

Historical Appendix 1a (formerly Appendix H) - UIS Residential Settings Report

**Assessment of Illinois Home and Community Based Services
Agencies Providing Residential Services**

Developed to assist the Illinois Statewide Transition Plan

Conducted by the Survey Research Office, Center for State Policy & Leadership,
University of Illinois Springfield

(Report issued on January 22, 2015)

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to examine the policies, procedures, and activities of residential settings for Home or Community Based Service waivers. In order to accomplish this, the UIS Survey Research Office, Center for State Policy & Leadership, used a multi-mode methodology in order to allow agencies and settings to self-report on the types of policies and procedures in place throughout settings in Illinois. This report contains four chapters in addition to this introduction.

1. **Scope of Project** - This section provides a brief introduction to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services' (CMS) final rule relating to Home and Community Based Services (HCBS) for Medicaid-funded long term services and supports provided in residential and non-residential home and community-based settings.
2. **Summary of Results** - The purpose of this section is to summarize the results of the two surveys as well as provide an overview of the "Level of Autonomy Score" and the "Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score." These scores are the numerical values that will be used to identify the key areas of the Illinois Statewide Transition Plan. This section contains four subsections:
 - a. Results from the Agency-Specific Surveys
 - b. Characteristics of the Residential Settings
 - c. Individuals' Access to the Community in Residential Settings
 - d. Individuals' Personal Choice in Care Options in Residential Settings.
3. **Methodology** - This section provides a detailed analysis of the methodological design of this project. There were systematic decisions on how to assess all aspects of the settings from engagement with the community, transportation opportunities, residential/room accommodations, visiting hours, meal options, and personal autonomy and choice in care options. A detailed discussion of these decisions and the methodology employed by UIS researchers is provided in the methodology section.
4. **Survey Report** - This is a topline report which includes complete question wording and the frequency of responses to each of the answer categories.

Scope of Project

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) published its final rule relating to Home and Community Based Services (HCBS) for Medicaid-funded long term services and supports provided in residential and non-residential home and community-based settings. The final rule took effect on March 17, 2014. According to this rule, states are required to submit transition plans to CMS within one year of the effective date indicating how they intend to comply with the new requirements within a reasonable time period.

In an effort to follow the CMS final rule guidance, the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services, along with the Department of Human Services and the Department on Aging, developed several surveys with assistance of researchers from the UIS Survey Research Office in order to assess the State's current compliance with the new regulations specific to the residential and non-residential settings requirements. This report deals specifically with residential settings offered through HCBS waivers. A report discussing non-residential settings will be provided at a later date.

The following Illinois HCBS waivers are included in this analysis:

- Children and Young Adults with Developmental Disabilities
- Children that are Technology Dependent/Medically Fragile
- Persons with Disabilities
- Persons with Brain Injuries (BI)
- Adults with Developmental Disabilities
- Persons who are Elderly
- Persons with HIV or AIDs
- Supportive Living Facilities

The following types of settings are **not** included in this classification:

- Hospitals
- Institutions for mental diseases
- An *intermediate* care facility for individuals with intellectual disabilities
- Nursing facilities
- Mental health or DASA residential sites
- Residences for private pay residents only
- Individuals receiving care in their private residences/family homes

This report provides the results of the examination of residential settings for Illinois HCBS waivers.

Summary of Results

The results chapter contains four main sections: Results from the Agency-Specific Surveys, Characteristics of the Residential Settings, Individuals' Access to the Community in Residential Settings, and Individuals' Personal Choice in Care Options in Residential Settings. This executive summary provides an overview of each of the sections as well as a synopsis of the findings. It also provides an overview of the "Level of Autonomy Score" and a "Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score." These scores are the numerical values that will be used to identify the next steps as part of the Illinois Statewide Transition Plan.

Results from the Agency-Specific Surveys

The main survey required from each agency which operates at least one residential setting in Illinois was titled the "Agency-specific survey." Agencies were able to complete this survey online, on a paper form sent via U.S. mail, or over the phone with trained SRO interviewers. Of the 252 agencies identified as operating at least one residential setting for Illinois waiver HCBS participants, 236 completed the agency-specific form. This resulted in a 93.6 percent completion rate among all 252 agencies. The agencies that did not complete the agency-specific form will be contacted by their corresponding state agency in early 2015 in order to assess whether or not these agencies operate residential settings in Illinois. Those that do will be required to complete the agency-specific survey with an individual from the corresponding state agency (Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services, the Department of Human Services, or the Department on Aging).

There are three main purposes of the agency-specific survey:

- 1) Determine the number of residential settings in Illinois for HCBS waivers;
- 2) Identify the agencies that have agency-wide policies and procedures that regulate various aspects of the daily operations of their settings;
- 3) Understand the legal policies and restrictions that govern the residential settings.

The main findings of the agency-specific survey are listed below:

- There are currently 1658 residential settings in Illinois.
- The majority of agencies have agency-wide policies that apply to the setting(s) regarding two issues: (a) the living arrangements of the individuals residing at the setting and (b) visitation procedures.
- The majority of agencies do not have agency-wide policies that apply to the setting(s) for the following: (a) limiting individuals' access to food, (b) limiting visiting hours, (c) disallowing individuals from engaging in activities, (d) limiting individual access to personal funds/resources, (e) disallowing individuals from engaging in community activities, (f) limiting employment opportunities. For the frequency of responses to these questions, please see the topline report at the end of this report.
- The majority of agencies report that state, county, or city landlord/tenant laws apply to their settings.
- Slightly more than half of agencies have individual residential/service contracts for the individuals living at the setting while 42.9% of the agencies have blanket residential/service contracts.
- Forty-four percent of agencies do not provide units or dwellings that can be owned, rented or occupied under a legally enforceable agreement by the individual receiving services.

Characteristics of the Residential Settings

The setting-specific survey completed by 1658 residential settings allows researchers to gain unique insight into the demographic characteristics of the residential settings. The demographic section provides three important pieces of information.

- 1) The number of individuals (both Illinois HCBS waivers and others) at each residential setting.
- 2) The physical location and type of building of each setting
- 3) The controlling entity for each of the settings

Number of individuals

The mean number of individuals supported at each setting is 8.22, with the largest setting supporting 150 individuals. It is important to note that six settings reported that they are not currently supporting any Illinois HCBS waiver participants.

Physical location and type of building

- Sixteen settings (1%) report that they are “physically connected to a hospital, nursing facility, institution for mental disease, or an intermediate care facility for individuals with intellectual disabilities.”
- Fifty-eight (3.5%) report that while they are not physically connected, they are on the grounds or adjacent to these types of facilities.
- The majority (95.5%) report that they are not physically connect nor adjacent to these type of facilities.

When we examine types of settings, we find that the majority of respondents are Community Integrated Living Arrangements (CILAs). Eighty-nine percent of respondents report that CILA best describes their setting. The table below presents the percent of respondents from each of the categories.

