



NYSILC 2014 SPIL Evaluation Report

Consultant's Report on the First Year of the 2014-2016
State Plan for Independent Living (SPIL)

Submitted by Alan Krieger
Krieger Solutions, LLC
May 28, 2015

Table of Contents

Background..... 1

2014 SPIL Evaluation Summary 2

Summative Analysis 2

 Overall: 2

 Summary of the evaluation of each of the objectives and consultant observations. 3

 Summary 8

Formative Analysis..... 8

Recommendations 10

SPIL Committee Report..... 11

Objective # 1 – NYSILC Operation..... 11

Objective # 2 – SSAN 17

Objective # 4 – NYSCB IL FFS 23

Objective # 5 – Capacity Building 26

Objective # 6 – DVRN 27

Objective # 7 – CIL Coach 30

Objective # 8 – Capacity Building (first cycle ending 6/30/14) 32

Objective # 9 – Database..... 35

Objective # 10 – SSP 37

Background

The Council has done a very good job with the new SPIL and with the committees working on the first year evaluation to upgrade the objectives and performance targets compared to the last SPIL. In four years, the Council has come a long way. The objectives and targets are more outcome or impact oriented; vague terms have been defined more clearly to make the evaluation more objective. More work remains to continue to refine and tighten the objectives and targets, but overall the progress is very good.

This year's activities (2013-2014) included continuing to work with the committees to discuss how to evaluate the new SPIL objectives and continuing to look at "value added" components for each objective. These "value added" components are efforts to make the evaluation process more outcome oriented. The previous SPIL had mostly activity or process oriented objectives. They discussed what the Council or its subcontractors would be doing. The new SPIL has a few more outcome oriented objectives, but in the push to get it finished, many activity oriented objectives remained in place. So we are again looking to add some "value added" elements to bring more of an outcome orientation to the evaluation.

There were a number of targets that were not clearly defined in the SPIL (e.g. what is a "system change") and committees have taken steps to more clearly define these so they can be more accurately evaluated.

For this evaluation of the first year of the new SPIL, the same process was followed. Each committee held discussions to review the evaluation data collected by Council staff. The evaluation consultant was involved with many of these calls. A compilation of these evaluation summaries was made by Council staff and sent to the consultant. This report is based on those summaries. The SPIL Committee will review this report prior to its being presented to the full Council.

No additional training was provided for Council members on the evaluation process, but as new individuals continue to be appointed to NYSILC, this may be something to consider in the future. New members continue to be provided a link to the webinar recorded in year two. The outcome evaluation training materials developed and presented in year one were also included in the new member orientation manual.

Some of the objectives from the previous SPIL that had been delayed due to a slow RFP or contracting process were pushed back, and extended into this SPIL with the use of unspent Part B funds.

Most of the objectives in the SPIL are fairly straight forward to evaluate. They are written in measurable and specific terms and generally relate to whether or not certain activities took place, how many people participated in the activity, what the impact was of the activities, and/or how often or to what degree the activity was accomplished. Similar to the earlier years, each committee developed an evaluation

process that generally relied on the NYSILC staff gathering the relevant data from records for projects being conducted by NYSILC, or from the DSU for projects that were handled through RFP's. Some additional work was done to evaluate some of the "value added" components. Committees are taking more care to try to determine the actual impact of the projects, not just the amount of effort that was expended. One committee asked to have a supplemental survey done to get a more complete picture of the impact of a project. This is moving in a very good direction.

Each of the committees conducted their evaluation between November 2014 and early February 2015. Summaries were then transmitted to the SPIL evaluator who then drafted an evaluation report based on those summaries. The SPIL committee reviewed the draft report and this final report includes comments from the committee.

2014 SPIL Evaluation Summary

Summative Analysis

Overall:

There were 10 objectives in the 2014-2016 SPIL. One of the objectives (#3 IL conference) was not intended to have any work done this first year. The 9 remaining objectives had 39 specific measurable performance targets set for this year. Initially objectives and targets were considered either met or not met. Based on discussions in prior years, the Council has added a range of ratings including: exceeded, fully met, substantially met, partially met, not met/no progress. This reflects the understanding that even when an objective is not fully met, if there was substantial progress, that has substantial impact and is worth noting.

Overall, the council fully met 4 of the 9 active objectives (objectives 2, 5, 8 and 10) and the rest were substantially met (# 1, 4, 6, 7 and 9). The fully completed rate of 44% is more than last year (33%) and slightly less than the year before (50%). The 100% of objectives being "substantially met" is impressive and exceeds prior year results if this new standard were to be applied.

For the 9 active objectives, there was a total of 39 performance targets. Twenty-one exceeded the target and nine met the target, so 30 out of 39 active targets were accomplished, a rate of 77%, nearly reaching the very ambitious level of 80% (96% success). This is a substantial increase from last year's 55% and even exceeds 2012's 73%, which was high due to a number of targets being reduced to zero and then considered to be met. This shows substantial improvement in both setting more realistic targets and holding contractors responsible for meeting them.

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

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

Objective 1: NYSILC Operation.

This objective was revamped in the new SPIL to show more of an impact or outcome. In the earlier SPIL one target was that meetings were held or the 704 report was completed. In the new SPIL some qualitative elements were added to these targets – Council meetings had to have a quorum so business could be transacted. The 704 report was completed accurately and submitted on time to RSA. This objective had ten targets. Four were exceeded, 3 were met (70% met or exceeded), and 3 were substantially met.

While much of the Council's impact is measured in the accomplishment of the objectives that follow, there are other impacts worth noting as well. In previous reports, these included: maximizing cooperative working relationships; developing, distributing and posting quarterly newsletters and an Annual Report; maintaining a website with timely information; developing mechanisms to solicit and recruit new council members; and conducting a statewide needs assessment. These types of outcomes should be reflected in any full evaluation of the Council.

The committee evaluated the Council as only having “partially” met the accomplishment of objectives and performance targets. However, upon closer examination these were both “substantially” met. The target was to accomplish 60% of the objectives and 80% of the performance targets. Actual results were 44% of objectives (4 of 9) which is 73% of the target of 60%; and for performance targets 77% were met, which is 96% of the target of 80%.

Areas for further improvement include clarifying how many Council members actively participate on committees. The report shows the number assigned to committees, but does not indicate level of engagement. This was deferred due to the added administrative cost of collecting this information. There may be a simple, low cost way to do this and it is worth having the committee discuss this further. Similarly, having the Council or committees “address” an issue is a very vague standard. Even the term “issue” is vague. Some further definition of these terms could be helpful.

The consumer satisfaction survey had a very ambitious target of 30% participation, double the earlier targets which were not accomplished. The actual result of 19% was an improvement over prior years. A suggestion for future plans could be to set an “ideal goal” – something to strive for, such as 30%, and indicate a level that would be fully satisfactory, such as 15% or 20% which is more realistic.

The youth participation target is a great example of focusing on impact. In the past the number of youth participating was the target. This time around a second target was added as to the number of youth who stay engaged following the initial activity. That's the real goal of the project, to engage youth in an activity that leads to more long term involvement and leadership. NYSILC enhanced the application form to capture this information, and now notes up front that successful applicants will be asked for follow up information by replying to a questionnaire about their experience. This second target was exceeded, more fully demonstrating the value of this program.

There was also a third youth target – youth involvement on the Council – both on the youth subcommittee and the council overall. Both elements were exceeded.

Objective 2: Support a Statewide Systems Advocacy Network (SSAN)

This is another example of improvements made over the prior plan. A strong definition was made for what constitutes a “systems change”. While the committee found that there were six of these, when applied against the new definition, at least a few fall short. One part of the definition is that the SSAN coordinator will take a leadership role in the process and that SSAN providers would be substantially involved. Another element is that the change has to be statewide or lead to statewide change. It appears that at least three of the examples meet this enhanced definition, so the committee's rating of “exceeded” still stands.

Another target was the formation of partnerships. There is no standard for what constitutes a meaningful or substantial partnership. Three impressive examples are cited, but it's not clear how many of the 156 partnerships meet this degree of involvement. Having a clear standard for this would make this number more impressive and significant.

As noted in prior years, the number of education alerts, public education activities, testimonials, etc. is impressive. It would be very interesting to be able to show some impact in terms of getting more people involved or successful change of policies. This is difficult to measure, but worth continuing to consider.

Objective 3: IL Conference – this was not active this year.

Objective 4: NYS CB (formerly CBVH) will provide IL services on a fee-for-service basis to eligible individuals who are legally blind.

This objective had four targets. Two were exceeded, one was substantially met and the fourth had no final results, but had made great progress (increasing the number of CILs or SCILs providing NYS CB fee for services). The committee decided to send out a survey to centers that had had discussions with NYS CB to clarify the degree of progress made. Based on the survey results, it appears that there was great progress and it is likely that NYS CB will exceed the target in the second year of the plan. This points to the need for more careful planning in developing these targets.

The total number to be served was 350 and the actual number was 313 (89%), a substantial improvement over last year (263 or 75%). Another target looked at two possible impacts of the services – experiencing improved access and experiencing increased independence. The targets set were 100 (29%) and 125 (36%) respectively. For both targets 137 people (44%) achieved this, exceeding both the raw numbers and the percent of accomplishment. This is very similar to last year in terms of numbers (139 met their IL goals), but represents a lower percentage of success (last year was 53%). It is closer to prior years at 41%.

The fourth target related to securing 2 additional CILs to provide CBVH IL Fee for Services. This was not met, but there was significant outreach to 11 centers. A follow up survey showed that at least 2 are interested in becoming new vendors and 3 are looking to expand services, so that it's likely the target will be met next year.

