

@

2016 Centers for Independent Living (CIL) Transition & Diversion Services Survey Study

Summary of Findings: Transition of youth with significant disabilities eligible for Individualized education programs (IEPs) to post-secondary life

May 2, 2017

PREPARED BY

Michelle Putnam, PhD, Simmons College, Boston, MA
Darrell Jones, MA, ILRU, TIRR Memorial Hermann Research Center, Houston, TX
Richard Petty, MBA, ILRU, TIRR Memorial Hermann Research Center, Houston, TX
Caitlin Coyle, PhD, University of Massachusetts, Boston, MA

For additional information about the survey or the study methodology and process, please contact Darrell Jones at dljones@bcm.edu, Richard Petty at Richard.petty@bcm.edu or Michelle Putnam at michelle.putnam@simmons.edu.

2016 CIL Transition & Diversion Services Survey Study

Summary of Findings: Transition of youth with significant disabilities eligible for Individualized education programs (IEPs) to post-secondary life

Background for the study:

On November 16, 2015, the Administration for Community Living proposed a rule change to section 7(17) of the Rehabilitation Act as part of its implementation of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) (enacted July 22, 2014) that amended the definition of independent living core services provided by Centers for Independent Living (CILs) to include three new core services: 1) facilitate the transition of individuals with significant disabilities from nursing homes and other institutions to home and community-based residences, with requisite supports and services, 2) provide assistance to individuals who are at risk of entering institutions so that the individuals remain in the community; and 3) facilitate the transition of youth who are individuals with significant disabilities, who were eligible for individualized education programs (IEPs) under Section 614(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and who have completed their secondary education or otherwise left school to post-secondary life.

In its proposal, ACL indicated that no additional funding would be provided to CILs to support the development or implementation of the three new core services. ACL also proposed, through WIOA implementation rule changes, the requirement that CILs demonstrate minimum compliance with Section 725 for a wide range of CIL activities including provision of IL core services, efforts to increase the availability of quality community options for IL, and resource development activities to secure other funding sources. The regulations implementing the three new core services and new accountability requirements went into full effect November 28, 2016.

Study purpose:

This study was developed and fielded in the months just prior to the WIOA implementation guidelines going into full effect. The purpose of the 2016 CIL Transition & Diversion Services Survey Study was to gain a better understanding of whether CILs were already providing the three new core services as part of their current work, and if so, to whom and to what extent. The survey also collected data on what resources CILs thought would be required to fully implement the three new core services: 1) transition-related services to people with disabilities moving from institutional to community-based living settings, 2) services that help divert individuals with disabilities from entering institutions, and 3) services that assist youth with disabilities in transition from school to life after post-secondary education. The aim of obtaining this information was to gain a better understanding of the resources and assistance needs CILs may have with the new WIOA implementation guidelines in effect.

Study team:

The study represents a collaborative effort. Richard Petty and Darrell Jones at ILRU, TIRR Memorial Hermann commissioned the study, assisted with identifying the sample and participated in the development of the survey and interpreting its results. Michelle Putnam, Simmons College School of Social Work, led the study and participated in all aspects of the study process including fielding the survey and analyzing and interpreting survey data. Caitlin Coyle, University of Massachusetts, Boston served as a statistical consultant, participating in data analysis and interpretation. All team members participated in writing this report.

Study methodology:

This study used an electronic survey delivered through SurveyMonkey. SurveyMonkey is recognized for being highly accessible to persons with disabilities, including those with low-vision, and for providing multiple levels of confidentiality and anonymity to survey respondents. Very few respondents reported difficulty in using SurveyMonkey.

The study was approved by the Institutional Review Boards (IRB) of Simmons College and the University of Texas Health Sciences Center (which serves as the IRB for ILRU at TIRR Memorial Hermann). All required IRB information was provided to sample members on the first electronic pages of the survey. Consent to participate was obtained from all respondents by active agreement, through clicking an “I agree” button prior to starting the survey. All data collected are confidential.