Table 1. Types of settings

	Percent (n)
Community Integrated Living Arrangement (CILA)	89% (1476)
Supportive Living Facility (SLF)	6.2% (103)
Community Living Facility	2.2% (37)
Child Group Home	1.7% (28)
Comprehensive Care in Residential Settings	0.2% (4)
Supported Residential	0.2% (4)
Site-based Permanent Supported/Supportive Housing	0.1% (1)
Other	0.3% (8)

When asked to describe this setting as located in a rural area (located outside of a metropolitan area), located in a suburban area, or located in an urban area, half of respondents described their setting as being located in a suburban area (50.6%). Thirty-one percent reported that their setting was located in a rural area (31.0%) and 18.4 percent reported that their setting was located in an urban area.

When asked to describe the setting, slightly more than half of the settings are single housing units or apartments (50.7%) followed by group housing units (33.5%). Table 2 provides the complete list.

Table 2. Physical description of settings

	Percent (n)
A single housing unit or apartment	54.5% (907)
A group housing unit	36.0% (597)
An apartment building	8.0% (132)
Multiple settings co-located	1.1% (19)
A residential school	0.1% (1)
A gated/secured community	0.1% (1)

Controlling Entity

In addition, when asked what entity or entities control(s) the policies or procedures for the setting, 88.2 percent report that it is the parent agency or organization. Thirty-six report that the landlord controls the policies or procedures (2.2%), followed by private citizen or family (1.9%), the individual setting (1.6%) or a subsidiary or foundation (0.4%).

Finally, settings were told to identify all of the state agencies from which they receive funding for their services. As seen in the table below, the Illinois Department of Human Services is the largest funder for services.

State Agency Funding Services

	Number of settings
Illinois Department of Human Services	1505
Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services	349
Illinois Department on Aging	31

The final two results sections discuss the results of the setting-specific survey. The setting-specific survey deals with all aspects of the residential settings. In order to reduce the complexity of this instrument, we have categorized these into two factors: Individual's Access to the Community in Residential Settings and Individuals' Personal Autonomy and Choice in Care Options in Residential Settings. Each of these sections has the following subsections.

Individuals' Access to the Community in Residential Settings

- Community Engagement
- Transportation Opportunities

Individuals' Personal Choice in Care Options in Residential Settings

- Individual Care Plans
- Dining/Food Accommodations
- Setting Accommodations

Each of settings receives two scores within each of the five subsections: a “Level of Autonomy Score” and a “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score.” These scores measure related but unique concepts. The “Level of Autonomy Score” measures what level of autonomy or personal freedom individuals experience based on the policies of each residential setting. The “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score” measures how often individuals engage in these autonomous behaviors. These scores are calculated similarly among all of the five subsections.

“Level of Autonomy Score”- This score is calculated using items on a five-point Likert scale ranging from “Strongly Agree (5), Somewhat Agree (4), Neither Agree nor Disagree (3), Somewhat Disagree (2), Strongly Agree (1).” Settings were asked to report their level of agreement on a variety of different items measuring each of the five subsections. For example, one of the items measuring community engagement using the Likert scale asked respondents their level of agreement with the following statement: *Individuals are given easy access to the community outside of the setting.* While each of the subsections may have a different number of items measuring the concept, the “Level of Autonomy Scores” are standardized.

The scores for each of the subsections range from 1 to 5, where 1 indicates the lowest level of autonomy and 5 indicates the highest level of autonomy. The table below provides the mean “Level of Autonomy Score” for each of the subsections with the standard deviations in parentheses.

Table 3. Level of Autonomy Scores

	Level of Autonomy Score
Community Engagement	4.45 (.60)
Transportation Opportunities	3.77 (.50)
Individual Care Plans	3.84 (.53)
Dining/Food Accommodations	3.46 (.72)
Setting Accommodations	4.77 (.28)

As seen in the table above, all of the “Level of Autonomy Scores” range between the neutral category (3: Neither Agree nor Disagree”) and the strong agreement category (5: “Strongly Agree”). Overall, this indicates a high level of autonomy in each of the five subsections. Setting Accommodations has the highest “Level of Autonomy Score” while Dining/Food Accommodations has the lowest “Level of Autonomy Score.” To find a detailed discussion of the items that constructed each of these scores, please see the corresponding section in the following pages.

“Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score”- This score is calculated using a four-point frequency measure ranging from “All of the time” (4), “Most of the time” (3), “Some of the time” (2), “Never” (1). Settings were asked to report how often a variety of different behaviors occurs for each of the five subsections. For example, one of the items measuring individual care plans using the frequency scale asks respondents to report the frequency of the following item: *Individuals complaints are addressed in a timely manner.*

The scores for each of the subsections range from 1 to 4, where 1 indicates the lowest frequency amount and 4 indicates the highest frequency amount. The table below provides the mean “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score” for each of the subsections with the standard deviations in parentheses.

Table 4. Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score

	Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score
Community Engagement	2.95 (.58)
Transportation Opportunities	3.25 (.56)
Individual Care Plans	3.35 (.33)
Dining/Food Accommodations	3.12 (.43)
Setting Accommodations	3.19 (.40)

As seen in the table above, all of the “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Scores” range between “Some of the Time” (2) and “All of the Time” (4). Individual Care Plans has the highest “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score” at 3.35. This indicates that when it comes to individuals’ care plans, the majority of individuals are able to assert a high level of independent behavior. The lowest “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score” is Community Engagement. To find a detailed discussion of the items that constructed each of these scores, please see the corresponding section in the following pages.

The following pages discuss the five subsections of the results section. Each of the sections provides an overview of the findings (bullet points), and detailed descriptions of both the “Level of Autonomy Score” and the “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score.”

Individuals’ Access to the Community in Residential Settings

This results section is concerned with the policies and procedures in place that allow individual residents to be able to access the external community, outside of the residential setting. This section contains two subsections: Community Engagement and Transportation Opportunities.

Community Engagement

- Overall, the results on the level of community engagement within the residential settings are mixed. While settings report the second highest autonomy score on community engagement (4.45), they also report the lowest frequency of behaviors score. The latter may be due to the how often individuals within the setting pursue both competitive employment opportunities and noncompetitive employment opportunities.
- When respondents were asked “How often, if at all, do individuals participate in community activities while residing at the setting,” the majority of respondents report that individuals participate in these activities regularly with 87.7 percent of settings reporting this. Twelve percent of respondents report that the individuals participate occasionally and less than one percent (0.4%) report that individuals participate in community activities not often at all.
- The overall “Level of Autonomy Score” for community engagement is 4.45 (out of 5); The “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score” for community engagement is 2.95 (out of 4).

The overall “Level of Autonomy Score” for community engagement is 4.45, which indicates a high level of autonomy for residents in terms of their engagement in the community. When we examine the six items that constructed this score, we find slight differences among the different measures. The table below presents the percent of respondents who self-reported a “1” on this item (which indicates a low level of autonomy). The item that had the highest percent of respondents reporting that a low autonomy score is “Individuals are able to come and go as they please.”