Objective 5: Capacity Building

Learning from the last SPIL, the committee built in a year for an RFP to get developed and issued and it took that long for the process to move forward. Ten centers were awarded contracts in the next fiscal year.

Objective 6: Support a statewide consumer-controlled, non-partisan Disability Voting Rights Network (DVRN) for voters with disabilities to promote voter registration, voter education and use of the new accessible voting systems.

This objective had 3 performance targets: developing relationships with 20 network partners, registering to vote 3,000 people with disabilities, and addressing six voter education issues. The network developed 32 partnerships and addressed 6 voter education issues. Three questions raised in the last round and not yet addressed by the committee are:

- What constitutes a meaningful partnership, what must a partner do to be a meaningful collaborator?
- What constitutes addressing a voter education issue?
- What is a meaningful voter education issue?

These are difficult questions to wrestle with and will be difficult to precisely define. Tackling this discussion will help the Council better set performance standards in the future for other projects.

The third target was the number of people registered to vote. The website to accomplish this was delayed and as a result at the end of the year, only 177 people have been registered. However since that time the pace has accelerated and they have now registered over 1,800. They will probably not reach the full target of 5,000 by the end of the project, but are making substantial progress and have developed a tool that can be used in the future.

Objective 7: Support direct consulting services and coaching for the

statewide network of centers. *(Note: Krieger Solutions, LLC is the contractor on this project and this places us in a potential conflict of interest in evaluating this project.)*

The targets set for this project make it difficult to evaluate the project. There were four targets. One was the number served (an activity target). This target was 5 and the project served 9 centers, exceeding the target.

The other three were outcome targets, but were developed without a clear sense of the base line. It's also unclear on what number the percent of success is based – the total network of centers, or the total number served by the project, or the total number receiving a specific service. For example, one target is that no centers will have a “qualified audit.” It turned out that there were no centers in the network with a qualified audit, therefore this target was met before the project started.

Another target was that 70% of centers would have boards engaged in strategic planning. There is no clear baseline for how many are currently involved. The project served 9 centers, but only 4 were provided coaching in strategic planning. The committee based their evaluation on the 9 centers who received coaching, even though 5 of them were not targeted for strategic planning assistance and were not asked about this by the contractor. Only one of the centers was actively engaged in a strategic plan, but they were engaged prior to the start of the project. So the outcome could be zero or one. The other three centers involved in coaching on this subject all intend to investigate it in the coming year, with no guarantee they will move forward. This is another project where more lead time should have been built in.

The final target was for centers to have at least 50% non-IL funding. Again the contractor only asked the 4 centers involved with this aspect of the project. None were at this level and none have made substantial progress. It took a year to learn about this and begin to develop a fund development plan. Once the plan is completed, it will take at least several years to achieve the target of 50% non-IL funding.

The committee rated this objective “substantially met”. While progress has been made and services delivered, “partially met” may be a better rating for this objective, given the targets specified.

Objective 8: Capacity Building

This project had two targets: the number of people served and the number of self-sustaining programs. The number of people served vastly exceeded the target (277%). The committee’s report cited three substantial examples of the impact of these services, but there is no indication if these are typical of the 499 cases or are exceptions. Adding an impact target as was done with the fee for services objective would strengthen the evaluation of this objective.

The second target on the number of self-sustaining programs was met. The committee took time to develop a definition of what self-sustaining meant (“any effort

from obtaining funds, volunteers, expertise, or cost allocating to continue to provide programs and services to the target population after the grant ends”). When applied against this standard, all the programs had accomplished this. To the committee’s credit they wanted to extend this out into the future and agreed to have a follow up evaluation one year later to see whether this programs continued to be in operation.

Objective 9: Develop a Database

This objective has two targets. The first is the degree of accomplishment. This is difficult to measure without a clear timeline. The committee felt that on the basis of progress reported they had met the target. It would have been helpful to see a plan with a clear timeline so a more accurate measure could be made of the progress to date.

The second target was the number of centers engaged in the project. The target was 20% or 9 out of 44 centers. Eight centers participated so this target was substantially met.

Objective 10: Support Service Provider (SSP)

This objective had 6 targets active in this year. Many of these are difficult to measure as written. Several refer to a percent of progress made. Again, without a clear timeline, this is difficult to assess. Others refer to a percent outcome, but it’s not clear what the basis is on which the percent is calculated.

The committee made some decisions to clarify some of this. It would have been helpful to have this more defined when written into the SPIL. A number of the targets were set at 50%, figuring it’s a two year plan so they should be half way there in the first year. In reality, some of those targets had to be fully completed in the first year (and they were) to enable the project to succeed. These were rated as “exceeded” when in reality, they probably should have been rated as “met”.

Another target was for the number of SSPs who would be trained. The target was 2 and they have trained 5. The committee identified some follow up questions to find out more qualitatively about who the SSPs were (peers?) and to what level they were trained.

Another target was the number of deaf-blind individuals served. The target was 8 and the outcome was 18. It’s not clear from the report if most of the 18 had already been part of the program and was the 8 supposed to be new consumers? It sounds like there was only one new consumer served in the program. There is also no outcome measure for what constitutes good service or what the goals of service are. This would further strengthen the objective and the evaluation.

The final target was to make the program self-sustaining. The target is 25%, but again, does not indicate 25% of what. The report indicates that the program has made a lot of efforts, but has shown very little result to date. The committee rated it at 75%

successful. While it may eventually be successful, 75% seems a very high rating based on the reported results.

Summary

Overall the objectives had very strong results and the committees have done a good job of clarifying and defining the terms used for evaluation purposes. As noted above there are additional areas still in need of definition and specificity.

Formative Analysis

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 this new state plan, the Council made an effort to 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.

A number of the objectives show a clear shift in the direction of impact based performance targets and/or outcomes. 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 the last SPIL having 14 objectives, each with multiple performance targets that were mostly activity oriented, to now having a number of them that are outcome focused, is a large step forward. Continuing to include “value added” elements that focus on outcomes is a good strategy for continuing this development to 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. Committees may wish to begin the evaluation process on the first day of the plan implementation by looking at each objective and performance target and discussing upon what they would base their evaluation. If it’s not clear in the objective itself, 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? It could be helpful to also look at “why” an objective was met, exceeded or fell short. Was it due to poor planning, poor implementation, or unexpected factors, or influences outside the control of those running that program?

Whatever the reason, what can be done in the following year to address these issues (including possibly revising unrealistic targets or objectives)?

Some of the objectives far exceeded their targets. For these, the questions need to be asked as to whether the targets were too low, were the providers exceptionally effective, or were additional resources made available? As these questions are answered, successes can be analyzed and future plans can have more accurate targets.

Value added: 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 Chairs of each of the committees serve on the Executive Committee. Therefore it was decided to use the Executive Committee to help evaluate the evaluation process overall and the work of the evaluation consultant. Feedback from the committee was as follows:

1. How helpful and effective is the Council’s evaluation process as it now exists? What is useful about the process? How can it be improved?
 - It has been helpful to have definitions for what we monitor (i.e. what is self-sustaining?) as it gives us a model.
 - The evaluation process helps us to think concretely in terms of value added.
 - It helps for the council to view itself as being accountable and gives us specific targets for our outcomes. We have to take them seriously and periodically review our progress...mark how we are doing and change course if we need to.
 - It has developed into a good working tool.

2. Improvements: Is the value of what we are meeting or not meeting helpful to us? Will it continue to evolve? What does it mean?
 - Alan has included the “value added” to help us toward ensuring what we measure is valuable to us.
 - Building capacity should be a focus for us...moving towards measuring across SPIL’s to ensure that we are planning strategically and learning and growing over time as an entity. This should be a key component of what we are doing

today. Things like the engagement plan are things that happen over multiple years and we want to make sure we are planning for the long term.

3. How helpful and effective has the evaluation consultant been? What specifically has been useful about the consultant's training, coaching, facilitating? What could have been improved? What more would you like the consultant to do?
 - Brad has appreciated working with Alan and is very satisfied with our partnership.
 - Julie feels that Alan has been very helpful on surveys, and understanding the difference between services and goals from a NYSCB perspective.
 - Bob appreciates Alan's availability and the way he breaks issues down for us. He sets up a good model for us going forward. However, we may not need a consultant somewhere down the line during next three year SPIL. *Alan acknowledged that one of the ethical standards of a consultant is to try to work yourself out of a job. He could always do more training (so as to not maintain ongoing dependence).*
 - Alan has been very valuable to NYSILC. However, some of the committees still have issues with input and attendance among members. Perhaps he could help with this in the future.

Recommendations

As the NYSILC committees continue to analyze and evaluate each of the objectives, they can continue to assess whether the targets are properly set, resources appropriately allocated, and systems effectively in place to ensure the best use of funds and the greatest impact on plan goals. Continuing to work to increase targets that focus on the impact of these objectives will help with this process, as will conducting conversations and/or surveys with providers and consumers to gather more detailed data in areas where performance fell short.

In some cases, where an objective or target was "substantially met" they may want to consider whether the target was overly optimistic and needs to be scaled back or if there are strategies for improving outcomes in future years.