Survey sample:

The survey sample was CILs, with invitations to participate sent to CIL executive directors. Active CILs were identified from the administration records of IL-NET, ILRU’s technical assistance program for CILs. IL-NET is funded by a grant from ACL. These CILs were believed to have either federal or state funding, or both, to support IL service delivery. The initial list was verified against ACL’s list of recently funded CIL awardees to validate their operational status and contact information, including working email addresses of CIL directors, the target sample for this survey. CILs not on ACL’s list were verified by reviewing the CILs website and/or contacting the CIL by email or telephone to ascertain operational and contact status. CILs that could not be verified were removed from the list and noted as inactive. This sample list development and review process increased the reliability of the initial sample list, but a possibility remained that some CIL operational and contact information reported on CIL websites was inaccurate.

The initial survey sample included 386 CILs identified as in active operation through the process described above. All 386 CILs were emailed invitations to the survey (see below). Of the 386 emails sent, 6% (n=23) bounced back as invalid email addresses. We obtained alternate email addresses for 20 of these bounced emails by reviewing CIL websites for alternate contacts and calling CILs primary telephone numbers. We were unable to reach 3 CILs by this approach, and later identified these 3 as no longer being

in operation. The final survey sample, N=366, includes only those CILs that were verified as being operational and that had active email addresses.

Survey content:

A 100-item electronic web-based survey was developed between June and July of 2016. The survey contained three sections of about equal length and a short set of descriptive questions about the CIL at the end of the survey. Each section focused on one of the three new core services: institutional transition to community-based settings, diversion from institutional care, and youth transition from school to life after post-secondary education. Some questions were drawn from prior ILRU IL-NET surveys and modified for this survey. Other questions were new, specific to this survey. A pilot test of the final electronic draft of the survey was conducted with experienced independent living specialists and former CIL staff to receive feedback on both the survey questions and on the electronic formatting of the survey. Based on this feedback, small changes in wording and format were made and a second pilot test conducted, which resulted in the final, approved survey that was sent to CILs.

Data collection:

Simmons College fielded the survey and managed data collection. In mid-August 2016, an invitation to participate in the online survey through SurveyMonkey was sent to 366 active CILs by email addressed to the executive director. Respondents were offered the chance to win free admission to an ILRU online training course as an incentive for survey completion. The survey was open and available for CILs to complete for a period of about 8 weeks, from mid-August to early October. A series of reminder emails were sent during this time, with the majority of respondents completing the survey in the first 4 weeks.

A total of 168 CILs (N=168) responded (46% of the CILs identified as being in active operation). This a strong response rate based on current analysis of electronic survey response rates among health care and practice professionals which averages around 35-38%^{1,2} and ongoing discussions regarding the decline of survey response rates since the mid-2000's.³ Not all respondents completed the entire survey, likely due to its length. However, in our discussions about the number of survey items, we decided we would like to try to obtain the most comprehensive data set possible given the importance of the topic and the lack of research into CILs and their service provision. We were not entirely surprised that some participants did not complete the survey given their own time constraints. We believe that enough participants completed the entire

¹ Cunningham, C. T., Quan, H., Hemmelgarn, B., Noseworthy, T., Beck, C. A., Dixon, E., ... Jetté, N. (2015). Exploring physician specialist response rates to web-based surveys. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 15, 32. <http://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-015-0016-z>

² Cho, Y. I., Johnson, T. P., & VanGeest, J. B. (2013). Enhancing surveys of health care professionals: a meta-analysis of techniques to improve response. *Evaluation & the health professions*, 36(3), 382-407.

³ Klabunde, C. N., Willis, G. B., & Casalino, L. P. (2013). Facilitators and barriers to survey participation by physicians: a call to action for researchers. *Evaluation & the health professions*, 36(3), 279-295.

survey (36%) that the response rate falls within acceptable norms of response rates from health and professional service providers.

Using Halbesleben and Whitman's 2013 framework for evaluating survey quality to assess non-response bias⁴, we hypothesize that a majority of non-respondents likely had interest in the topic of the survey, but were passive, not actively deciding not to participate but that personality, work demands or other factors inhibited their participation. Only 5 CILs actively opted-out of our email invitations and reminders, which may support this notion. We also note that very few published studies of CIL services or that sample CIL staff exist, so limited benchmarks for survey response among CIL staff is not available for comparison. Halbesleben and Whitman recommend replication of the survey method in future research to help norm survey response on unique sample populations.