Table 5. Items of “Level of Autonomy Score”

	Percent reporting lowest rating of autonomy
Individuals are able to come and go as they please.	14.2%
Interested individuals are given the resources on how to obtain employment.	6.2%
Individuals know where to find information on community activities.	4.0%
Individuals receive personal services (e.g., haircuts) in the community outside of the setting.	1.5%
Individuals are given easy access to the community outside of the setting.	0.8%
Individuals receive professional services (e.g., dental care) in the community outside of the setting.	0.6%

The “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score” was constructed using five items listed in the table below. The overall score for community engagement is 2.95, which indicates the lowest level of the frequency of independent behaviors. The table below presents the percent of respondents who self-reported a “1” on this item (which indicates the survey response of “never,” the lowest frequency score). As you can see in the table, the item that had the highest percent of respondents reporting a low frequency score is “individuals pursue competitive employment opportunities” with more than one-fourth of settings report that this never occurs. In addition, 15.1 percent of settings report that individuals never pursue other employment opportunities (both paid and volunteer).

Table 6. Items of “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score”

	Percent reporting lowest level of frequency
Individuals pursue competitive employment opportunities.	27.3%
Individuals pursue other employment opportunities (both paid and volunteer).	15.1%
Individuals talk about activities occurring outside of the setting.	2.6%
There is a record of the individual residents who attend each community activity event.	1.2%
Individuals participate in personal, social, and family events.	0.1%

Transportation Opportunities

- Overall, while settings report that the individuals engage in independent behaviors with regards to transportation opportunities quite often, it also appears that the level of autonomy associated with transportation is at a moderate level (ranging between neutral and somewhat agree).
- While 97.9 percent of the settings report that their setting is near other private residences and 76.6 percent report that their setting is near retail businesses, providing opportunities for transportation is still an important service provided by these settings. Therefore, 99.3 percent of settings report that they offer transportation opportunities. Twelve settings report that they do not offer any transportation opportunities.
- The overall “Level of Autonomy Score” for transportation opportunities is 3.77; the “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score” for transportation opportunities is 3.25.

The overall “Level of Autonomy Score” for transportation opportunities is 3.77, which indicates a moderate level of autonomy for residents in terms of their transportation opportunities. When we examine the seven items that constructed this score, we find slight differences among the items. The table below presents the percent of respondents who self-reported a “1” on this item (which indicates a low level of autonomy). As you see in the table, the item that had the highest percent of respondents reporting a low autonomy score is “a transportation schedule is posted in a common area.”

Table 7. Items of “Level of Autonomy Score”

	Percent reporting lowest rating of autonomy
A transportation schedule is posted in a common area.	59.9%
Individuals cannot only enter/exit the setting from designated entrances/exits.	36.3%
Individuals do not have to follow curfews or other requirements for a scheduled return to the setting.	14.6%
There are public transportation opportunities available to individuals in the setting.	11.0%
Transportation opportunities are not limited for individuals.	4.3%
The setting provides transportation opportunities to individuals outside of regularly scheduled options.	1.1%
The setting provides regularly scheduled transportation opportunities to individuals.	0.4%
Individuals feel confident using the transportation opportunities provided by the setting.	0.3%

The “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score” was constructed using three items listed in the table below. The overall score for transportation opportunities is 3.25, which indicates a high level of the frequency of independent behaviors in terms of transportation opportunities. The table below presents the percent of respondents who self-reported a “1” on this item (which indicates the survey response of “never,” the lowest frequency score). As seen in the table, the item that had the highest percent of respondents reporting a low frequency score is “individuals are informed/educated on how to use public transportation.”

Table 8. Items of “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score”

	Percent reporting lowest level of frequency
Individuals are informed/educated on how to use public transportation.	14.1%
Individuals use the transportation opportunities provided by the setting.	0.8%
Individuals know how to contact a staff member about transportation opportunities.	3.3%

Individuals' Personal Choice in Care Options in Residential Settings

This results section is concerned about the level of personal choice individual residents have while residing at the settings. This includes their individual care plans, their living arrangements, their sense of individuality, their dining arrangements, and their interactions with visitors and staff members. This section contains three subsections: Individual Care Plans, Dining/Food Accommodations, and Setting Accommodations

Individual Care Plans

- A vital component of the new federal regulations is that individuals at residential settings have flexibility and freedom in developing their individual care plans. The results of this survey indicate that the frequency of independent behaviors associated with individual care plans is at a high level.
- The majority of the residential settings that responded to this survey report that while individuals have a lot of choice in the type of care or assistance they receive or from whom, they are not in complete control. Eighty-eight percent of residential settings report this to be the case while 8.6 percent report that individuals have complete control and 3.8 percent report that individuals have little choice or control.
- Almost all of the settings (98%) report that the average individual at their setting has been asked about their goals and aspirations in the past 12 months and 79.5 percent report that individuals make changes to their plan of care “as needed or as requested.”
- The overall “Level of Autonomy Score” for individual care plans is 3.84, the “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score” for individual care plans is 3.35.

The overall “Level of Autonomy Score” for individual care plans is 3.84, which indicates a moderate level of autonomy for residents in terms of their individual care plans. When we examine the six items that constructed this score, we find slight differences among the measures. The table below presents the percent of respondents who self-reported a “1” on this item (which indicates the lowest level of autonomy). The item that had the highest percent of respondents reporting the lowest autonomy score is “individual requests regarding their care are forward to an independent/non-setting based case manager.”

Table 9. Items of “Level of Autonomy Score”

	Percent reporting lowest rating of autonomy
Individual requests regarding their care are forwarded to an independent/non-setting based case manager.	16.8%
Information on how to file a complaint is easily accessible to individuals.	4.1%
Individuals have a choice of which provider staff delivers care/support.	2.6%
Individual schedules for PT, OT, medication, diet, or other care options are NOT posted in common areas (i.e., hallways).	2.4%
Individuals know how make changes to their plans of care.	1.6%
Individuals feel comfortable expressing concerns regarding their care.	0.6%

The “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score” was constructed using eight items listed in the table below. The overall score for individual care plan is 3.35, which indicates the highest level of the frequency of

independent behaviors in terms of individual care planning. The table below presents the percent of respondents who self-reported a “1” on this item (which indicates the survey response of “never,” the lowest frequency score). The item that had the highest percent of respondents reporting a low frequency score is “Staff members do not discuss individuals with other staff members in public space.” 7 percent of settings report that this never happens.

Table 10. Items of “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score”

	Percent reporting lowest level of frequency
Staff members do not discuss individuals with other staff members in public spaces.	7.0%
Individuals make changes to their plan of care as needed.	2.0%
When needed, individuals know how to request a new/additional service.	2.0%
Individuals with concerns, discuss the concerns with the setting staff.	0.9%
Individuals provide input into their daily schedules.	0.5%
Individual complaints are addressed in a timely manner.	0.1%
When an individual files a complaint, it is considered confidential.	0.1%
Individuals have the opportunity to express their level of satisfaction with the services they are receiving.	0.0%

Dining/Food Accommodations

- One way that individuals are able to express their own personal choice is in their dining and meal decisions. According to the survey results, current setting accommodations do not allow a lot of freedom and flexibility in regards to dining and food accommodations. One of the major restrictions is where individuals are allowed to eat with a significant number of settings reporting that individuals are not allowed to eat in their units nor eat outside of common dining areas.
- Slightly more than half of the settings (52.3%) report that individuals have a lot of choice when it comes to their dining and meal decisions. Forty-seven percent of settings report that individuals have some choice when it comes to these decisions and less than one percent (0.2%) report that individuals have no choice at all.
- The overall “Level of Autonomy Score” for dining/food accommodations is 3.46; the “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score” for dining and food accommodations is 3.12.