ATTACHMENTS FOLLOW - SPIL Committee report: detailed evaluations of each objective

SPIL COMMITTEE REPORT

NYSILC 2014 SPIL Objectives/Evaluation Summaries

COMPLETED 2014 SPIL Evaluation Summary:

Objective # 1 – NYSILC Operation

- Executive Committee
- 2014 Performance Targets:
 - Number of full council meetings held during the year with a quorum: 4.
 - Information/data:
 - NYSILC successfully held all four full council meetings during the year at the Troy Hilton Garden Inn on the following dates: Friday, November 8, 2013, Friday, March 14, 2014, Friday, May 16, 2014, and Friday, September 12, 2014. Outcome successfully met.
 - This is verified by the summary minutes posted on the NYSILC website under Full Council Meeting Audio and Minutes <http://www.nysilc.org/index.php/full-council-minutes-audio-and-minutes>. It acknowledges that there was a quorum at each meeting. The November 2013 meeting is in the archive link.
 - Value added: None/not needed.
 - Evaluation: Exceeded, **met**, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year:
 - Number of people actively serving on NYSILC committees (duplicated count): 35.
 - Information/data:
 - Based on the NYSILC 2014 Organizational and Committee Materials document/listing, the following active NYSILC committees (during the past year) had the corresponding number of people on their committees (duplicated count): Executive Committee (8), Public Policy (11), Finance Committee (6), Recruitment (5), Emergency Preparedness (12), Youth Leadership Subcommittee (5), Development Subcommittee (10), Consumer Satisfaction Survey Subcommittee (9), Outreach Subcommittee (9), Database Work Group (9), and By Laws Ad Hoc (4). Total serving: 88. Outcome exceeded.
 - This is verified by the NYSILC 2014 Organizational and Committee Materials document and the committee listing.

NYSILC SPIL Evaluation Report, FY 2013-2014

- Value added: it was felt that since 90% of Council members actively serve on one or more committees, they should participate in discussions at least 50% of the committee meetings, either during the meeting or in a follow up email/call about the meeting.

NOTE: While this is well intended, given the nature of how minutes are taken and summarized, it would be extremely difficult to document this activity. While we want to substantiate what we do, we certainly do not want to create more time documenting what we do versus actually doing it. There is a tradeoff.

- Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: Keep result for this year. However for next year, how track? Some participants don't always participate by conference calls. Can't just use attendance in committee minutes. After contract year, send out an email or call chairs and ask what percentage of members actively participated in committees?
- Number of issues addressed by NYSILC committees (12):
 - Based on the information from the July-September 2014 NYSILC quarterly contract report (which also reflects the end of the contract year) seven issues were discussed by NYSILC committees where progress was made during the quarter. When added to previous quarters: Total issues addressed by committees for the year: 33. Outcome exceeded.
 - Some of the issues by committee included:
 - The Executive Committee met monthly and discussed:
 - Update about the RSA Post-SPIL letter and agreement with regard to the technical edits, update about the employment initiative, update regarding the NYSILC website going live to a new platform, update on the Best Practices Webinar, update on details of the Leadership Development and Civic Engagement Campaign, and review and action on the 2015 appointments.
 - Public Policy Committee met in July to discuss the SSAN and define a significant statewide systems change and how to measure it.
 - The Database Work Group completed significant work online and in August on their data interface document and sent it out to the center network for input.
 - Unresolved Issues: NETXNY computer consultants and webmasters have worked with NYSILC on the new web platform. Effort needs to be made to finalize the new NYSILC website and installation of the new office technology by the end of 2014.
 - Successfully addressed issues: Governor Cuomo issued Employment First Executive Order # 136 in September 2014. The council played a key role in the process.
 - This is verified by NYSILC quarterly contract reports which were shared in the

NYSILC SPIL Evaluation Report, FY 2013-2014

full council meeting packets.

- Value added: Number of issues addressed was misconstrued to mean action alerts. This actually means the activity of NYSILC committees and the items of business addressed and documented by the groups.
 - Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year:
- Annual financial audit completed; “unqualified” and 990 forms filed fully, accurately, and on time: 100%. Based on the information from the July-September 2014 NYSILC quarterly contract report (which also reflects the end of the contract year), the NYSILC independent fiscal audit was successfully conducted and presented to the Finance Committee (and reported to the full council) earlier in the year. It was shared electronically to members. The NYSILC 2012 990 was posted online at the following link: [NYSILC 2012 990](#). Outcome successfully met.
 - This is verified by NYSILC quarterly contract reports which were shared in the full council meeting packets.
 - Value added: None/not needed.
 - Evaluation: Exceeded, **met**, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year:
 - Annual 704 Report completed with DSU to RSA fully, accurately, and on time: 100%. Based on the information from the July-September 2014 NYSILC quarterly contract report (which also reflects the end of the contract year), NYSILC worked with its partners to help complete the annual 704 report. The NYS 2013 704 Report is posted online at the following link: [NYS 2013 704 Report](#). Outcome successfully met.
 - This is verified by NYSILC quarterly contract reports which were shared in the full council meeting packets.
 - Value added: None/not needed.
 - Evaluation: Exceeded, **met**, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year:
 - CIL statewide consumer satisfaction survey: Percentage of participation (response rate) 30% and issuance of report of results: 30%. Based on the 2013 NYS Statewide Consumer Satisfaction Survey Report compiled and drafted by Liberteks for NYSILC, the collective response rate for the network was 19.3%. The full report was distributed and posted on the NYSILC website:

http://www.nysilc.org/images/FINAL_NYS_2014_Consumer_Satisfaction_Survey_Report.docx. This is an excellent increase from the previous cycle, but falls short of the target. Outcome was substantially met (60%+).

- This is verified by the report conducted by Liberteks which was shared at the November 2014 full council meeting.
 - Value added: Any issues raised in the survey should be brought to the attention of the IL network as appropriate. NYSILC will track any actions taken and any results.
 - *The question related to **being able to set my goals** had a lower (comparable to the other questions) satisfaction even though it still was in the lower 90 percentile. It raises the need to do an upcoming training in goal development.*
 - Evaluation: Exceeded, met, **substantially met (60%+)**, partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year:
- Percentage of SPIL objectives that are fully completed on an annual basis: 60%. In the NY SPIL, there are ten objectives. For 2014, objective # 3 related to the IL conference is inactive and not scheduled until the following year. This results in nine active objectives during the year. NYSILC developed new evaluation criteria for its objectives. It includes exceeded, met, substantially met (60%), partially met, no progress, inactive, or discontinued. For this outcome, it is an assessment of the nine objectives and how many were fully completed (having all of their active outcomes either exceeded or met). Objective # 2 related to the SSAN with seven outcomes (six exceeded and one met), Objective # 5 new capacity building (with just one active outcome met), objective # 8 old capacity building with two outcomes (one exceeded and one met), and objective # 10 SSP (six active outcomes, five exceeded and one met) were all fully completed. Other objectives were very close (# 1, 6, 7, and 9) with most outcomes exceeded or met and then the remaining substantially or partially met. So 4/9 completed or 44%. Percentage of SPIL objectives that are fully completed on an annual basis: 44%.
 - This is verified by a variety of documents available to NYSILC and mentioned in this report.
 - Value added: None.
 - Evaluation: Exceeded, met, substantially met (60%+), **partially met**, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year:
- Percentage of SPIL performance targets that are met on an annual basis: 80%. In the NY SPIL, there are ten objectives. They have a total of 56 outcomes or targets related to them. Not every target or outcome is active in 2014. NYSILC developed new evaluation criteria for its targets. It includes exceeded, met, substantially met (60%), partially met, no progress, inactive, or discontinued. Targets will be evaluated according to these new

criteria. Based on preliminary information, twenty-one targets exceeded outcomes, nine targets met outcomes, three targets substantially met (60%) outcomes, five targets partially met outcomes, and one target was not met. In addition, seventeen outcomes were inactive in 2014. When the first three are combined (exceeded, met, substantial) it amounts to thirty-three targets with significant results. So 33/56 or 59%. This is a very good result and almost achieved substantially met (60%).

- This is verified by a variety of documents available to NYSILC and mentioned in this report.
 - Value added: None.
 - Evaluation: Exceeded, met, substantially met (60%+), **partially met**, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year:
- Number of young adults participating in a training sponsorship: 10. Based on the information from the July-September 2014 NYSILC quarterly contract report (which also reflects the end of the contract year), three events increased applications to the sponsorships during the last quarter. Seven young adults and youths from ATI Cortland went to the one day rally of the National Council on Independent Living (NCIL) conference in Washington, DC in late July, five individuals went to the inaugural University of Youth Power event in Albany, NY in late July, and four individuals went to ADAPT activities scheduled in September. Added to the nine sponsorships earlier in the year, total youth and young adult sponsorships: 25.
- This is verified by NYSILC quarterly contract reports which were shared in the full council meeting packets.
 - Value added: 50% of participating young adults will, following the training, take on additional leadership roles and/or become more active in their community. (Data obtained from the applications or questionnaires).
 - Of the 25 applicants and participants, 76% identified activity in the community and some additional leadership. 24% did not and either chose not to identify the information or were just beginning the learning process.
 - Examples:
 - Many identified that they volunteered for their local ILC: (18).
 - ILCs directly identified - ATI, RCIL, CDR.
 - Many identified participation in local youth groups: (14).
 - Youth groups directly identified:
 - RCIL Youth Own (YO!) Group.
 - ATI United Voices of Cortland (YouthPower!).
 - Some identified volunteerism/participation in other community groups and activities:
 - YMCA, Habitat for Humanity, Red Cross Blood Drive, Red Cross, youth soccer co-coach, Fairport Methodist Youth Group, Fairport Methodist Church (teaching), The

NYSILC SPIL Evaluation Report, FY 2013-2014

Life Giving Word Center (church), serving as peer mentor for teens with disabilities, facilitating a youth summit at local campus, and volunteering at local daycare.

