

Government of the District of Columbia  
Department on Disability Services (DDS)  
Quality Assurance & Performance Management Administration (QAPMA)

## **NCI Adult In-Person Survey**

District of Columbia Report Year 2017-2018



Submitted: July 29, 2019

## Table of Contents

List of Tables .....	2
Introduction .....	3
<i>What Topics Are Covered by the Survey?</i> .....	3
<i>How were people selected to participate?</i> .....	3
<i>Limitations of Data</i> .....	3
Findings .....	4
<i>Choice &amp; Decision Making</i> .....	4
<i>Service Coordination</i> .....	5
<i>Safety</i> .....	6
<i>Employment goals and other daily activities</i> .....	6
<i>Community Inclusion, Participation, and Leisure</i> .....	7
Things to Consider .....	7

## List of Tables

Table 1 Choice and Decision Making.....	4
Table 2 Service Coordination .....	5
Table 3 Safety.....	6
Table 4 Employment Goals and Other Daily Activities .....	6
Table 5 Community Inclusion, Participation, and Leisure .....	7

## Introduction

The National Core Indicators™ (NCI™) program is a voluntary effort by state developmental disability agencies to track their performance using a standardized set of consumer and family/guardian surveys with nationally validated measures. The National Association of State Directors of Developmental Disabilities Services (NASDDDS) and the Human Services Research Institute (HSRI) coordinates this initiative.

NCI has developed more than 100 standard performance measures (or ‘indicators’) that states use to assess the outcomes of services for individuals and families, including results in the areas of employment, rights, service planning, community inclusion, choice, health, and safety. In 2017-18, a total of 45 states, the District of Columbia and 22 sub-state entities participated in NCI. Not all states participate in the Adult In-Person Survey every year. Thirty-five (35) states and the District of Columbia administered the Adult In-Person Survey in 2017-18 and submitted valid samples for analysis. A total of 25,671 individuals participated in the survey.

As a part of the District’s Statewide Transition Plan, DDS gathers and analyzes the NCI data to produce a presentation for the Quality Improvement Committee. As part of this report presents the aggregate findings of critical indicators from the survey and how the results of the District of Columbia compared to those states that participated in NCI as a whole.

### *What Topics Are Covered by the Survey?*

The National Core Indicator survey is organized by domain areas which are considered most relevant to individuals. These domains are further broken down into sub-domains, each of which has a statement that specifies the concerns measured. Each sub-domain includes one or more indicators of how the state performs in this area. This report will review the areas of Service Coordination, Choice & Decision Making, Safety, and Employment Goals & Daily Activities.

### *How were people selected to participate?*

Each state is instructed to attempt to complete a minimum of 400 surveys with a random sample of individuals aged 18 or older who are receiving at least one publicly funded service besides case management. A sample size of 400 allows valid comparisons to be made across states with a 95% confidence level and a +/- 5% margin of error. States that do not complete a sample that reaches the 95% confidence level and 5% margin of error (based on the size of the total sample frame) are not included in NCI reporting. Both the confidence level (95%) and margin of error (5%) used are widely accepted for reviewing results, regardless of population size. Most states draw a sample greater than 400 to account for refusals and inaccurate contact information.

### *Limitations of Data*

The NCI Adult In-Person Survey tool is not intended to be used for monitoring individuals or providers; instead, it assesses system-wide performance. The NCI averages should not be interpreted as necessarily defining “acceptable” levels of performance or satisfaction. Instead, it describes average levels of performance or satisfaction across the states. It is up to public

managers, policy-makers, and other stakeholders to decide what is an acceptable or unacceptable result (i.e., scale score or percentage of individuals achieving the indicated outcome).

## Findings

### Choice & Decision Making

*People make choices about their lives and are actively engaged in planning their services and supports.*

The survey indicates that participants like to make choices about their lives and are actively engaged in planning their services and supports. The majority of the percentages were above 50%. The mean score of 73% indicates as a whole, individuals with disabilities can make more independent choices regarding their services, supports, living, and lifestyle. DC, in comparison to NCI, scored -12% lower, which indicates that this should be an area of focus.

<b>Choice and Decision-Making</b>	<b>DC</b>	<b>NCI</b>	<b>-</b>
Chose or had some input in choosing where they live (if not living in the family home; proxy respondents were allowed for this question)	44%	57%	-13
Chose or had some input in choosing their housemates or chose to live alone (if not living in the family home; proxy respondents were allowed for this question)	41%	43%	-2
Chose or has input in choosing paid community job (proxy respondents were allowed for this question)	93%	87%	-6
Chose or had some input in choosing day program or workshop (proxy respondents were allowed for this question)	41%	56%	-15
Chose staff or were aware they could request to change staff (proxy respondents were allowed for this question)	65%	65%	*
Decides or has input in deciding their daily schedule (proxy respondents were allowed for this question)	66%	85%	-19
Decides or has input in deciding how to spend free time (proxy respondents were allowed for this question)	72%	92%	-20
Chooses or has input in choosing what to buy, or has set limits on what to buy with their spending money (proxy respondents were allowed for this question)	67%	87%	-20
Can change case manager/service coordinator if wants to (proxy respondents were allowed for this question)	68%	89%	-21
Average	61%	73%	-12

Table 1 Choice and Decision Making

### Service Coordination

Service coordinators are accessible, responsive, and support the person's participation in service planning.