The overall “Level of Autonomy Score” for dining/food accommodations is 3.46, which is the lowest score among all of the subsections. When we examine the five items that constructed this score, we find differences among the items. The table below presents the percent of respondents who self-reported a “1” on this item (which indicates a low level of autonomy). The item that had the highest percent of respondents reporting a low autonomy score is “individuals are able to eat in their units.”

Table 11. Items of “Level of Autonomy Score”

	Percent reporting lowest rating of autonomy
Individuals are able to eat in their units.	18.2%
Individuals are able to set their own dining/meal-time schedule.	5.5%
Individuals are able to eat in places other than the common dining areas.	5.4%
Individuals do not have assigned seating during meal-times.	1.5%
Individuals are able to eat at non-designated meal-times.	0.9%

The “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score” was constructed using four items listed in the table below. The overall score for dining and food accommodations is 3.12, which indicates a lower level of the frequency of independent behaviors in terms of dining and food accommodations. The table below presents the percent of respondents who self-reported a “1” on this item (which indicates the survey response of “never,” the lowest frequency score). The item that had the highest percent of respondents reporting a low frequency score is “individuals eat in places other than common dining areas.”

Table 12. Items of “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score”

	Percent reporting lowest level of frequency
Individuals eat in places other than common dining areas.	16.0%
There is more than one meal option during meal-times.	1.4%
Between designated meal-times, the setting provides other food or refreshments.	1.2%
Individuals engage with others during meal-times.	0.9%

Setting Accommodations

- According to the survey results, individuals have a lot of autonomy when it comes to their setting accommodations as well as demonstrate frequently independent behaviors.
- More than half of the settings report that individuals have a lot of freedom to move inside/outside of the setting (57.3%), while 42.24 percent report that they have some freedom and less than one percent reporting that they have no freedom at all. In addition, 65 percent of the settings report that individual residents have a lot of privacy while at the setting.
- The overall “Level of Autonomy Score” for setting accommodations is 4.77; the “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score” is 3.19.

The overall “Level of Autonomy Score” for setting accommodations is 4.77. This score is the highest of all of the subsections indicating a very high level of autonomy for individuals in terms of their setting accommodations. When we examine the twelve items that constructed this score, we find slight differences among the items. The table below presents the percent of respondents who self-reported a “1” on this item (which indicates the lowest level of autonomy). The item that had the highest percent of respondents reporting the lowest autonomy score is “individuals are able to lock the door to their units.”

Table 13. Items of “Level of Autonomy Score”

	Percent
Individuals are able to lock the door to their units.	46.6%
Individuals are allowed to have their own checking and/or savings account.	5.8%
Individuals are able to furnish and decorate their units to their own preferences.	3.5%
Individuals have access to cell phones, computers, and other mobile technological devices in common areas.	3.0%
Visitors are allowed to visit individuals in the setting outside of regularly scheduled visiting hours.	1.6%
Individuals are allowed to own cell phones, computers, and other mobile technological devices.	1.4%
Individuals have access to do their own laundry.	1.2%
Visitors are free to move about public areas within the setting.	0.7%
Individuals have access to a kitchen setting.	0.6%
Individuals have access to a television in common areas.	0.5%
Individuals are allowed to receive visitors at this setting.	0.2%
Individuals are able to have their own sense of style.	0.0%

The “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score” was constructed using twelve items listed in the table below. The overall score is 3.19, which indicates a moderate level of the frequency of independent behaviors in terms for setting accommodations. The table below presents the percent of respondents who self-reported a “1” on this item (which indicates the survey response of “never,” the lowest frequency score). The item that had the highest percent of respondents reporting a low frequency score is “married couples have the option to share a unit.”

Table 14. Items of “Frequency of Independent Behaviors Score”

	Percent reporting lowest level of frequency
Married couples have the option to share a unit.	25.3%
Individuals and their visitors do not have to follow the visiting hour schedules	25.1%
Individuals have the option to live in private units.	14.9%
If sharing a room, individuals get to choose a roommate.	13.2%
Setting providers do not maintain control over the individual’s finances.	12.6%
Individuals with roommates discuss their living situation with staff or counselors.	7.8%
Individuals are not assigned a roommate by staff.	1.7%
Staff members assist the individuals who need help getting dressed, at a time designated by the individual.	1.5%
Staff members do not have difficulty getting along with individuals at the setting.	0.7%
Staff members knock before entering individuals units.	0.1%
Individuals choose their daily clothing.	0.1%
Individuals are clean and well-groomed.	0.1%

Methodology

The HCBS residential survey is actually two surveys: an agency-specific survey and a setting-specific survey. Every agency was required to fill out both an agency-specific residential survey as well as a setting-specific residential survey for each of their residential settings. Settings were able to participate in the surveys via online, mail, and phone.

The Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services, along with the Department of Human Services and the Department on Aging provided a list of agencies which operate residential settings offered through HCBS waivers. A total of 256 agencies met these guidelines. Mailing addresses, contact information for the director of each agency, and email addresses were provided by each of the corresponding state agencies. All agencies were contacted at least five times by researchers at the Survey Research Office (SRO).

The first contact to the agencies was through emails from their corresponding state agencies: Illinois Departments of Healthcare and Family Services, Human Services, or Aging. After the email distribution, the same information was sent from the SRO in an introductory letter via U.S. Postal Service on September 26th, 2014. This correspondence discussed the need for Illinois to take inventory of all supportive congregate and/or group residential settings that are not hospitals, nursing homes, IMDs or ICF-DDs and where the HCBS participant and the State, at this time, considers this setting as his/her residence. This letter also informed the agency that they will be receiving information on how to complete a survey for their residential settings from the University of Illinois at Springfield (UIS). In addition, the recipients received specific language explaining that while there are no right or wrong answers to questions, their participation in the survey is mandatory.

The first round of survey instruments was sent to each of the 256 agencies via U.S. Postal Service on October 3rd, 2014. Included in the mailing was an introductory letter to the director of the agency, an agency-specific survey, ten copies of the setting-specific survey, and five business reply envelopes. The agency-specific survey contained an identifying tracking number in order for SRO researchers to keep track of the agencies who had completed the surveys. Individuals were instructed that they could complete the hard copies of the surveys included in the mailing packet or complete the surveys online through provided URLs. If agencies needed additional copies of the setting-specific survey, they were instructed to contact the SRO via email or telephone.