- Leadership roles include:
 - Serving on the CDR board of directors, serving on the RCIL board of directors, leading a committee as chair of the CDR Program Assessment Committee, serving on the ADAPT Youth Summit Committee (national), and the ADAPT Media Committee (national).
- Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
- Recommendations for Next Year:
- Number of young adults appointed to NYSILC or joining youth leadership subcommittee: (1). The youth leadership subcommittee reconvened in the early evening of September 4th. They discussed plans going forward with plans to expand upon the 2013 youth survey. They had two new members from the University of Youth Power event. This exceeded the target for the year by one. In addition, the Recruitment Committee identified that one of the new appointees to the council for 2015 is within the young adult age range and qualifies for one individual appointed to NYSILC which adds to exceeding the target of zero. Total youth: 3. Outcome exceeded.
- This is verified by Youth Leadership Subcommittee minutes (November 2014 full council meeting packet) and Recruitment Committee meeting minutes from the May and September full council meeting packets.
 - Value added: NOTE -there is a limit to the number of designated youth members on the Council and when there is already good representation, the goal is to keep other youth leaders engaged with the subcommittee, so they can be in line for future appointment when a Council membership slot opens up
 - Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year:

2014 SPIL Evaluation Summary:

Objective # 2 – SSAN

- Public Policy
- 2014 Performance Targets:
 - Number of SSAN significant statewide system changes: 2.
 - Information/data: The following significant systems changes were achieved during the past year (several other accomplishments were also listed in the report):
 - Disability Rent Increase Exemption. In August of this year, Governor Cuomo signed the Disability Rent Increase Exemption (DRIE) into law. DRIE benefits people with disabilities living in New York City who have fixed incomes and receive disability benefits such Social Security Disability Insurance, Supplemental Security Income, or Veterans Administration disability benefits. Before DRIE was passed this year, an individual would have to have an annual income below \$20,412 for an individual or \$29,484 for two or more people to qualify for the DRIE. This is compared to the Senior Citizen Rent Increase exemption that was increased to \$50,000 this year. This new expansion will prevent homelessness and preserve housing affordability for individuals with disabilities. While the impact is only NYC specific, NYAIL and the SSAN network advocated for the passage of this bill through Action Alerts and press releases.
 - Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act. On July 22, President Obama signed the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) which impacts many important laws including Title VII which addresses CILs and SILCs. The SSAN, centers, and advocates in our state and across the country were involved.
 - Accessibility Signage. In July of this year, Governor Cuomo signed into law a bill that removes the word “handicapped” and modifies the symbol used on new or replaced state accessibility signage. Many centers were involved (Westchester, Rockland) due to the sponsors. NYAIL participated in a bill press conference event.
 - Judge ruled that NYC failed to meet the disaster planning needs of people with disabilities. In November 2013, the Federal Court decided that New York City failed to address needs of disabled in emergency planning. NY City centers (CIDNY, BCID) were the lead in the suit. The SSAN supported the centers involved in the suit and the issue.
 - New York State’s long-awaited *Olmstead* Plan was released on October 13, 2013. This plan details how the State intends to comply with the Supreme Court’s *Olmstead v. L.C* decision of 1999. The SSAN, centers and advocates were involved in the process.
 - New York released their Community First Choice Option State Plan Amendment in the first quarter of the year. This occurred after years of advocacy by advocates.
 - Total number of significant system changes: 6. Outcome exceeded.

- This is verified by the 2014 SSAN Annual Report.
- Value added: Public policy met to define a statewide systems change and to keep track on significant progress on important issues. Definition will be shared with systems advocates.
 - A significant statewide systemic change as a result of the efforts of the Statewide Systems Advocacy Network (SSAN) must:
 - Create systems change for New Yorkers with disabilities and have statewide impact: Any implemented law, policy, regulation, procedure, practice, budgetary implication, or environmental change that affects New Yorkers with a disability would be considered a “significant statewide systems change”.. Significant systems change cannot be isolated to a region unless results ultimately have a statewide impact.
 - Blocking a negative law, regulation, budget decrease, program cut or lawsuit does not classify as a significant systemic change. However, these events have substantial impact and these successes will be classified as a *significant milestone*.
 - Significant progress made towards a statewide systems change does not classify as a significant systemic change, but will be recognized as a *significant milestone*.
 - Documentation of the above events must reflect a leadership role of the SSAN Coordinator and demonstrable participation by the SSAN providers.
 - Evaluation: Exceeded/met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
- Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
- Recommendations for Next Year: **Good. Satisfied with results. This includes the progress on the value added definition.**
- Number of local partnerships and coalitions established by the SSAN network: 70.
 - Information/data: The SSAN centers established 156 new partnerships and coalitions, exceeding the goal by 86. A few examples of the partnerships and coalitions established in this quarter include:
 - During this quarter AIM Independent Living began working with local restaurants in Corning to develop alternative format menus for people with disabilities.
 - Southern Tier Independence Center worked with local and statewide groups that have been advocating for additional Family Court Judges in NYS. The outcome of this partnership was bill A10139/ S7883, passed and signed by the Governor; locally an additional Family Court judge position will be created in Broome County. Backlogs and

time delays in Family Court have had a negative impact on children and parents with disabilities and we are hopeful this additional judgeship will benefit children and their families.

- Finger Lakes Independence Center had a meeting with the Tompkins County Office for the Aging to discuss a strategic plan that would meet the housing needs of older adults and people with disabilities. During the meeting FLIC advocated for accessibility, affordability and visitability.
 - Total local partnerships and coalitions: 86. Outcome exceeded.
 - This is verified by the 2014 SSAN Annual Report.
 - Value added: None.
 - Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: **Good. Satisfied with results.**
- Number of educational alerts disseminated to local volunteers by the SSAN network: 616.
- Information/data: Distribution of alerts is one of the areas in which SSAN centers are most active, and this year was no different with a total of 883 alerts distributed to local volunteers. During this quarter, we issued 13 NYAIL Action Alerts and shared educational information with the SSAN on many other emerging issues, presenting opportunities for additional alerts at the local level. In this quarter, the SSAN staff collectively disseminated 168 alerts to their local volunteers. Examples include:
 - Educated Governor Cuomo on the inaccessibility of Lever Machines and asked him to veto A09321A/S07371A.
 - Urged Senators and Representatives to support the federal Keeping All Students Safe Act.
 - Asked Representatives to not Co-sponsor or support the Murphy Bill (Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, HR 3717).
 - Urged Congress, President Obama, and the Secretary of Labor to raise the federal minimum wage to \$10.10 for everyone, including individuals with disabilities.
 - Urged support for the Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities.
 - Educated the network on Governor Cuomo's Employment First Executive Order.
 - Urged Congress to pass the federal Medicare Advantage Participant Bill of Rights Act (HR4998 / S2552).
 - Total educational alerts disseminated: 883. Outcome exceeded.
 - This is verified by the 2014 SSAN Annual Report.

- Value added: None.
 - Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: **Good. Satisfied with results.**
- Number of local public education activities engaged in by the SSAN network: 280.
- Information/data: The SSAN Centers exceeded this goal by engaging in 552 public education activities in the past year. Just during this quarter the SSAN network engaged in 130 public education activities. Examples of local public education include:
 - The Resource Center for Independent Living worked with new Oneida County Board of Elections Commissioners to design a voter survey to be used with the voting machine demonstrations throughout the community. This survey assesses remaining barriers facing individuals with disabilities with regard to registering and voting. RCIL discussed their agency's experience especially surrounding stigma of individuals who are deaf in the voting process.
 - The Finger Lakes Independent Center drafted a document that NYAIL distributed to advocates explaining concerns about the Reservations, Understandings and Declarations attached to the US ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.
 - Access to Independence of Cortland County, Inc. held an ADA Celebration Day. The purpose of this event was to highlight systems change accomplishments and raise awareness for current issues that affect New York and the Cortland community.
 - ARISE in Syracuse was featured in WSYR-TV 9 news story on New York State's Employment First Initiative. Link: <http://www.localsyr.com/story/d/story/gov-andrew-cuomo-pushing-employment-for-people-wit/30132/kQ9JUtkUSkSQTnU8prxBKA>
 - Resource Center for Independent Living had a letter to the editor published in the Utica Observer Dispatch in response to the paper's position that sheltered work should continue to be an option for those who cannot work in the mainstream job market. Link: <http://www.uticaod.com/article/20140920/OPINION/140919424/0/SEARCH>
 - Total public education activities engaged: 552. Outcome exceeded.
 - This is verified by the 2014 SSAN Annual Report.
 - Value added: None.
 - Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: **Good. Satisfied with results.**

- Number of grassroots organizing activities engaged in by the SSAN network: 84.
 - Information/data: SSAN sites reported a total of 162 grassroots organizing activities for the year. Examples of grassroots organizing activities that occurred this quarter include:
 - Independent Living, Inc. organized a group to discuss redistribution of program dollars to focus on moving Office for People with Developmental Disabilities participants from sheltered workshops to integrated employment.
 - Westchester Disabled on the Move recruited people with disabilities to serve on and advise the City of Yonkers disability advisory council.
 - Directions in Independent Living developed and distributed a Regional Transportation Needs Survey to demonstrate the need for increased transportation options. They hoped to receive over 5,000 completed surveys to produce a comprehensive report for legislators and funders.
 - Total grassroots organizing activities engaged: 84. Outcome exceeded.
 - This is verified by the 2014 SSAN Annual Report.
 - Value added: None.
 - Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: **Good. Satisfied with results.**

- Number of oral or written public testimonies statements or letters provided, in response to a documented request, by the SSAN network: 84.
 - Information/data: SSAN sites collectively provided 155 public testimonies during the past year. Examples of public testimony accomplished this quarter include:
 - Directions on Independent Living, Inc. met with Dunkirk Mayor and police chief, as well as an ADA compliance officer to address the August 20th WKBW-TV report of “New Law Restricts Operation of Motorized Wheelchairs” and in response WKBW-TV issued a revised statement of clarification.
 - Finger Lakes Independent Center sent public comments to Governor Cuomo, Howard Glaser (Office of the Secretary to the Governor), and Mark Blanke (NYS Department of State Division of Building Standards and Codes) on the proposed amendment to Section 906 of the NYS Fire Code about removing barriers to equal access to portable fire extinguishers for individuals with disabilities.
 - Independent Living Inc. provided written testimony on the Office for People with Developmental Disabilities’ Transformation Plan.