Survey results:

Survey results are presented in three separate reports: institutional transitions, institutional diversions, and transitions of youth. Tests of statistical significance are not reported, but may be requested.

Survey respondents:

Respondents were experienced and knowledgeable.

Of the respondents who provided information about their organization, a majority indicated they were Executive Directors or CEOs/Presidents of their CIL (81%). Other respondents included program managers, independent living specialists or other administrators. These respondents had long-term experience and high levels of formal education. More than half (57%) had worked at their CIL 11 years or more. Another 21% had worked at their CIL between 6 and 10 years. Forty-percent reported having a graduate degree, another 40% reported a bachelor's degree as their highest level of education. Most of these respondents (84%) indicated they identified as a person with a disability.

Eighty-five percent of respondents reported having either a lot (40%) or some (45%) knowledge about how to contract with other organizations like managed care organizations or other community-based organizations to provide transition services. Just over half (56%) of respondents said they had seen their CILs budget decrease over the past 3 years, another quarter (25%) report the budget had stayed about the same over that period of time.

Respondents represented geographically diverse CILs.

Three-quarters (74%) of respondents worked at only one CIL that had one location. One-quarter of respondents worked at a CIL with multiple regional sites. Respondents

⁴ Halbesleben, J. R., & Whitman, M. V. (2013). Evaluating survey quality in health services research: a decision framework for assessing nonresponse bias. *Health Services Research, 48*(3), 913-930.

represented CILs across an array of geographic regions. Most (67%) had between 6 and 20 staff members.

Key findings about Youth Transition

1) Less than half of CILs (44%) reported that they currently provide transition services as a regular part of the work their CIL already does for youth who are individuals with significant disabilities, who are eligible for IEPs under section 614(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 14149d), and who have completed their secondary education or otherwise left school, to postsecondary life. Of the remaining CILs, 38% said this is an occasional part of the work their CIL already does, 18% said their CIL rarely provides transition services for these youth, and 3% said their CIL never provides these services to these youth. A higher percentage of CILs in urban areas indicate that providing transition services to these youth are a regular part of the work their CIL already does.

2) Most CILs transition only a few youth with significant disabilities who are eligible for IEPs to post-secondary life each month. Nearly half of all CIL respondents (47%) report transitioning 1-3 students per month. However some CIL respondents (15%) reported transitioning 7 or more per month. CIL respondents were split on whether they could transition more IEP-eligible youth with significant disabilities per month with their current funding — 44% said they could, 47% said they could not, and 10% said they didn't know if they could or could not.

3) About half of CILs have specific transition programs or approaches for IEP-eligible youth with significant disabilities, while the other half do not.

4) Higher percentages of urban and suburban CILs say they have specific programs than do CILs providing services in rural or mixed density areas.

5) Of CILs with specific programs or approaches to IEP-eligible youth transition work, the majority (62%) reported developing their own programs, another 23% indicated they modified an existing program, and 8% adopted a fully developed program created elsewhere.

6) Just over half (52%) of CILs indicated they have specific independent living specialists dedicated to transitioning youth with significant disabilities who are IEP eligible.

7) CILs reported providing a wide range of services to IEP-eligible youth with significant disabilities transitioning to secondary life. Services most universally reported by respondents included assistance with goal setting (92%), independent living skill-building services (91%) and self-advocacy skills (86%), providing information and assistance or referral about transportation (91%), other home and community-based services (87%), and obtaining assistive technology or durable medical equipment (78%). Other services include assistance in preparing for/applying for college or training

programs (63%), job preparation services (63%), assistance in job search and placement (52%), and helping transitioned individuals make friends, build social networks (55%) and get involved in meaningful and productive activities in the community (51%).

8) Most CILs (77%) also provide transition services for youth with disabilities who are not IEP eligible who are transitioning to postsecondary life, to youth with IEPs who are still in school (87%), and to youth with disabilities without IEPs who are still in school (76%). Most CILs (77%) also say the services they provide for youth not eligible for IEPs who are transitioning to postsecondary life are the same as those they provide to IEP-eligible youth with significant disabilities. Of those who say services are different, they indicate that the focus of support is broader and the services are tailored differently to youth with IEPs. CILs that say the services are different cite more extensive funding and teaching of IEP-related advocacy skills for students with IEPs.