A reminder postcard was sent to all of the agencies on October 13, 2014. This postcard contained the project identification number for each of the agencies as well the URL to complete the surveys online. A second mailing occurred on October 17th, 2014. This mailing included the introductory letter, the agency-specific survey, and five copies of the setting-specific survey. Agencies that had not completed the surveys by November 4, 2014 received phone calls from trained SRO interviewers. These phone calls were placed at different dates and times of the work week in an effort to increase the number of responses. Phone interviews concluded on November 23, 2014. The survey closed on December 15, 2014.

Through these various methods, SRO was able to get information through the survey from 236 of the 252 agencies (95%) that operate residential settings in Illinois. In addition, these agencies are responsible for operating 1658 residential settings in Illinois.

Response bias may occur within surveys that rely on self-assessment, especially in situations in which funding may be in jeopardy. The following steps were taken to mitigate this bias:

1) The instructions attached to both surveys -- agency-specific and setting-specific -- emphasized that the data provided by both the agency and the setting are for informational purposes only and will not be used to assess the federal compliance of either the agency or the setting.

2) The following information was included on every page of the setting-specific survey:

REMINDER: The input you provide will be used to inform the Transition Plan and will NOT be used to evaluate whether the setting is currently in compliance with the new federal requirements. For example, selecting “Never” or “Strongly Disagree” for one of the items does not indicate that you are not in compliance. *Please answer the questions based on what “typically occurs” in the setting.* The emphasis is on what are in the setting’s policies and procedures. It is recognized that individual’s plans of care may dictate certain restrictions that would be documented to cause harm or reflect one’s abilities.

3) The majority of both surveys used Likert scales to effectively evaluate agencies and settings. The Likert technique is one of the most used and most validated survey designs. It involves asking a respondent to indicate how much he/she agrees or disagrees with each of a set of statements. The surveys used a five-point Likert response scale: strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, or strongly agree.

4) Each survey included both positive statements (Individuals have access to a kitchen setting) and negative statements (Individuals do NOT have access to do their own laundry). When a survey or section of a survey contains only positive or only negative items, research shows that this can influence how people respond. A set of items worded only positively (with no negative items mixed in) can induce a positive bias from respondents. They respond by agreeing with those items more than they might if the set also included negatively worded items. The same goes for only framing survey items negatively. Thus, to reduce this bias, the surveys always include a mix of positively and negatively worded items.

5) In addition to the Likert design, the survey included questions on the frequency of certain behaviors, rather than just asking whether the behavior occurs or not. The questions included asking respondents “how often” certain activities occur at the setting. The four-point response categories ranged from “all of the time,” “most of the time,” “some of the time,” and “never.” Including this scale allows individuals to provide more specific and useful information.

The following report is separated into four sections: Results from the Agency-specific Surveys, Demographics of the Residential Settings, and Individuals’ Access to the Community in Residential Settings, Individuals’ Personal Autonomy and Choice in Care Options in Residential Settings.

If you have any questions or comments about this report, please contact the Survey Research Office:

Dr. Ashley Kirzinger, Director
Survey Research Office
Center for State Policy & Leadership
University of Illinois Springfield
(217) 206-6591, sro@uis.edu

Topline Report

Agency-Specific Surveys

How much, if at all, do you agree with the following statements about your agency? Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree? If you do not know the answer, please check “Don’t know.”

There are agency-wide policies that apply to the setting(s) regarding visitation procedures.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	47.6% (108)
Somewhat agree	28.6% (65)
Somewhat disagree	6.2% (14)
Strongly disagree	14.1% (32)
Don’t know	3.5% (8)

There are agency-wide policies that apply to the setting(s) regarding the living arrangements of the individuals residing at the setting(s).

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	64.2% (145)
Somewhat agree	23.0% (52)
Somewhat disagree	3.5% (8)
Strongly disagree	5.8% (13)
Don’t know	3.5% (8)

There are agency-wide policies and procedures that limit individuals’ access to food at its setting(s).

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	3.9% (9)
Somewhat agree	8.7% (20)
Somewhat disagree	12.7% (29)
Strongly disagree	71.6% (164)
Don’t know	3.1% (7)

There are agency-wide policies and procedures that limit visiting hours at its setting(s).

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	6.6% (15)
Somewhat agree	14.5% (33)
Somewhat disagree	17.5% (40)
Strongly disagree	59.2% (135)
Don’t know	2.2% (5)

There are agency-wide policies and procedures that disallow individuals from engaging in legal activities at its setting(s).

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	4.4% (10)
Somewhat agree	5.3% (12)
Somewhat disagree	4.4% (10)
Strongly disagree	76.0% (171)
Don't know	9.8% (22)

There are agency-wide policies and procedures that limit individual access to their personal funds/resources at its setting(s).

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	6.2% (14)
Somewhat agree	13.2% (30)
Somewhat disagree	10.1% (23)
Strongly disagree	68.7% (156)
Don't know	1.8% (4)

There are agency-wide policies and procedures that disallow individuals from engaging in community activities at its setting(s).

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	0.4% (1)
Somewhat agree	1.3% (3)
Somewhat disagree	3.9% (9)
Strongly disagree	91.7% (21)
Don't know	2.6% (6)

There are agency-wide policies and procedures that limit individual employment opportunities at its setting(s).

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	2.2% (5)
Somewhat agree	3.9% (9)
Somewhat disagree	6.6% (15)
Strongly disagree	80.8% (185)
Don't know	6.6% (15)

Please answer whether the following apply to all of your settings, some of your settings, none of your settings. If you do not know the answer, please check "Don't know."

State, county, or city landlord/tenant laws apply to your setting(s).

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Applies to all of our settings	36.4% (82)
Applies to some of our settings	20.9% (47)
Applies to none of our settings	25.3% (57)
Don't know	17.3% (39)

The agency has a blanket residential/service contract for all individuals residing at the setting(s).

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Applies to all of our settings	42.9% (97)
Applies to some of our settings	7.5% (17)
Applies to none of our settings	41.2% (93)
Don't know	8.4% (19)

The agency has individual residential/service contracts for all individuals residing at the setting(s).

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Applies to all of our settings	51.3% (116)
Applies to some of our settings	7.1% (16)
Applies to none of our settings	35.8% (81)
Don't know	5.8% (13)

The agency provides units or dwellings that can be owned, rented, or occupied under a legally enforceable agreement by the individual receiving services.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Applies to all of our settings	35.0% (79)
Applies to some of our settings	11.9% (27)
Applies to none of our settings	44.2% (100)
Don't know	8.8% (20)

Setting-Specific Survey

How many HCBS or other State-funded approved participants are supported at this location?

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Less than five	39.8% (662)
Five to 10 participants	51.6% (860)
11-20 participants	2.4% (39)
More than 20 participants	7.0% (103)

Which of the following best describes your setting?

