December 31, 2017). This is a learning process for both parties and is something that should not be rushed. In addition, NYSILC learned from previous evaluations to not have over optimistic and irrelevant outcomes. Instead, it was left to have the vendor identify outcomes unique to their project during the RFP process. Once the contract is finalized, they will be shared with the SILC for monitoring and evaluation purposes. Outcome substantially met.

- Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
Exceeded target/Met target/**Substantially met** target (more than 60%),  
Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other

**The following objective was carried over from the previous SPIL 2014-2016 with unspent Title VII, Part B funds.**

**Objective # 6: Improve the capacity of the IL network to address priority unserved and underserved populations identified in the statewide needs assessment by providing ten (10) \$25,000 capacity building self-sustaining grant opportunities that can be evaluated by the council, disseminated, and documented for replication for the benefit of the network.**

o Measurable Indicators/Performance Targets:

1. Number of people served by identified target unserved/underserved population: (target 600/adjusted to 540).

- Preliminary Assessment: The target of 600 should be adjusted down to 540 now that the Southern Tier Independence Center (STIC) no longer has an active project. Collectively, the nine sites reported that they generated 353 new Consumer Service Records (CSRs) during the past year. This number represents 65% of the adjusted target. Based on feedback from previous evaluations, it is believed that the outcome was set too high. Future projects could also benefit from outcomes that represent the uniqueness of the population they serve. Outcome: substantially met.

- Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:
- Exceeded target/Met target/**Substantially met** target (more than 60%),  
substantially met. (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other

2. Number of community organizational contacts related to targeted populations that are developed as a result of outreach efforts: (target 50/adjusted to 45)

- Preliminary Assessment: The target of 50 should be adjusted down to 45 now that the Southern Tier Independence Center (STIC) no longer has an active project. Collectively, the nine sites reported that they made 114 community organization contacts (or partnerships) because of outreach efforts related to their target populations. Examples of selected community contacts from the

projects include: Employment Solutions, HR Bethany Village, GST BOCES-Odessa-Montour, Master’s Vineyard School, Chemung County SPCA, Cortland City Youth Bureau Advisory Board, Seven Valleys New Tech school, Tompkins Cortland Community College, Cornell University’s Tang Yan Institute, Burlington Coat Factory, United Way, North Country Center Association for the Visually Impaired, Legal Aid Society, Senior Citizens Council, Friends of the North County, Literacy Volunteers, WeCare Transport, Carmel Recreation, Putnam Valley Library, Patterson Library, Carmel Library, Reid Memorial Library, Putnam County Dept. of Health, Putnam Chabad, Church of the Holy Communion, Community of the Holy Spirit, Trinity Lutheran Church, Brewster UMC, Grace Assembly of God, Lakeview Community Church, Mount Lebanon Baptist, Our Lady of Loretto Church, Patterson Community Church, Red Mills Baptist, St. Philips Church in the Highlands, Second Kent Baptist, St. John the Evangelist, St. Lawrence O’Toole, St. Luke’s Lutheran Church, Temple Beth Shalom, Donovan Middle School, Mohawk Valley Resource Center for Refugees, laundromats, Library, restaurants and at the Department of motor vehicles, The Boxwood Alliance, AIP White Plains, Community helping Hand Ossining, JCC on the Hudson, YWCA White Plains, Ossining Recreation, the Carver Center, Eastchester Lake Isle Senior Nutrition Program, Yonkers Riverfront Library, Dobbs Ferry Senior Center, New Rochelle Public Library, Medina BOCES, Niagara Academy, Orleans and Niagara Counties BOCES. Partnerships ended up having a different value for each project. Some directly contributed to the outreach to the target population. Others provided opportunity, or access to an existing provider. A few of the partnerships were community points of interest where the target population frequents. The target of 50 should be adjusted down to 45 now that the Southern Tier Independence Center (STIC) no longer has an active project. Outcome exceeded.

- Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
Exceeded target/Met target/Substantially met target (more than 60%), Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
 N/A or Other

3. Amount of new funding secured toward self-sustaining programs: (target \$166,664).
  - Preliminary Assessment: Collectively, all nine sites tried to develop resources for their projects, or looked to leverage their funding. Based on the reports, about half of the centers/projects pursued several funding options during the year. However, the status of these proposals was either pending, or funding was declined. WNYIL received their annual distribution from the Tower Foundation (\$41,046). They formally ended their relationship with the foundation when the project closed. BRiDGES continued their contractual relationship with the East Ramapo School District (\$53,000). During the past year, this amounted to \$94,046 in new funding secured by these projects, or 56% of the target. Outcome partially met.

In other “value-added” funding progress reported by these sites, two centers

developed government funding opportunities for their projects. AIM received additional OPWDD family supports and services funding to support their youth programs. ATI hired a staff person to facilitate the different fee for service revenue opportunities for youth programs. Specifically, they have pursued ACCES-VR Core Rehabilitation Services (CRS), Youth Employment Services (YES), NYSCB pre-vocational and vocational services, and OPWDD pre-vocational and vocational services. Both were an undetermined dollar value, but will help to sustain the projects. Last, the WNYIL reported that they will receive a “No Wrong Door” grant through the NYS Office for the Aging. The multi-year funding will provide \$1.3 million in year one and just over \$1 million in each subsequent year.

- Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
Exceeded target/Met target/Substantially met target (more than 60%), **Partially met target** (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other

4. Number of self-sustaining programs: (target 8).

- Preliminary Assessment: Based on quarterly report information, out of the nine existing CBILCO projects, it was assessed that four projects will be self-sustaining. BRiDGES (Rockland County), AIM (Corning), and ATI (Cortland) all have developed the programmatic and funding mechanisms to support their programs in the future. A summary of their fund development is described above. NCCI (Plattsburgh) will also be self-sustaining. Despite several attempts to generate resources, their project was geared to develop best practices for access to health in their rural area. They will incorporate what they learned in their “how to” manual into day-to-day operations and practices, along with the networking opportunities that they have created. Four out of nine projects becoming “self-sustaining” establishes a result of 44%. Outcome partially met.
- Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
Exceeded target/Met target/Substantially met target (more than 60%), **Partially met target** (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other

5. Number of “how to” technical assistance manuals submitted to NYSILC: (target 10/adjusted to 9).

- Preliminary Assessment: Members of the Monitoring and Evaluation (M & E) Committee received nine Capacity Building Independent Living Center Opportunity (CBILCO) project “How To” manuals in mid-August 2017. WILC combined manuals for their two projects since they were essentially the same (healthy lifestyles) for White Plains and Putnam. As a result, the target should be adjusted down to 9. These were a deliverable for the project. Members reviewed selected draft manuals and sent back forms expressing what each center needed to do to improve their product. Final documents were

## NYSILC SPIL Evaluation Report 2017

all received by the end of September 2017. NYSILC will work with ADG to create a consistent format to convert the content for each manual. In 2018, one manual will be posted to the NYSILC website monthly and sent out to the network and NYSILC lists via Constant Contact to share the best practices of these projects. Outcome met.

- Confirmation/Evaluation Rating:  
Exceeded target/**Met target**/Substantially met target (more than 60%),  
Partially met target (less than 59%), Target not met  
N/A or Other