9) CILs reported partnering most with educational institutions in delivering youth transition services. Among the choices provided, CILs more often reported partnering with vocational rehabilitation agencies (71%), individual high schools (70%), school districts (63%), and colleges and universities (44%) than with other organizations such as state agencies on developmental disability (30%) or rehabilitation facilities (22%).

10) CILs report that funds for youth transition services come primarily from the Rehab Act or State Vocational Rehabilitation Agencies. Over half of CILs use existing independent living funding from Title VII, Part C (65%) and Title VII, Part B (53%) to provide youth transition services. Forty-three percent use funds from their state vocational rehabilitation agency, and 17% from another state agency.

11) Nearly all CIL respondents (90%) said they did not have sufficient funding currently to adequately provide the new core service for youth with significant disabilities who are eligible for IEPs and have completed their secondary education or otherwise left school, to postsecondary life. Half of CILs estimated they would need an 11%-30% increase in their current budget in order to adequately provide transition services to youth.

12) A majority of CILs indicated that affordable and accessible housing, access to good public transportation, and cost and availability of community-based service providers are challenges in the region in which they provide services. The largest majority of CILs who responded to questions about the context in which services are provided agreed that finding accessible (97%) and affordable (91%) housing is a challenge. Sixty-three percent disagreed that there is good public transportation in the region their CIL services for most people with disabilities. Ninety percent agreed that community-based services are too expensive for persons who do not qualify for Medicaid, and 83% disagreed that Medicaid pays for enough community-based service hours to meet people's needs.

13) Seventy-seven percent disagreed with the statement that there are enough community-based providers available in their CIL's region to respond to consumer demand. More than half (60%) of CIL respondents agreed that Medicaid income eligibility criteria are too restrictive, making it hard for people with disabilities to qualify for Medicaid's community-based services. A large number (70%) agreed that there is a lack of affordable attendant care services in their area. Additionally, 81% of CILs responding agreed that social isolation is a problem for persons their CIL assists.

14) More than half (53%) of CIL respondents said that in the area their CIL serves, there are colleges and universities that offer good support to persons with disabilities, including youth with disabilities. However, only 36% agreed that the level of physical accessibility in their CIL's community is fairly high.

Limitations:

To our knowledge, this is the first national survey of CILs on the institutional transition services they provide for individuals with significant disabilities. Limitations of the survey include the response rate, which although sufficient within the parameters of social science research as noted earlier, could be stronger. The number of respondents limits the range of data analysis options as small cell sizes limit tests for significance in cross-sectional analysis and sample size overall precludes robust predictive analysis.

There is also the possibility of response bias in that ACL provides a significant portion of the annual budget to CILs and therefore CIL responses may be more aspirational to some questions rather than actual. However, we have no evidence of this and therefore use these findings as a baseline for future research on CIL institutional transition and diversion services.

Conclusions:

Findings from the survey suggest that:

- Most CILs are currently providing transition services for youth with significant disabilities who are IEP eligible and who are transitioning to postsecondary life, but many only work with a few consumers each month. CILs provide a wide range of services as part of this work.
- CILs report that they do not have enough funding in their current budget to adequately provide the new youth transition-related core service to consumers who need assistance.
- CILs report they have relationships with educational institutions and other community organizations, but additional investigation is needed to determine whether these are business relationships and the extent to which CILs can generate additional income to expand services beyond the limitations of their WIOA funding.
- The community and regional context that CILs provide youth transition services within has substantial challenges beyond the scope of what CILs can individually address that may influence successful postsecondary transitions.

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

SECTION 1: CURRENT PROVISION OF TRANSITION SERVICES TO YOUTH TO POSTSECONDARY LIFE

Survey Question

Question 51, Table A. At this time, how often does your CIL provide transition services for youth who are individuals with significant disabilities, who are eligible for IEPs under section 614(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 14149d), and who have completed their secondary education or otherwise left school, to postsecondary life?

a) This is a regular part of the work my CIL already does.	44% (N=60)
b) This is an occasional part of the work my CIL already does.	38% (N=51)
c) My CIL rarely provides transition services for youth who are IEP eligible.	15% (N=21)
d) My CIL never provides transition services for youth who are IEP eligible.	3% (N=4)
	100% (N=136)

Additional analysis for Question 51

Question 51, Table B. At this time, how often does your CIL provide transition services for youth who are individuals with significant disabilities, who are eligible for IEPs under section 614(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 14149d), and who have completed their secondary education or otherwise left school, to postsecondary life?