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Physically connected to a hospital, nursing facility, institution for mental diseases, or an intermediate care facility for individuals with intellectual disabilities.	1.0% (16)
Not physically connected but on the grounds or adjacent to a hospital, nursing facility, institution for mental diseases, or an intermediate care facility for individuals with intellectual disabilities.	3.5% (58)
Not physically connected or adjacent hospital, nursing facility, institution for mental diseases, or an intermediate care facility for individuals with intellectual disabilities.	95.5% (1570)

Please identify all state agencies with whom you may receive funding to provide services for:

	Percent (n)
Illinois Department of Human Services	90.7% (1505)
Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services	21.0% (349)
Illinois Department on Aging	1.9% (31)

Which of the following best describes the setting?

	Percent (n)
Community Integrated Living Arrangement (CILA)	89% (1476)
Supportive Living Facility (SLF)	6.2% (103)
Community Living Facility	2.2% (37)
Child Group Home	1.7% (28)
Comprehensive Care in Residential Settings	0.2% (4)
Supported Residential	0.2% (4)
Site-based Permanent Supported/Supportive Housing	0.1% (1)
Other	0.3% (5)

Would you describe this setting as located in a rural area, located in a suburban area, or located in an urban area?

	Percent (n)
Located in a rural area (located outside of a metropolitan area)	31.0% (51)
Located in a suburban area	50.6% (826)
Located in an urban area	18.4% (300)

Please select all of the following that describe this setting:

	Percent (n)
A single housing unit or apartment	54.5% (904)
A group housing unit	36.0% (597)
An apartment building	8.0% (132)
Multiple settings co-located	1.1% (19)
A residential school	0.1% (1)
A gated/secured community	0.1% (1)

What entity/entities control(s) the policies or procedures for this setting?

	Percent (n)
The parent agency/organization	88.2% (1454)
The individual setting	1.6% (27)
A subsidiary or foundation	0.4% (6)
A landlord	2.2% (36)
A private citizen or family	1.9% (31)
Other, please specify:	5.8% (95)

Others mentioned: Agency board of directors, Private citizen, Not for profit, Housing authority.

Community Activities

The first set of questions deal with access to community activities (events occurring external to your setting such as religious services, shopping, employment, or other social/personal/family events outside of the setting). We are interested in how individuals participate in unscheduled and scheduled community activities at your setting.

How often, if at all, do individuals participate in community activities while residing at the setting? Would you say that the majority of individuals participate in these activities regularly, occasionally, or not often at all?

	Percent (n)
Regularly	87.7% (1439)
Occasionally	11.8% (194)
Not often at all	0.4% (7)

Please select whether the following occur all of the time, most of the time, some of the time, or never.

For each community activity, there is a record of the individual residents who attended the event.

	Percent (n)
All of the time	44.7% (733)
Most of the time	40.8% (668)
Some of the time	13.3% (218)
Never	1.2% (20)

Individuals participate in personal, social, and family events (i.e., attend religious services, eat with family).

	Percent (n)
All of the time	55.4% (913)
Most of the time	28.8% (474)
Some of the time	15.7% (259)
Never	0.1% (1)

Individuals pursue competitive employment opportunities.

	Percent (n)
All of the time	13.6% (223)
Most of the time	9.4% (154)
Some of the time	49.8% (818)
Never	27.3% (448)

Individuals pursue other employment opportunities (both paid and volunteer).

	Percent (n)
All of the time	26.8% (441)
Most of the time	22.2% (365)
Some of the time	35.8% (589)
Never	15.1% (248)

Individuals talk about activities occurring outside of the setting.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	56.7% (933)
Most of the time	24.2% (397)
Some of the time	16.5% (272)
Never	2.6% (43)

How much, if at all, do you agree with the following statements about your setting? Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree?

Individuals do NOT know where to find information on community activities.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	4.0% (65)
Somewhat agree	14.2% (232)
Neither agree nor disagree	12.3% (202)
Somewhat disagree	30.2% (494)
Strongly disagree	39.3% (644)

Individuals are able to come and go as they please.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	22.5% (367)
Somewhat agree	32.5% (530)
Neither agree nor disagree	14.8% (242)
Somewhat disagree	14.6% (238)
Strongly disagree	15.5% (253)

Interested individuals are given the resources on how to obtain employment.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	50.0% (818)
Somewhat agree	27.4% (448)
Neither agree nor disagree	11.1% (181)
Somewhat disagree	5.4% (89)
Strongly disagree	6.2% (101)

Individuals are given easy access to the community outside of the setting.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	58.2% (954)
Somewhat agree	31.3% (514)
Neither agree nor disagree	6.5% (106)
Somewhat disagree	3.2% (53)
Strongly disagree	0.8% (13)

Individuals do NOT receive any personal services (e.g., haircuts) in the community outside of the setting.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	1.5% (25)
Somewhat agree	2.0% (33)
Neither agree nor disagree	0.4% (6)
Somewhat disagree	5.6% (92)
Strongly disagree	90.0% (1485)

Individuals do NOT receive any professional services (e.g., dental care) in the community outside of the setting.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	0.6% (10)
Somewhat agree	1.6% (26)
Neither agree nor disagree	0.1% (2)
Somewhat disagree	3.4% (56)
Strongly disagree	94.3% (1542)

Setting Accommodations

The next set of questions deal with the accommodations provided by your setting for individuals.

Do individuals at your setting have a lot of choice, some choice, or no choice at all in the initial decision to live at your setting?

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
A lot of choice	65.0% (1058)
Some choice	33.2% (54)
No choice at all	1.8% (29)

When it comes to residential options for an individual living at the setting, would you say that a typical individual has a lot of choice, some choice, or no choice at all?

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
A lot of choice	46.9% (765)
Some choice	52.0% (848)
No choice at all	1.2% (19)

In general, would you say that individual residents have a lot of privacy, some privacy, or no privacy at the setting?

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
A lot of privacy	65.0% (1059)
Some privacy	35.0% (570)
No privacy at all	0.1% (1)

How much, if at all, do you agree with the following statements about your setting? Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree?

Individuals are NOT allowed to receive visitors at this setting.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	0.2% (3)
Somewhat agree	0.0% (0)
Neither agree nor disagree	0.2% (4)
Somewhat disagree	1.3% (21)
Strongly disagree	98.3% (1607)

Individuals are able to furnish and decorate their units to their own preferences.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	84.9% (1388)
Somewhat agree	10.6% (174)
Neither agree nor disagree	0.4% (6)
Somewhat disagree	0.5% (8)
Strongly disagree	3.5% (58)

Individuals are NOT able to lock the door to their units.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	17.1% (279)
Somewhat agree	7.6% (124)
Neither agree nor disagree	8.3% (135)
Somewhat disagree	20.5% (334)
Strongly disagree	46.6% (761)

Visitors are free to move about public areas within the setting (common areas, dining rooms).

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	84.4% (1380)
Somewhat agree	11.9% (195)
Neither agree nor disagree	2.9% (47)
Somewhat disagree	0.2% (3)
Strongly disagree	0.7% (11)

Visitors are allowed to visit individuals in the setting outside of regularly scheduled visiting hours.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	53.8% (874)
Somewhat agree	28.2% (459)
Neither agree nor disagree	12.9% (209)
Somewhat disagree	3.5% (57)
Strongly disagree	1.6% (26)

Please select whether the following occur all of the time, most of the time, some of the time, or never.