- Several SSAN centers including Southern Tier Independence Center and AIM Independent Living Center provided comments to the Justice Department about its proposed rules for movie captioning and audio descriptions.
 - Total number of public testimonies: 155. Outcome exceeded.
 - This is verified by the 2014 SSAN Annual Report.
 - Value added: None.
 - Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: **Good. Satisfied with results.**
- Number of CILs or SCILs without a SSAN contract voluntarily involved in the participation of the network: 2.
- Information/data: On September 11th, NYAIL hosted Part III of the Communication Outreach and Education Training facilitated by the Association Development Group (ADG), a woman owned business. This year's training helped centers identify ways to build upon and leverage existing partnerships and community based programs. Representatives from both SSAN and non-SSAN centers were invited to attend the training. Two non-SSAN centers, Center for Disability Rights and Taconic Resources, sent advocates to the training. These two centers, and other non-SSAN centers, participated in action alerts throughout the year based on connection to each issue. Going into 2015, center participation in action alerts (SSAN and non-SSAN) will be identifiable with the new online format. Total number non-SSAN centers involved in network: 2. Outcome successfully met.
 - This is verified by the 2014 SSAN Annual Report.
 - Value added: Definition of participation and agreement to participate in the action alerts and receive training to work on the outcomes.
 - Evaluation: Exceeded, **met**, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: **Good. Satisfied with results.**
Overall, the group appreciated examples shared in the different outcomes of different SSAN sites. It was also pointed out that the SSAN network achieved these results during the first year of the SPIL while experiencing contract difficulties. It raises the question if the SSAN might be better staggered between SPILs (years 2, 3 and year 1 new SPIL).

2014 SPIL Evaluation Summary:

Objective # 4 – NYSCB IL FFS

- Consumer Satisfaction Survey Subcommittee
- 2014 Performance Targets:
 - Number of legally blind consumers receiving CBVH Independent Living Fee-For-Service (FFS): 350.
 - Information/data: Based on information received from NYSCB and their central database, 313 individuals received NYSCB IL FFS during the past year. This reflected almost 90% progress toward the outcomes. It increased from the year before (compared to 263 individuals) and the subcommittee reflected last year that perhaps the trend is for less consumers being served but achieving better results. This will be measured in additional outcomes. Time will tell if this trend will continue in future years, or if demand will increase service activity. Total number of legally blind consumers receiving NYSCB FFS: 313.
 - This is verified by information gathered from the NYSCB Computerized Case Management System (CIS) and or Central Office/District Office records.
 - Value added: None.
 - Evaluation: Exceeded, met, **substantially met (60%+)**, partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: **Committee agrees that this is solid progress toward the current outcome (89%). It also reflects a little more than a 16% increase compared to last year's amount (263 versus 313). The group will continue to monitor its progress.**
 - Increase in the number of CILs or SCILs providing CBVH Fee-For-Service (FFS): 2.
 - Information/data: During the past year, no CILs or SCILs were added to the existing group to increase the number providing NYSCB IL Fee-For-Services. However, NYSCB staff met with twelve centers and felt confident that it helped to further develop positive relationships that should lead to potential opportunities in the future. NYSCB continues to cultivate and appreciate the necessary and unique services provided by the centers. The meetings gave both parties a chance to reacquaint themselves with the services provided by each other. Follow up regarding service needs in each territory and how centers can become an IL FFS provider for NYSCB is anticipated. Some of the centers participating included SICIL, BCID, BILS, ATI, RCIL (Utica), RCAL, DILS, CDR and RCIL (Rochester centers). Increase in the number of CILs or SCILs providing NYSCB FFS: 0.
 - This is verified by information gathered from the NYSCB Computerized Case Management System (CIS) and or Central Office/District Office records.

- Value added: None.
 - Evaluation: Exceeded, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, **more information needed**, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - **Recommendations for Next Year: First, even though no new CILs or SCILs successfully provided the service during the year, the committee did not feel that the given evaluation choices were accurate. Instead, a new choice of “more information needed” was created and selected for this target. This was due to the fact that meetings took place between NYSCB and several centers. It is just unfortunate that no opportunities were realized during the year. Julie added that a placement services contract will award nine centers with opportunities next year. As a result, the group felt that Brad should draft a brief (1-5 questions) follow up survey for the centers that participated in the meetings with NYSCB. Try to identify what happened. Were services identified that could be provided? How about follow up? Brad will share the draft before sending it out to the centers.**
- Number of legally blind consumers who receive services and experience improved access at home or in the community: 100.
 - Information/data: Based on information received from NYSCB and their central database/district office records, out of the individuals who received NYSCB IL FFS during the past year, one hundred thirty-seven legally blind consumers experience improved access at home or in the community. This is a new impact/outcome and is verified by records. While this exceeds the outcome, it is also important to note that 137/313 consumers who received this service achieved the result, or 44%. Total number of legally blind consumers who receive services and experience improved access at home or in the community: 137.
 - This is verified by information gathered from the NYSCB Computerized Case Management System (CIS) and or Central Office/District Office records.
 - Value added: None.
 - Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - **Recommendations for Next Year: This was a new impact question that resulted from the committee’s input last year. As consumers complete their goals, this is one of the questions. It directly relates to the target/outcome. Group very pleased with result.**
 - Number of legally blind consumers who receive services and experience increased

independence in their lives: 125.

- Information/data: Based on information received from NYSCB and their central database/district office records, out of the individuals who received NYSCB IL FFS during the past year, one hundred thirty-seven legally blind consumers experience increased independence in their lives. This is also a new impact/outcome and is verified by records. While this exceeds the outcome, it is also important to note that 137/313 consumers who received this service achieved the result, or 44%. Total number of legally blind consumers who receive services and experience increased independence in their lives: 137.
 - This is verified by information gathered from the NYSCB Computerized Case Management System (CIS) and or Central Office/District Office records.
- Value added: None.
- Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
- Recommendations for Next Year: **This was a new impact question that resulted from the committee's input last year. As consumers complete their goals, this is one of the questions. It directly relates to the target/outcome. Question was asked why it was the same number as identified in the previous target (137). Response was that as consumers make progress on goals, they can improve both their access and independence. They are both difference goals and questions and can be set and achieved in different ways. It just happened that 137 individuals achieved both. They are unduplicated results. Group very pleased with result.**

Overall, Brad needs to follow up with brief draft survey with committee members.

COMPLETED (met 12/5/14):

2014 SPIL Evaluation Summary:

Objective # 5 – Capacity Building

- Outreach Subcommittee
- 2014 Performance Targets:
- RFP issued to CILs and SCILs for capacity building grant opportunity (Year one). By the start of 2014, NYSILC coordinated SPIL information to the DSU related to this objective so that it could be reviewed and utilized in the drafting of the RFP. A Capacity building RFP was drafted by the DSU and sent through their internal approval process. Based on the technical Edit version of the SPIL 2014-2016, section 1.3B (4), provide any additional information about the financial plan, as appropriate. It details that any unspent Part B funds should be directed toward the used of capacity building projects in blocks of \$75,000. Therefore, the DSU confirmed that two additional projects could be added to the eight identified in the SPIL. This resulted in a total of ten capacity building projects. Eventually, Capacity Building RFP 14-013 was sent out to the statewide network of CILs and SCILs for competition during third quarter of the contract year in 2014. During the preliminary Q & A period, the network raised a question about the point system assigned to the budget which awarded more points for proposals that spent fewer funds. It was pointed out that direct SPIL language stated that the opportunities were to be equal grants of \$25,000 each. The DSU responded back and revised the budget and scoring and extended the response deadline. The DSU had a panel review and score the proposals. Awardees were notified in the first quarter of the new contract year. ACCES-VR announced the following ten centers as award recipients of SPIL objective #5 relating to capacity building projects for unserved and underserved populations and the unserved and underserved populations they serve: WILC White Plains - Healthy living, WILC Putnam ILS - Healthy Living, Rockland ILC - Youth, AIM - Youth, ATI Cortland - Youth, STIC - Veterans, NCCI - Healthy Living, WNYIL - Youth, BILS - Hispanic/deaf, RCIL Utica - Minorities. Outcome successfully met.
- This is verified by a variety of documents available to NYSILC including the fall issue of the NYSILC News Briefs which is available on the NYSILC website.
 - Value added: None.
 - Evaluation: Exceeded, **met**, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: The capacity building grants process is very involved. It includes an RFP development phase, followed by approvals, and distribution to the field by the Designated State Unit (DSU). After the proposals are reviewed by an independent panel, award letters are sent out to the grant recipients. It is a very lengthy process and represents good planning on our part for our network to achieve this within the projected one-year time frame. While the awarding of grants went smoothly, the issuance of contracts and start-up of projects

were delayed, which will be addressed next year. Overall, we learned from formative recommendations of previous evaluations and made changes.