	% of CILs in Urban areas saying	% of CILs in Suburban areas saying	% of CILs in Rural areas saying	% of CILs in Urban/ Rural mix* areas saying
a) This is a regular part of the work my CIL already does.	57% (N=12)	49% (N=11)	39% (N=22)	42% (N=14)
b) This is an occasional part of the work my CIL already does.	29% (N=6)	30% (N=7)	45% (N=25)	33% (N=11)
c) My CIL rarely provides transition services for youth who are IEP eligible.	10% (N=2)	13% (N=3)	16% (N=9)	21% (N=7)
d) My CIL never provides transition services for youth who are IEP eligible.	4% (N=1)	8% (N=2)	0% (N=0)	3% (N=1)
	100% (N=21)	100% (N=23)	100% (N=56)	99%** (N=33)

Note: Question 96 is the cross-referenced question, *In what type of area would you describe your CIL as being located?* *Urban/rural mix written in by respondents as other for Question 96. **Does not add to 100% due to rounding.

Additional analysis for Question 51

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Question 51, Table B. At this time, how often does your CIL provide transition services for youth who are individuals with significant disabilities, who are eligible for IEPs under section 614(d) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 14149d), and who have completed their secondary education or otherwise left school, to postsecondary life? (N=133)

	% of CILs that have <5 paid staff that say	% of CILs that have 6-10 paid staff that say	% of CILs that have 11-20 paid staff that say	% of CILs that have 21-40 paid staff that say	% of CILs that have 41+ paid staff that say
a) This is a regular part of the work my CIL already does.	45% (N=5)	31% (N=12)	46% (N=23)	50% (N=11)	64% (N=7)
b) This is an occasional part of the work my CIL already does.	45% (N=5)	41% (N=16)	34% (N=17)	41% (N=9)	27% (N=3)
c) My CIL rarely provides transition services for youth who are IEP eligible.	10% (N=1)	23% (N=9)	16% (N=8)	9% (N=2)	9% (N=1)
d) My CIL never provides transition services for youth who are IEP eligible.	0% (N=0)	5% (N=2)	4% (N=2)	0% (N=0)	0% (N=0)
	100% (N=11)	100% (N=39)	100% (N=50)	100% (N=22)	100% (N=11)

Note: Question 97 is the cross-referenced question, *How many paid staff members does your CIL have?*

Survey Question

Question 52, Table A. On average, how many youth with disabilities who are eligible for IEPs and have completed their secondary education or otherwise left school would you say your CIL transitions to post-secondary life per month?

a) 0	20% (N=27)
b) 1-3	47% (N=64)
c) 4-6	10% (N=13)
d) 7-10	4% (N=6)
e) 11 or more	11% (N=15)
f) I don't know	7% (N=10)
	100% (N=135)

Additional analysis for Question 52

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Question 52, Table B. Number of youth transitions per month by CIL location (N=133)

	% of CILs in Urban areas that say	% of CILs in Suburban areas that say	% of CILs in Rural areas that say	% of CILs in Urban/Rural mix* areas that say
a) They transition 0 youth per month	14% (N=3)	30% (N=7)	16% (N=9)	24% (N=8)
b) They transition 1-3 youth per month	62% (N=13)	39% (N=9)	48% (N=27)	39% (N=13)
c) They transition 4-6 youth per month	0% (N=0)	9% (N=2)	13% (N=7)	12% (N=4)
d) They transition 7-10 youth per month	10% (N=2)	4% (N=1)	2% (N=1)	6% (N=2)
e) They transition 11 or more youth per month	10% (N=2)	17% (N=4)	9% (N=5)	12% (N=4)
f) They don't know how many youth they transition per month	4% (N=1)	0% (N=0)	11% (N=7)	6% (N=2)
	100% (N=21)	99%** (N=23)	100% (N=56)	99%** (N=33)

Note: Question 96 is the cross-referenced question, *In what type of area would you describe your CIL as being located?* *Urban/rural mix written in by respondents as other for Question 96. **Does not add to 100% due to rounding.