Service Coordination percentages indicate that participants are receiving satisfactory services. There is a 2% difference from DC's scores in comparison to NCI. The majority of the ratings for DC are above 90%; however, areas of focus should center on communication between the individual and their case manager. The results indicate that individuals with disabilities are not able to effectively communicate their needs or services due to either the lack of communication, availability, or individuals are unsure of the discussion during the meeting.

Service Coordination	DC	NCI	-
Has met case manager	95%	94%	-1
Case manager asks person what s/he wants	83%	88%	-5
Able to contact case manager when s/he wants	83%	88%	-5
Staff come and leave when they are supposed to	93%	92%	-1
Took part in last service planning meeting, or had the opportunity but chose not to	98%	98%	
Understood what was talked about at last service planning meeting	89%	84%	-5
Last service planning meeting included people respondent wanted to be there	88%	93%	-5
Person was able to choose services they get as part of service plan	74%	79%	-5
Average Total	88%	90%	-12

Table 2 Service Coordination

## Safety

People are safe from abuse, neglect, and injury.

Based on the scores from the survey, participants feel that they have the support, and they have identified someone they can go to when they feel scared. However, the area of focus should center on communication. The recommendation is that case managers discuss safety and fear and suggest solutions to resolve their concerns (at home, day program, work, walking in the community, in transport or other places). The District of Columbia, in comparison to NCI, scored -4% lower.

Safety	DC	NCI	-
There is at least one place where the person feels afraid or scared (in-home, day program, work, walking in the community, in transport, or other place)	18%	19%	-1
Has someone to go to for help if they ever feel scared	90%	94%	-4
Average Total	54%	57%	-3

Table 3 Safety

## Employment goals and other daily activities

People have support to find and maintain community integrated employment.

The results indicate that this is an area of concern. Individuals with disabilities are interested in finding employment. The results also suggest that this is an area of high interest, and case managers should ensure that community employment is listed as a goal in their service plan. A recommendation would be for further research surrounding this question. The scores indicate that over 90% of participants in DC report having a paid job, but 64 % stated that they would like a paid job. These scores may suggest that individuals are busy during the day at either a day program or volunteer position, but the interest lies in finding employment.

Employment Goals and other Daily Activities	DC	NCI	-
Does not have paid community job, and would like a job in the community	64%	45%	-25
Has community employment as a goal in their service plan (information may have been obtained through state records)	55%	29%	-26
Has paid community job	91%	95%	-4
Attends a day program or workshop	83%	57%	-26
Volunteers	34%	31%	-3
Takes classes, training or does something to get a job or do better at current job	54%	20%	-34
Average Total	60%	46%	-26

Table 4 Employment Goals and Other Daily Activities

## Community Inclusion, Participation, and Leisure

People have support to participate in everyday community activities.

The results from the Community Inclusion scores indicate that participants are satisfied with the support and services that they receive. The District of Columbia scored slightly higher in this category compared to the national NCI average. Areas, where percentages were significantly lower, may have multiple meanings for interpretation. If the overall goal is for participants to feel included, engaged, and supported, the results indicate that participants are satisfied-based on performance.

<b>Community Inclusion, Participation, and Leisure</b>	<b>DC</b>	<b>NCI</b>	<b>-</b>
Went out shopping at least once in the past month (proxy respondents were allowed for this question)	89%	89%	*
Went out on errands at least once in the past month (proxy respondents were allowed for this question)	91%	86%	-5
Went out for entertainment at least once in the past month (proxy respondents were allowed for this question)	94%	74%	-20
Went out to eat at least once in the past month (proxy respondents were allowed for this question)	87%	86%	-1
Went out to religious service or spiritual practice at least once in the past month (proxy respondents were allowed for this question)	66%	41%	-25
Participated as a member in community group (proxy respondents were allowed for this question)	25%	32%	-7
Went on vacation in the past year (proxy respondents were allowed for this question)	79%	46%	-33
Able to go out and do the things s/he like to do in the community	71%	85%	-14
Able to go out and do the things s/he like to do in the community as often as s/he wants	75%	79%	-4
Has enough things to do when at home	86%	85%	-1
Average	76%	70%	-6

Table 5 Community Inclusion, Participation, and Leisure

## Things to Consider

This report illustrates the 2017-18 NCI Adult In-Person Survey demographics and outcome results from the District of Columbia (DC) compared to the NCI Average. All results are shown first in charts and sections that are highlighted are used to indicate areas where the state average was statistically higher or lower. Results from states with fewer than 20 responses are not displayed; however, the data are included in the NCI Average. All state and national data results for this survey can be found online at <http://www.nationalcoreindicators.org/resources/reports/>.