2014 SPIL Evaluation Summary:

Objective # 6 – DVRN

- Public Policy
- 2014 Performance Targets:
 - Number of network partners within the Network: 20.
 - Information/data: The DVRN reported establishing relationships with thirty-two partner organizations: New York Association of Psychiatric Rehabilitation Services (NYAPRS), New York State Disabilities Advocacy Association and Network (NYS DAAN), Nonprofit VOTE, Consumer Directed Choices, Inc., National Association of the Deaf, National Multiple Sclerosis Society - Upstate New York Chapter, NYSARC, Inc., New York Association on Independent Living (NYAIL), Association of Late-Deafened Adults (ALDA), Helping Hands for the Disabled of NYC, Catskill Center for Independence, Mental Health Association, Regional Center for Independent Living (RCIL), All About You Home Care, Inc. (AAY), Southern Tier Independence Center (STIC), North Country Self-Advocates, AIM Independent Living Center, Rockland Independent Living Center, Southern Adirondack Independent Living Center (SAIL), Suffolk Independent Living Organization (SILO), Westchester Independent Living Center (WILC), Westchester Disabled on the Move, Inc. (WDOMI), Bronx Independent Living Services, Self-Advocates Association of NYS, Inc. (SANYS), League of Women Voters of NYS, Resource Center for Accessible Living (RCAL), Independent Living Center of Hudson Valley (ILCHV), Aspire of Western New York, My Blind Spot, Inc., Liberty ARC, Long Island Center for Independent Living, Inc. (LICIL), Action Toward Independence. Total count: 32. This is verified by DVRN April-June 2014 quarterly and 2014 annual reports.
 - Value added: None.
 - Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: **Good. Satisfied with result. It was acknowledged that the benefit of establishing relationships with network partners is that they each have their own lists and potential contacts for sign up to the voting database and to attract for participation in voter education issues.**
 - Number of people with disabilities registered to vote within the Network: 3,000.
 - Information/data: First it should be noted that as a pre-requisite to achieve

this outcome, CDR was successful at developing a database that allows sorting by partnership affiliation, zip code, congressional district, and county of residence to seek the compilation of at least 5,000 nonpartisan disability voters. They contracted with Phelco Technologies for the development of the website and database. However, due to issues with website creation and costs, the website and database were completed and launched January 30, 2014. This reduced the timeframe and impacted the ability to sign up peers for this database through email, social media, and other online efforts. As of the quarterly report, they have signed up 177 registered voters with disabilities to the database. CDR devised a plan to step up the process on a monthly basis to achieve the goal including strategies with the steering committee, a YouTube video, and engaging the center network by March 2015. Total count: 177. This is verified by DVRN April-June 2014 quarterly and 2014 annual reports.

- Value added: Ideally include some way to track the number of people who actually vote? Do a survey with a representative sample? Discuss with contractor if they have a way to contact people who register to see if they actually voted. If it's cost effective, add it in; if it's cost prohibitive, drop it. Follow up with contractor.
 - Evaluation: Exceeded, met, substantially met (60%+), **partially met**, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: **An update was provided. Marie Hickey is the new project coordinator. There are only three months left for the project. She has been working very hard on voter registration and registering people to the database. Brad talked to her in mid-January and he believes that she is up to 1,800. Marie is visiting agencies and going to events. We will be able to monitor the quarterly report to see what the final result is. While they may not be able to achieve the target of 5,000, the strategies utilized to achieve the end result in a short period of time will be beneficial along with the database and educational materials.**
- Number of voter education issues addressed through the Network: 6.
 - Information/data:
 - Sent out monthly e-blast in October 2013, November 2013, December 2013, January 2014, February 2014, and March 2014.
 - Sent out a press release about the launch of DVRN on February 4, 2014.
 - Sent out an email, encouraging partner organizations to sign people with disabilities up for the database (with tips) on March 26, 2014.
 - Between October 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013, sent out 28 tweets on Twitter (<http://www.twitter.com/nydvn>) and published 11 posts on Facebook

- (<http://www.facebook.com/nydisabilityvote>). Information includes important voting news and advice.
- Between January 1, 2014 to March 31, 2014, sent out 50 tweets on Twitter (<http://www.twitter.com/nydvn>) and published 22 posts on Facebook (<http://www.facebook.com/nydisabilityvote>). Information includes important voting news and advice.
 - Developed two documents for partner organizations to share with their network: Introduction to NYDVN and Voting 101: The Basics.
 - Total count: 6.
 - In addition, going into next year, CDR will host a minimum of three forums with at least ten partner organizations attending each one on WebEx. Possible topics include: Voter Registration and Participation, Enhancing Your Member List, Election Follow-up, Local Spring Elections, Planning and Hosting a Candidate Forum, and/or creating a coalition based on DVRN.
 - This is verified by DVRN April-June 2014 quarterly and 2014 annual reports.
 - Value added: What does it mean to “address” an issue? Would be helpful to set a measurable standard for what it means to “address” an issue - sending out an education alert, holding workshops/meetings, etc. Is there any measurable result of these efforts? Impact on potential voters? Or just subject related?
 - Evaluation: Exceeded, **met**, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: **They worked on distributing press releases, informational alerts, Facebook posts, Twitter tweets, and educational documents. They will be looking into webinars. Value added asked about how to measure what addresses an issue versus just sending out a communication. This would be important to clarify for the future - how you identify a voter issue and educate and what mode you use for education and outreach.**

2014 SPIL Evaluation Summary:

Objective # 7 – CIL Coach

- SPIL Committee
- 2014 Performance Targets:
 - Number of CILs or SCILs using consulting/coaching service: 5.
 - Information/data: In April and May 2014 Krieger Solutions (the consulting vendor) completed assessments with nine centers and have begun a webinar series. They sent the reports to each Executive Director and reviewed them individually with each Director. Krieger Solutions (and their team) completed five webinars: two fiscal webinars (5/22 and 6/17), two with the board development group (5/30 and 6/24), and one with the fund raising group (6/8 with next one scheduled for 7/2). Center directors reported satisfaction with the initial sessions and we have scheduled subsequent sessions. Total CILs/SCILs using service: 9.
 - This is verified by the ILC Coaching and Consultation Quarterly Report for April-June 2014.
 - Value added: None.
 - Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: **Looked good. Were the webinars for all centers recorded or customized? A combination. Have to check on quality of recordings. Some had technical difficulty. Each one had a group presentation, some Q & A, discussion, with power point. Need to check in with group first. Quality recording will be posted.**
 - Percentage of CILs or SCILs with unqualified financial audits: 90%.
 - Information/data: All of the fifteen respondents who replied to the fiscal component of the survey indicated that they already had unqualified audits. The consultant believes that this was perhaps not the best measure or indicator for financial issues. They will continue to monitor it and report on any other concrete outcomes related to other fiscal issues as they arise. Percentage of CILs/SCILs with unqualified audits: 100%.
 - This is verified by the ILC Coaching and Consultation Quarterly Report for April-June 2014.
 - Value added: None.
 - Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: **Good with result. Measure good,**

but if a center articulates a specific need related to this area (financial) perhaps a different outcome can be developed that is more concrete. Might be hard to do since this area is different for so many centers.

- Percentage of CILs or SCILs with boards engaged in developing or monitoring strategic plans: 70%.
 - Information/data: Out of the nine CILs/SCILs receiving the service, four responded related to Board Development and Strategic Planning. They were all at different phases of strategic planning: # 1 board development as a first step before starting strategic planning in early 2015, # 2 finalizing the strategic plan with the board and prioritizing goals, # 3, investigating the cost and consultant choice to facilitate the process, and # 4 looking at future agency growth in a strategic plan next spring 2015. Percentage of CILs/SCILs with boards engaged in developing or monitoring strategic plans: 44%.
 - This is verified by the ILC Coaching and Consultation Quarterly Report for April-June 2014.
 - Value added: None.
 - Evaluation: Exceeded, met, substantially met (60%+), **partially met**, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: **Honest assessment. Partially met seems to be the best decision for evaluation. Perhaps we learn that up front next time we should assess the result for the entire network.**
- Percentage of CILs or SILCs with at least 50% non-IL funding: 40%.
 - Information/data: Out of the nine CILs/SCILs receiving the service, two responded related to Fund Development. Both were at different ends of fund development – one trying to engage their board in the process – the other trying to maximize efforts connected to a community event. At this point, the activity is just getting started related to this area. However, a total of four centers participated and received coaching and instruction in this area. 44% of the CILs/SCILs participating responded. Please note that the 44% does not reflect the funding target but participating in the coaching and instruction. Actual funding levels associated with IL and non-IL sources have not been assessed at this time for these CILs/SCILs. It is recommended that this be done at the end of the project and provide time for the coaching to catch up with results. Percentage of CILs/SICLs with at least 50% non-IL funding: TBD.
 - This is verified by the ILC Coaching and Consultation Quarterly Report for April-June 2014.
 - Value added: None.