Survey Question

Question 53, Table A. Do you think your CIL could be transitioning more youth with disabilities who are eligible for IEPs and have completed their secondary education or otherwise left school to postsecondary life than your CIL already does now with its current funding?

a) Yes	44% (N=59)
b) No	47% (N=63)
c) I don't know	10% (N=13)
	100% (N=135)

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Additional analysis for Question 53

Question 53, Table B. Percentage of CILs by region and ability to transition more youth eligible for IEPs than CIL already does with current funding.

	% of CILs in Urban areas that say	% of CILs in Suburban areas that say	% of CILs in Rural areas that say	% of CILs in Urban/Rural mix* areas that say
a) Yes , CIL could do more transitions with youth eligible for an IEP than they do now with current funding	48% (N=10)	35% (N=8)	45% (N=25)	45% (N=15)
b) No , CIL could not do more transitions with youth eligible for an IEP than they do now with current funding	43% (N=9)	48% (N=11)	46% (N=26)	48% (N=16)
c) Do not know if CIL could do more transitions with youth eligible for an IEP than they do now with current funding	9% (N=2)	17% (N=4)	9% (N=5)	6% (N=2)
	100% (N=21)	100% (N=23)	100% (N=56)	99%** (N=33)

Note: Question 96 is the cross-referenced question, *In what type of area would you describe your CIL as being located?* *Urban/rural mix written in by respondents as other for Question 96. **Does not add to 100% due to rounding.

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Additional analysis for Question 53

Question 53, Table B. Percentage of CILs by number of average monthly transitions and ability to transition more youth eligible for IEPs than CIL already does with current funding.

	% of CILs that say they do 0 transitions per month with IEP eligible youth	% of CILs that say they do 1-3 transitions per month with IEP eligible youth	% of CILs that say they do 4- 6 transitions per month with IEP eligible youth	% of CILs that say they do 7-10 transitions per month with IEP eligible youth	% of CILs that say they do 11+ transitions per month with IEP eligible youth
a) Yes , CIL could do more transitions with youth eligible for an IEP than they do now with current funding	48% (N=13)	41% (N=26)	31% (N=4)	83% (N=5)	40% (N=6)
b) No , CIL could not do more transitions with youth eligible for an IEP than they do now with current funding	44% (N=12)	48% (N=31)	62% (N=8)	17% (N=1)	47% (N=7)
c) Do not know if CIL could do more institutional transitions with youth eligible for an IEP than they do now with current funding	7% (N=2)	11% (N=7)	7% (N=1)	0% (N=0)	13% (N=2)
	99%* (N=27)	100% (N=64)	100% (N=13)	100% (N=6)	100% (N=15)

Note: Question 52 is the cross-referenced question, *On average, how many youth with disabilities who are eligible for IEPs and have completed their secondary education or otherwise left school would you say your CIL transitions to post-secondary life per month?* *Does not add to 100% due to rounding.

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Survey Question

Question 54, Table A. Does your CIL have a specific transition program or approach for youth with disabilities who are eligible for IEPs and have completed their secondary education or otherwise left school? OR Does your CIL do this transition work using its existing four core services but no specific program or process was created to do this work?

a) Yes. My CIL has a transition program or approach to assist youth with disabilities who are eligible for IEPs to transition to post-secondary life.	46% (N=62)
b) No. My CIL does transition work with youth who are IEP-eligible using its existing four core services but no specific program or approach was created to do this work.	53% (N=71)
c) I don't know	1% (N=2)
	100% (N=135)

Additional analysis for Question 54

Question 54, Table B. Percentage of CILs by region and specific transition program for IEP-eligible youth (N=133)

	% of CILs in Urban areas that say	% of CILs in Suburban areas that say	% of CILs in Rural areas that say	% of CILs in Urban/Rural mix* areas that say
a) Yes. My CIL has a specific transition program or approach to assist youth with disabilities who are eligible for IEPs to transition to post-secondary life.	57% (N=12)	57% (N=13)	39% (N=22)	42% (N=14)
b) No. My CIL does transition work with youth who are IEP-eligible using its existing four core services but no specific program or approach was created to do this work.	38% (N=8)	39% (N=9)	61% (N=34)	58% (N=19)
c) I don't know	5% (N=1)	4% (N=1)	0% (N=0)	0% (N=0)
	100% (N=21)	100% (N=23)	100% (N=56)	99%* (N=33)

Note: Question 96 is the cross-referenced question, *In what type of area would you describe your CIL as being located?* *Urban/rural mix written in by respondents as other for Question 96. **Does not add to 100% due to rounding.