Individuals have the option to live in private units.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	47.4% (771)
Most of the time	15.1% (246)
Some of the time	22.5% (366)
Never	14.9% (242)

If sharing a room, individuals get to choose a roommate.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	26.4% (395)
Most of the time	27.6% (412)
Some of the time	32.8% (490)
Never	13.2% (197)

Married couples have the option to share a unit.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	65.7% (1020)
Most of the time	5.2% (80)
Some of the time	3.9% (60)
Never	25.3% (393)

Staff members knock before entering individual units.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	76.3% (1241)
Most of the time	20.5% (333)
Some of the time	3.2% (52)
Never	0.1% (1)

Individuals with roommates discuss their living situation with staff or counselors.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	51.2% (766)
Most of the time	25.4% (380)
Some of the time	15.6% (233)
Never	7.8% (117)

Individuals are assigned a roommate by staff.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	1.7% (26)
Most of the time	9.8% (148)
Some of the time	46.4% (698)
Never	42.0% (631)

Individuals and their visitors follow the visiting hour schedules.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	25.1% (376)
Most of the time	47.9% (718)
Some of the time	5.4% (81)
Never	21.6% (323)

In general, would you say that individuals have a lot of freedom to move inside/outside of the setting, some freedom to move inside/outside of the setting, or no freedom to move inside/outside of the setting?

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
A lot of freedom	57.3% (934)
Some freedom	42.4% (691)
No freedom	0.4% (6)

Next, we are interested in the dining/food accommodations at your setting. When it comes to dining/food options, would you say that a typical individual has a lot of choice, some choice, or no choice at all?

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
A lot of choice	52.3% (850)
Some choice	47.4% (770)
No choice at all	0.2% (4)

Please select whether the following occur all of the time, most of the time, some of the time, or never.

Individuals do NOT engage with others during meal-times.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	0.9% (14)
Most of the time	1.7% (27)
Some of the time	23.9% (387)
Never	73.6% (1192)

There is more than one meal option during meal-times.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	41.3% (671)
Most of the time	19.8% (322)
Some of the time	37.5% (609)
Never	1.4% (23)

Individuals eat in places other than common dining areas.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	8.9% (145)
Most of the time	2.3% (37)
Some of the time	72.8% (1183)
Never	16.0% (260)

Between designated meal-times, the setting provides other food or refreshments.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	79.1% (1288)
Most of the time	17.5% (285)
Some of the time	2.2% (36)
Never	1.2% (19)

How much, if at all, do you agree with the following statements about your setting? Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree?

Individuals are assigned seating during meal-times.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	1.5% (25)
Somewhat agree	4.9% (80)
Neither agree nor disagree	9.2% (150)
Somewhat disagree	9.7% (158)
Strongly disagree	74.6% (1215)

Individuals are NOT able to eat at non-designated meal-times.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	0.9% (15)
Somewhat agree	3.9% (63)
Neither agree nor disagree	3.2% (52)
Somewhat disagree	23.8% (387)
Strongly disagree	68.2% (1110)

Individuals are able to eat in places other than common dining areas.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	28.3% (460)
Somewhat agree	45.4% (739)
Neither agree nor disagree	5.4% (88)
Somewhat disagree	15.5% (253)
Strongly disagree	5.4% (88)

Individuals are NOT allowed to eat in their units.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	18.2% (296)
Somewhat agree	26.7% (433)
Neither agree nor disagree	9.5% (154)
Somewhat disagree	18.4% (299)
Strongly disagree	27.1% (440)

Individuals are able to set their own dining/meal-time schedule.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	14.6% (238)
Somewhat agree	42.9% (699)
Neither agree nor disagree	16.8% (274)
Somewhat disagree	20.1% (327)
Strongly disagree	5.5% (90)

We are also interested in the transportation opportunities and access at your setting. How much, if at all, do you agree with the following statements about your setting? Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree?

Individuals can only enter/exit the setting from designated entrances/exits.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	36.3% (589)
Somewhat agree	11.0% (179)
Neither agree nor disagree	10.1% (164)
Somewhat disagree	5.4% (87)
Strongly disagree	37.1% (602)

There are NO public transportation opportunities available to individuals in the setting.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	11.0% (179)
Somewhat agree	15.1% (246)
Neither agree nor disagree	3.3% (54)
Somewhat disagree	28.7% (467)
Strongly disagree	41.9% (681)

The setting provides regularly scheduled transportation opportunities to individuals.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	79.6% (1258)
Somewhat agree	16.7% (264)
Neither agree nor disagree	2.3% (37)
Somewhat disagree	0.9% (14)
Strongly disagree	0.4% (7)

The setting provides transportation opportunities to individuals outside of regularly scheduled options.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	65.8% (1075)
Somewhat agree	27.4% (447)
Neither agree nor disagree	2.0% (32)
Somewhat disagree	3.7% (61)
Strongly disagree	1.1% (18)

Individuals have to follow curfews or other requirements for a scheduled return to the setting.

	Percent (n)
Strongly agree	14.6% (237)
Somewhat agree	37.4% (608)
Neither agree nor disagree	10.5% (171)
Somewhat disagree	16.2% (263)
Strongly disagree	21.4% (348)

Is your setting near other private residences?

	Percent (n)
Yes	97.9% (1593)
No	2.1% (35)

Are retail businesses near your setting?

	Percent (n)
Yes	76.6% (1246)
No	23.4% (381)

Only answer these questions if your setting provides transportation opportunities to individuals. If your setting does not provide transportation opportunities, please continue to the next page.

Please select whether the following occur all of the time, most of the time, some of the time, or never.

Individuals are informed/educated on how to use public transportation.

	Percent (n)
All of the time	26.7% (428)
Most of the time	29.9% (478)
Some of the time	29.4% (470)
Never	14.1% (225)

Individuals use the transportation opportunities provided by the setting.

	Percent (n)
All of the time	70.7% (1140)
Most of the time	23.7% (382)
Some of the time	4.8% (78)
Never	0.8% (13)

Individuals know how to contact a staff member about transportation opportunities.

	Percent (n)
All of the time	60.8% (978)
Most of the time	26.4% (424)
Some of the time	9.6% (154)
Never	3.3% (53)

How much, if at all, do you agree with the following statements about your setting? Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree?

Transportation opportunities are limited for individuals.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	4.3% (70)
Somewhat agree	20.5% (331)
Neither agree nor disagree	7.6% (123)
Somewhat disagree	27.5% (443)
Strongly disagree	40.0% (644)

Individuals feel confident using the transportation opportunities provided by the setting.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	81.9% (1320)
Somewhat agree	11.2% (181)
Neither agree nor disagree	6.0% (96)
Somewhat disagree	0.6% (10)
Strongly disagree	0.3% (5)

A transportation schedule is posted in a common area at the setting.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	6.5% (104)
Somewhat agree	5.5% (88)
Neither agree nor disagree	22.2% (355)
Somewhat disagree	5.9% (94)
Strongly disagree	59.9% (956)

The next set of questions deals with individual choice when it comes to their care and services provided. First, we are interested in how often individuals are asked about their needs and preferences.