- Evaluation: Exceeded/met, substantially met (60%+), **partially met**, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
- Recommendations for Next Year: **Same as above. Honest assessment. Partially met seems to be the best decision for evaluation. This one is even more difficult to assess the target. Brett participated in this training. In the future, goal could be to develop a fund development plan.**

2014 SPIL Evaluation Summary:

Objective # 8 – Capacity Building (first cycle ending 6/30/14)

- Outreach Subcommittee
- 2014 Performance Targets:
- Number of people served by identified target unserved/underserved population (180). Based on the final CBILCO quarterly reports for each project (4/1/14-6/30/14), they identified the total number of people served for their identified target population during the year: CDCI healthy lifestyles (116), NCCI veterans with disabilities (109), ARISE veterans with disabilities (92), and CIDNY youth with disabilities (282). Total population served: 499. Outcome exceeded.
 - This is verified by NYSILC CBILCO quarterly reports which were shared in the full council meeting packets.
 - Value added: What changes occur for the people served? Review content of quarterly reports.
- A 19-year-old Asian male with a physical disability and a wheelchair user, has a para service for school. He was referred to the CIDNY youth programs to get assistance with transition. As a senior in high school, with less than a month away from graduation, he had not yet applied for college, was not informed about ACCES-VR, and had not received basic information about transition planning, like benefits advisement. With the help of the Youth Programs Coordinator, the family was able to meet with a CIDNY benefits counselor. This consumer was screened and then counseled on the process of obtaining SSI benefits. He was informed that by obtaining SSI, not only will he have his own source of income, but he will obtain Medicaid. Medicaid will also allow him to apply for personal assistant services which he needs to function independently. He is currently receiving para services in high school, which he will not receive should he enroll in college. He reported that when he gets home from school, his caregiver at home is his 90 year old grandmother because his parents work. The consumer was informed about his rights for accommodations should he enroll in college, and he reported that he will notify CIDNY should he receive his benefits.
- For the last 3 quarters, CIDNY's Director of Advocacy has worked with a consumer and his parent. He is a 19-year-old male with epilepsy and development disabilities whose mother had called CIDNY and requested assistance with transferring her son to a new school. The student and his family relocated to New York from Puerto Rico less than a

year ago and are non-English speaking. The parent also reported her concerns about the treatment that her son was receiving at the school. She reported that the school staff would place him in a “time out” room when they thought he misbehaved, but such actions were not part of his IEP. In addition, when he was placed in the time out room, he was unsupervised, even though he is subject to seizures. During these incidents and when he was suspended, the parent was never notified beforehand. She has since removed him from the school and we are working with her to transfer the student. The Youth Program Coordinator accompanied the family on school visits to assess the facilities and provide any additional support and advocacy they needed. The student is now enrolled in a new school. The Director of Advocacy and Youth Program Coordinator are currently advocating for proper services to be put in place. The services needed include: bilingual paras for both in school and on the bus as well as bilingual physical therapist. A request for mediation meeting was submitted. A mediation meeting was held but proved unproductive. An impartial hearing was requested and held. The order from the impartial hearing officer required that the family receive home instruction and related services out of the school. This was a temporary solution until a private bilingual placement could be found.

- ARISE has identified a misrepresentation by the VA on how to receive increased benefits for an existing but worsening disability. Our Project Coordinator has taken care to educate and advocate with and on behalf of veterans to ensure that existing claims are not subject to an additional 18 months waiting period before a determination is made on the worsening condition.
- Severe PTSD forced a veteran to give up his on-the-road job as a tractor trailer driver. We assisted him to obtain disability benefits through the State of Pennsylvania since this is where his company was located. A referral to the veteran’s liaison at the local One Stop allowed him to consider new career opportunities through the education retraining program for older vets aged 35-60. We also connected him to Logan Walter, a counselor with the Department of Veterans Affairs, filing for an increase in this veteran’s disability payments for which he was eligible but received reduced benefits because he had been working.
- ARISE assisted a WWII veteran with obtaining personal care assistance. A letter was written by his doctor and ARISE made the referral to the Department of Aging and Youth’s Community Living Program. He was approved for the much needed care and we were able to assist him with obtaining necessary medical equipment for the home.
- In March of 2014, ARISE was able to assist a veteran with an SSI application. ARISE also assisted with this veteran’s request for vocational services with the goal of opening a small business.
 - Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: None. Very impressive results.
- Number of self-sustaining programs (4). It should be mentioned that the NYSILC Outreach Subcommittee reached an initial agreement on what constitutes self-sustaining activity - which could be any effort from obtaining funds, volunteers, expertise, cost allocating to continue to provide programs and services to the target population after the grant ends.

Based on the final CBILCO quarterly reports for each project (4/1/14-6/30/14), these four projects identified the following self-sustaining activity:

- CDCI received an anonymous contribution for its organic gardening program, developed an alliance with SUNY Albany Excellence in Aging, acquired a BIP grant from NYS DOH related to its diabetes program, and is able to fully sustain its program going forward.
- NCCI are satisfied that their staff are trained to assist veterans with disabilities, they developed their manual so staff and the public can refer to various services and resources, the ombudsman program can help when facilities are involved in the process, and the relationships they developed with groups can help them to facilitate the process.
- ARISE found challenges with the population along with successes along with a lack of resources. They will to dedicate a .20 FTE to outreach and refer veterans with disabilities to Onondaga County services.
- CIDNY will continue to provide services to youth with disabilities. They received a grant from the O'Neill Foundation for a "Know Your Rights" workshop for topics like advocacy and disability rights.
- Total number of self-sustaining programs: 4. Outcome successfully met.
- This is verified by NYSILC CBILCO quarterly reports which were shared in the full council meeting packets.
 - Value added: Initial criteria determined as identified above.
 - Evaluation: Exceeded, **met**, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: The group felt that the four projects met, to varying degrees, the definition of self-sufficiency. However, in order to truly verify that they achieved and sustained their programs, Brad will do the following:
 - He will contact the programs and inform them that he will follow up with them same time next year (December 2015) to verify that they are able to sustain services to their target populations (minimum) and possibly be able to continue their programs.
 - It was acknowledged that youth and veterans already have service statistics that will isolate service fluctuations. Healthy lifestyles will be different.
 - He will have a brief survey which he said he would prefer to do by telephone.

These projects participated in a Best Practices webinar on September 23, 2014 to highlight the successes of their programs and the populations they served. To access the Power Point presentation and details of each project (which includes audio) is available at the following link:

http://www.nysilc.org/images/FINAL_NYSILC_Best_Practice_Webinar.ppt. A transcript to the presentation is available at the following link:

http://www.nysilc.org/images/NYSILC_Best_Practices_Webinar_Transcript.rtf.

2014 SPIL Evaluation Summary:

Objective # 9 – Database

- SPIL Committee
- 2014 Performance Targets:
 - Percentage completion of a multi-purpose, interface database design: 25%
 - Information/data: The Database Work Group met on February 19 and March 25, 2014. The February date represented the initial meeting for the group. Members reviewed background on the SPIL objective, outcomes and general goals of the group related to the development of the product was discussed. It was decided that instead of a database, the product would be more of a web-based platform. The March meeting was structured around a presentation by Rodney Craig of the Michigan Statewide Independent Living Council (MISILC) and the model they have developed in their state. Even though they have a database for approximately 15 statewide centers that all receive federal funds (which is different than what New York would need), the protocols and experiences led to a wide ranging discussion within the group. It left everyone ready to start defining the needs of our product at the next meeting. For the May 6, 2014 and June 24, 2014 work group meetings, the group began the process of defining the data interface product in the document that will be sent to ACCES VR, which will include: technical specifications, common data fields (with Federal and State breakouts and differences), and a Survey Monkey survey to assess the center network databases. In the follow up meeting the group worked on the draft and looked to finalize the document. It was sent to the technical writers and then reviewed by a vendor for technical specifications. The group finalized the draft online with track changes and felt good about achieving the intent and scope of the initial task of the committee. It was sent out to the center network in September 2014 for input. The centers who responded did so to mostly ask for more details about the SPIL project and requested to be able to connect to it at a later date. The one colleague who responded with a change/addition had their comments incorporated into the document. NYSILC then met with ACCES-VR and requested funds to help with the development and ongoing cost of the SPIL objective submitted. The request is under consideration. NYSILC submitted it to ACCES-VR so that the product description can be reviewed for technical specifications and procurement. At this point, the initial task of the data interface design has been drafted, developed and submitted to move it along in a process. Percentage completion of data interface design: (25%).
 - This is verified by the NYSILC ACCES-VR Database Work Group progress meeting summaries shared at full council meetings along with product development knowledge.

- Value added: Is there a concrete development plan that can show where 25% of the way is? Yes. It was shared and reviewed at the NYSILC November 14, 2014 FCM. It was submitted to ACCES-VR for IT and procurement review.
- Evaluation: Exceeded, **met**, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
- Recommendations for Next Year: **Good. Very straight forward.**
- Percentage of CILs/SCILs contributing to the multipurpose, interface database design: 20%.
 - Information/data: Four members of the work group are CILs/SCILs and participate actively in discussions and online feedback that contribute to the database's initial design (STIC, WNYIL, ATI Cortland, BILS, and CDCI). In addition, three CILs/SCILs responded/provided feedback when the data interface document was sent out to the center network (WILC, CIDNY, and FLIC). Overall, this results in the participation of eight CILs to date (8/44=18%). Percentage of CILs/SCILs contributing to design: 18%.
 - This is verified by the NYSILC ACCES-VR Database Work Group progress meeting summaries shared at full council meetings along with product development knowledge.
 - Value added: Suggested rewording: 20% (8 or more) of CILs/SCILs will contribute to the multipurpose, interface database design via providing feedback on the initial design. What is the total number of CILs/SCILs to be used to determine this? (I think there are several ways to "count" centers in NYS and we need to come up with a specific number.)
 - Use the acknowledged 44 center network number of CILs and SCILs addressed for the statewide consumer satisfaction survey.
 - Evaluation: Exceeded, met, **substantially met (60%+)**, partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: **Okay with it.**

Note: two outcomes inactive for 2014.