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Additional analysis for Question 54

Question 54, Table C. Percentage of CILs by number of paid staff and specific transition program for IEP-eligible youth (N=133)					
	% of CILs that have <5 paid staff that say	% of CILs that have 6-10 paid staff that say	% of CILs that have 11-20 paid staff that say	% of CILs that have 21-40 paid staff that say	% of CILs that have 41+ paid staff that say
Yes. My CIL has a specific transition program or approach to assist youth with disabilities who are eligible for IEPs to transition to post-secondary life.	45% (N=5)	33% (N=13)	44% (N=22)	68% (N=15)	55% (N=6)
No. My CIL does transition work with youth who are IEP-eligible using its existing four core services but no specific program or approach was created to do this work.	55% (N=6)	64% (N=25)	54% (N=27)	32% (N=7)	45% (N=5)
I don't know	0% (N=0)	3% (N=1)	2% (N=1)	0% (N=0)	0% (N=0)
	100% (N=11)	100% (N=39)	100% (N=50)	100% (N=22)	100% (N=11)

Note: Question 97 is the cross-referenced question, *How many paid staff members does your CIL have?*

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Survey Question

Question 55, Table A. Did your CIL develop this program or approach on its own, adopt a fully developed program or approach created somewhere else, or modify a program or approach created somewhere else to suit your CIL's own needs?

a) My CIL developed its own IEP-eligible youth transition program or approach from scratch.	62% (N=38)
b) My CIL adopted a fully developed IEP-eligible youth transition program or approach created elsewhere.	8% (N=5)
c) My CIL modified an existing IEP-eligible youth transition program or approach created elsewhere to suit its own needs.	23% (N=14)
d) I don't know where my CILs IEP-eligible youth transition program or approach is from.	7% (N=4)
100% (N=61)	

Note: Asked only of those who said, Yes. My CIL has a transition program or approach to assist youth with disabilities who are eligible for IEPs to transition to post-secondary life to Question 54.

Survey Question

Question 56, Table A. Where was the adopted or modified program or approach taken from? Please provide the name of the organization that developed the program or approach, or the name of the program or approach here. We will use this information to understand if similar programs or approaches are being used across CILs nationally. If you do not know, please just write "I do not know." (N=19)

Specific source N=12 (63%)

1. The League
1. APRIL youth peer mentoring framework
2. Project Search
3. RAMP, CIL
4. Its All About Work
5. Institute for Educational Leadership- Ready to Achieve Mentoring Program
6. New York Association on Independent Living
7. RAMP Center for Independent Living Rockford, Illinois
8. Alliance for Disability Advocates CIL, Raleigh, NC
9. Center for Work Ethics
10. Independence Inc, Minot North Dakota-CIL
11. Everything You Want tot Know About Becoming an Adult
12. TIP Program

Created our own N=3 (16%)

Don't know N=4 (21%)

Note: Asked only of those who said they adopted or modified an existing approach in Question 55.

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Survey Question

Question 57, Table A. Where did your CIL hear about the program that it decided to adopt or modify? Please mark all that apply. (N=20)

a) Heard about the program or approach from another CIL.	65% (13)
b) Heard about the program or approach from ILRU and/or IL-NET	25% (5)
c) Heard about the program or approach from an organizational partner	25% (5)
d) Read about the program or approach	30% (6)
e) Heard about the program or approach at a conference or other meeting	30% (6)
f) I don't know	5% (1)
g) Other. Please briefly indicate where your CIL got information about the program it adopted or modified.	0% (0)

Note: Asked only of those who said they adopted or modified an existing approach in Question 55.