Thinking about the average individual at your setting, were they asked about their goals and aspirations in the past 12 months?

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Yes	98.0% (1580)
No	0.6% (10)
Don't know	1.4% (22)

How often, if at all, do individuals make changes to their plan of care?

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Never	1.1% (17)
Annually	7.5% (118)
Semi-annually	10.9% (171)
Monthly	1.0% (15)
As needed/ requested	79.5% (1244)

Please select whether the following occur all of the time, most of the time, some of the time, or never.

Individual complaints are addressed in a timely manner.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	62.7% (1021)
Most of the time	37.1% (604)
Some of the time	0.1% (1)
Never	0.1% (2)

Individuals make changes to their plan of care as needed.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	55.5% (900)
Most of the time	33.5% (543)
Some of the time	9.1% (147)
Never	2.0% (33)

Individuals with concerns, discuss the concerns with the setting staff.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	70.0% (1141)
Most of the time	27.0% (440)
Some of the time	2.0% (33)
Never	0.9% (15)

Individuals provide input into their daily schedules.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	55.7% (904)
Most of the time	36.6% (593)
Some of the time	7.2% (117)
Never	0.5% (8)

Staff members do NOT discuss individuals with other staff members in public spaces.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	58.0% (942)
Most of the time	31.2% (507)
Some of the time	3.8% (62)
Never	7.0% (114)

When an individual files a complaint, it is considered confidential.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	92.4% (1505)
Most of the time	6.9% (113)
Some of the time	0.6% (9)
Never	0.1% (1)

When needed, individuals know how to request a new/additional service.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	45.9% (746)
Most of the time	40.5% (659)
Some of the time	11.6% (188)
Never	2.0% (33)

Individuals have the opportunity to express their level of satisfaction with the services they are receiving.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	85.0% (1379)
Most of the time	13.6% (221)
Some of the time	1.4% (22)
Never	0.0% (0)

How much, if at all, do you agree with the following statements about your setting? Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree?

Individuals do NOT feel comfortable expressing concerns regarding their care.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	0.6% (10)
Somewhat agree	1.6% (26)
Neither agree nor disagree	2.7% (44)
Somewhat disagree	15.8% (255)
Strongly disagree	79.3% (1282)

Individuals do NOT know how make changes to their plans of care.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	1.6% (26)
Somewhat agree	6.4% (103)
Neither agree nor disagree	8.1% (131)
Somewhat disagree	39.0% (629)
Strongly disagree	44.9% (724)

Information on how to file a complaint is easily accessible to individuals.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	62.6% (1013)
Somewhat agree	25.3% (409)
Neither agree nor disagree	6.1% (99)
Somewhat disagree	1.9% (31)
Strongly disagree	4.1% (67)

Individuals do NOT have a choice of which provider staff delivers care/support.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	2.6% (42)
Somewhat agree	25.7% (414)
Neither agree nor disagree	10.7% (173)
Somewhat disagree	34.1% (550)
Strongly disagree	27.0% (435)

Individual requests regarding their care are forwarded to independent/non-setting based case manager.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	36.5% (592)
Somewhat agree	31.9% (517)
Neither agree nor disagree	12.4% (201)
Somewhat disagree	2.3% (38)
Strongly disagree	16.8% (273)

Individual schedules for PT, OT, medication, diet, or other care options are posted in common areas (i.e., hallways).

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	2.4% (39)
Somewhat agree	5.3% (85)
Neither agree nor disagree	12.4% (200)
Somewhat disagree	6.2% (100)
Strongly disagree	73.7% (1191)

Once an individual has made the choice of your setting, please select the one statement that best describes the level of individual choice at the setting.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Individuals have complete control over the type of care or assistance they receive or from whom they receive care or assistance from.	8.6% (140)
While individuals have a lot of choice in the type of care or assistance they receive or from whom, they are not in complete control.	87.5% (1417)
Individuals have little choice in the type of care or assistance they receive and not have control over from whom they receive care or assistance.	3.8% (62)

Please select whether the following occur all of the time, most of the time, some of the time, or never.

Individuals choose their daily clothing.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	68.5% (1112)
Most of the time	27.3% (443)
Some of the time	4.1% (67)
Never	0.1% (1)

Setting providers maintain control over the individual's finances.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	12.6% (201)
Most of the time	30.4% (484)
Some of the time	38.0% (604)
Never	19.0% (302)

Individuals are clean and well-groomed.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	56.5% (915)
Most of the time	43.0% (697)
Some of the time	0.4% (7)
Never	0.1% (1)

Staff members assist the individuals who need help getting dressed, at a time designated by the individual.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	56.9% (921)
Most of the time	36.3% (587)
Some of the time	5.3% (86)
Never	1.5% (25)

Staff members have difficulty getting along with individuals at the setting.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
All of the time	0.7% (11)
Most of the time	0.4% (6)
Some of the time	46.1% (747)
Never	52.9% (1622)

How much, if at all, do you agree with the following statements about your setting? Do you strongly agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree, or strongly disagree?

Individuals are able to have their own sense of style (haircut, clothing options).

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	91.6% (1488)
Somewhat agree	7.4% (120)
Neither agree nor disagree	0.8% (13)
Somewhat disagree	0.2% (3)
Strongly disagree	

Individuals are allowed to have their own checking and/or savings account.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	70.5% (1143)
Somewhat agree	16.0% (260)
Neither agree nor disagree	5.3% (86)
Somewhat disagree	2.4% (39)
Strongly disagree	5.8% (94)

Individuals are NOT allowed to own cell phones, computers, and other mobile technological devices.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	1.4% (23)
Somewhat agree	2.5% (40)
Neither agree nor disagree	1.7% (27)
Somewhat disagree	6.7% (108)
Strongly disagree	87.8% (1426)

Individuals have access to a kitchen setting.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	92.7% (1509)
Somewhat agree	5.4% (88)
Neither agree nor disagree	0.9% (14)
Somewhat disagree	0.4% (7)
Strongly disagree	0.6% (10)

Individuals do NOT have access to do their own laundry.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	1.2% (19)
Somewhat agree	1.9% (30)
Neither agree nor disagree	0.7% (12)
Somewhat disagree	3.9% (64)
Strongly disagree	92.3% (1496)

Individuals have access to a television in common areas.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	98.6% (1592)
Somewhat agree	0.7% (12)
Neither agree nor disagree	0.2% (3)
Somewhat disagree	0.0% (0)
Strongly disagree	0.5% (8)

Individuals have access to cell phones, computers, and other mobile technological devices in common areas.

	Percent (<i>n</i>)
Strongly agree	61.4% (998)
Somewhat agree	18.1% (294)
Neither agree nor disagree	13.7% (222)
Somewhat disagree	3.8% (62)
Strongly disagree	3.0% (49)