2014 SPIL Evaluation Summary:

Objective # 10 – SSP

- **SPIL Committee**

- **2014 Performance Targets:**
 - Percent to establish an advisory group of deaf-blind individuals: 50%.
 - Information/data: The SSP advisory committee continues to meet regularly. Four of the advisory committee members met in June to discuss potential fundraising ideas for the SSP program. These ideas ranged from a grab-a-partner (runner and sighted guide) triathlon, family day event, or a Halloween Bash. The advisory board committee will make a decision on the fundraising event at the next meeting. Once the fundraiser and the date have been decided; it will be announced at the Deaf-Blind Awareness Day during the bi-annual Rochester Deaf Awareness Week. Deaf-Blind Awareness Day will occur on September 19th from 9am to 10pm. The board advisory committee and CDR feel strongly that the Rochester Deaf Community needs more exposure to the Deaf-Blind culture and access to resources that are available to the Deaf-Blind community. Information about the event will be distributed through CDR's Facebook pages, flyers, and by word of the hands. The Deaf-Blind Awareness day will feature speakers, exhibition booths, a short film, and a Deaf-Blind panel. When CDR applied for the Daisy Marquis Jones grant; we budgeted \$1,000 to sponsor this event. The money will go to advertising, photography, and refreshments. Additional to the SSP tracking tool and consumer assessment tool, the program manager decided to create an assessment tool to use for board advisor candidates. This tool will help CDR identify future candidates, strengthen relationship between the manager and board advisor, and help define the role of board advisory committee members. This tool will be used to identify a new candidate that will replace one of the SSP board advisors who recently stepped down in June to focus more on her employment.
Percent to establish an advisory group of deaf-blind individuals: 100%.

 - Value added: Does this mean 50% of the membership will be in place? Is there a clear numeric target for desired membership? Should we put a number in instead of a percent? Recommended rewording: By the end of the first year the advisory group should be in place consisting of at least 50% deaf-blind members and numbering at least 6 (this will have to be negotiated with the contractor)

 - Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.

 - Recommendations for Next Year: **Question was asked, what does the 50% target mean? It was reasoned that their advisory board would be up to half capacity by the end of this year and up to full capacity at the end of next year (100%). Based on the**

narrative they are meeting regularly and making decisions so they are operating at full capacity now (100%). This addresses the value added question. Everyone was okay.

- Percent to develop and document outreach and educational materials: 50%.
 - Information/data: The SSP program used All Out Marketing to create a website page that is accessible for those who are Deaf Blind. The website has a jump feature that allows jumping to the next category without losing your place. The font, colors, and layout were approved by the advisory board members who are Deaf/Blind. We are currently working on adding an interactive video on the website, brochures, and exhibit marketing materials. We realized All Out Marketing was limited in their resources and was not able to meet all of our expectations. The SSP Program is in the process of securing one or two additional vendors who also meet MWBE and NYSED requirements to enhance the current features.
 - The SSP program has a Facebook page that highlights community events, actions alerts, and interesting articles related to the Deaf Blind community. Majority of our outreach has been through the word of mouth (or more appropriate - word of hands). Consumers participate in monthly Deaf-Blind coffee chat and Deaf Blind Breakfast. CDR is in the process of setting up a series of Deaf Blind Support Group meetings that cover topics such as building a network as a Deaf Blind parent, asking for reasonable accommodation at their workplace, depression among Deaf Blind community and much more. Each support group meeting will have a guest speaker who will talk for up to an hour. The first support group is set to begin in 2015.
 - The Manager of Deaf Services continues to meet with national and local agencies to strengthen partnership and provide education about our services.
 - Percent to develop and document outreach and educational materials: 50%.
 - Value added: Is there a concrete development plan that can show where 50% of the way is? Should we put a number in instead of a percent?
Recommended rewording: This should be 100% done in year 1?
 - They met with MWBE vendors and worked on website and FB outreach strategies. Sites promote activities for the community. They will build on support group strategies in 2015. 50% seems very appropriate.
 - Evaluation: Exceeded, **met**, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: **The same capacity question applies to this target. The narrative shows that the program developed several outreach strategies during the year. It was felt that they deserved 50% for their effort. However, next year when 100% is the target, demonstration of impact would be expected for their**

effort based on these strategies. As a result of x,y, and z...250 new individuals were. This addresses the value added question. Good.

- Percent to develop and document process for the screening and assessment of deaf-blind individuals for SSP: 50%.
 - Information/data: CDR has been working on better screening and assessment tools for the SSP program. Last quarter, the advisory board approved the new intake package with some modification to meet the visual need. The new intake package began last quarter and the results were favorable. One of our newest consumers complimented on how easy it was to fill out the new application, because it was less stressful for her eyes. The new intake allowed CDR to gather more information from their consumers and connect them to resources outside of CDR. CDR continues to update and maintain a database with consumer demographic information and individual independent living goals/set/met charts. CDR continues to develop and seek tools to help track data and measure outcomes. CDR developed a spreadsheet that helps track the number of SSP hours used by each consumer on monthly basis and identify a pattern in the SSP program. For example, the program saw an increase of SSP requests during the month of November and December. It's not surprising to see the number of requests go up during the holiday, but it helps us see how many hours of work we should expect for next year. In May, data was extracted from the case notes and a spreadsheet was created to reflect the number of SSP hours used in 2012 and 2013. CDR provided 724 SSP hours in 2012 and 1,196 SSP hours in 2013. As of June 2014, 677.50 SSP hours have been provided to date. Percent to develop and document process for the screening and assessment of deaf-blind individuals for SSP: 100%.
 - Value added: Is there a concrete development plan that can show where 50% of the way is? Should we put a number in instead of a percent? Recommended rewording: This should be 100% done in year 1?
 - Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: **Based on the narrative, the program has developed an extensive system that provides documentation and records. As with the first target, they reached full capacity by year's end. As noted in the value added, this objective really should have been complete in year one. Very hard to evaluate.**
- Number of SSPs trained: 2.
 - Information/data: As of June 2014, CDR has five Support Service Providers (SSPs) and continues to recruit additional personnel for relief positions. CDR is in the process of adding two more trained SSP staff to the team in July. Number of SSPs trained: 5.

- Value added: Trained for what? Are there concrete standards/criteria for what constitutes successful training/adequate expertise? According to standards for SSPs.
- Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
- Recommendations for Next Year: **Based on the narrative, the program clearly exceeded the target. As noted in the value added, it would be good to follow up and find out more about the five trained SSPs. Are they peers who are trained from the program to enhance the services to new consumers?. If so, how are they trained? Good.**
- Number of deaf-blind individuals served: 8.
 - Information/data: The Support Service Provider (SSP) has continued to provide critically specialized services to 18 Deaf-Blind consumers in Monroe County. At the beginning of the quarter, we received 1 new referral from Helen Keller National Center and began SSP services for the individual in the month of May. CDR also welcomed back a returning SSP consumer who moved away for a few months. CDR continued to provide SSP services to 18 Deaf-Blind consumers at a maximum of 20 hours per month per consumer from April to June 2014. Number of deaf-blind individuals served: 18.
 - Value added: What are the intended outcomes for these individuals? Recommended rewording: As a result of the service, 8 individuals should increase their integration into the community and/or their ability to complete activities of daily living.
 - Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
 - Recommendations for Next Year: **Based on the narrative, the program clearly exceeded the service target. Services are provided based on a combination of IL philosophy and person-centered planning. The CDR website provides a description about the services. Value added addressed in website description. Good.**
- Percent document demonstrated attempts to make SSP program and outreach efforts self-sustaining: (25%).
 - Information/data: CDR continues to apply for grants from local foundations and surrounding areas. CDR sent a Letter of Inquiry to the Helmsey Trust Foundation and the Lavelle Foundation; our research shows that they have supported Helen Keller National Center's SSP program in the past and continue to support their organization through different programs. The

Helmsey Trust Foundation is not accepting new proposals at this time, but the Lavelle Foundation showed some interest and requested more details about the program. While we sought grant funding opportunities from local and national foundations, we came across a donation in the sum of \$500.00 from the Rochester Deaf Rotary Club. Last year, CDR's Manager of Deaf Services did a speech honoring a Deaf-Blind person, Patty Starr, for her hard work in the Deaf-Blind community at the annual Rochester Deaf Rotary Club banquet. The Rochester Deaf Rotary Club was impressed by CDR's SSP program and decided to donate the proceeds from their Wine and Cheese event in March. CDR is grateful for the support of our community organizations in Rochester and will continue to strengthen our relationship with them. CDR continues to diversify their sustainability approach by incorporating a fee-for-service model as a contractor (e.g. HKNC, ACCESS-VR and NYCB) and utilize grants to support the SSP program. We are also exploring alternative source of funding such as financial reimbursement through medical insurance and waiver programs. CDR is in the process of campaigning to the government for a statewide funding that will support SSP services throughout New York State. The SSP board advisors, members of the Deaf-Blind community and HKNC express interest in being a part of the collaborative effort to sustain the SSP program. CDR's advocacy department is working toward a goal to create a forum that allows the Deaf-Blind community to share their concerns and target certain departments that could supply a statewide funding to sustain the SSP program. Percentage attempt to make SSP program and outreach efforts self-sustaining: 75%.

- Value added: None.
- Evaluation: **Exceeded**, met, substantially met (60%+), partially met, not met, no progress, dropped, inactive.
- Recommendations for Next Year: **Group felt this was a fair assessment at this time given the effort that they have put into seeking support for the program. It was also felt that in the future we should not say "attempt" to self-sustain.**

Note: two outcomes inactive for 2014.