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

SECTION 2: TYPES OF TRANSITION SERVICES CILS PROVIDE TO YOUTH TRANSITIONING TO POSTSECONDARY LIFE, TRANSITION PARTNERS, AND TRANSITION STAFF

Survey Questions 58-60

Questions 58, 59, 60, Table A. On this first (second, final) page of services, which of the following does your CIL provide as part of its transition services to youth with disabilities who are eligible for IEPs and have completed their secondary education or otherwise left school to postsecondary life? Please mark all that apply.

a) Assistance with goal setting*	92% (N=121)
b) Independent living skill-building services**	91% (N=121)
c) Providing information and assistance about transportation***	91% (N=120)
d) Providing information and referral to other home and community-based services**	87% (N=115)
e) Assisting youth in developing self-advocacy skills*	86% (N=113)
f) Assistance in obtaining assistive technology/Durable medical equipment*	78% (N=103)
g) Providing peer-counseling to transitioned individuals**	77% (N=102)
h) Making referrals to community-based mental health services and resources*	77% (N=102)
i) Assistance with locating and securing affordable housing*	77% (N=102)
j) Assisting youth in building self-esteem**	74% (N=99)
k) Working with families of transitional-age/transitioning youth**	74% (N=98)
l) Assistance applying for income benefits**	71% (N=94)
m) IEP assistance*	67% (N=88)
n) Providing information about safety, including neglect and abuse, weather extremes, and disasters*	67% (N=88)
o) Benefits counseling**	65% (N=86)
p) Providing assistance in making home modifications*	64% (N=84)
q) Assistance preparing for/ applying to college or training programs*	63% (N=83)
r) Job preparation services*	63% (N=83)
s) Providing regular follow-up to transitioned youth*	61% (N=80)
t) Helping transitioned individuals make friends, build social networks*	55% (N=72)
u) Assistance in job search and placement*	52% (N=68)
v) Helping transitioned individuals get involved in meaningful and productive activities in the community**	51% (N=68)
w) Individual student services**	44% (N=58)
x) <i>Scholarships (written in by respondent)</i> ***	1% (N=1)

Note: *N=132, **N=133, N=134***. N's vary because these questions were split across several SurveyMonkey screens. N is based each specific question screen.

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Survey Question

Question 61, Table A. Which of these organizations, if any, does your CIL formally partner or collaborate with to provide transition services for youth with disabilities who are eligible for IEPs and have completed their secondary education or otherwise left school, to postsecondary life? (N=126)

a) Vocational rehabilitation agency(ies)	71% (N=89)
b) Individual high schools	70% (N=88)
c) School districts	63% (N=79)
d) Colleges and universities	44% (N=55)
e) Developmental disability organization(s)	38% (N=48)
f) Job-training programs	36% (N=45)
g) Housing organizations	34% (N=43)
h) Mental health organizations	33% (N=42)
i) Technical or vocational schools	33% (N=41)
j) State agency on developmental disability	30% (N=38)
k) Rehabilitation facilities	22% (N=28)
l) I don't know which organizations my CIL partners with	2% (N=2)
m) My CIL does not partner or collaborate with any of these organizations in transition work for youth with IEPs	11% (N=14)
n) <i>Other local or regional community-based organizations*</i>	2% (N=3)

Note: *Written in by respondent

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Additional analysis for Question 61

Question 61, Table B. Which of these organizations, if any, does your CIL formally partner or collaborate with to provide transition services for youth with disabilities who are eligible for IEPs and have completed their secondary education or otherwise left school, to postsecondary life? (N=126)

	% are in Urban areas	% are in Suburban areas	% are in Rural areas	% are in Urban/ Rural mix* areas	
<i>Of CILs saying they partner with this organization</i>					
a) Vocational rehabilitation agency(ies)	15% (N=13)	13% (N=12)	47% (N=42)	25% (N=22)	100% (N=89)
b) Individual high schools	17% (N=15)	16% (N=14)	43% (N=37)	24% (N=21)	100% (N=87)
c) School districts	13% (N=10)	19% (N=15)	44% (N=34)	24% (N=19)	100% (N=78)
d) Colleges and universities	13% (N=7)	15% (N=8)	41% (N=23)	31% (N=17)	100% (N=55)
e) Developmental disability organization(s)	6% (N=3)	19% (N=9)	44% (N=21)	31% (N=15)	100% (N=48)
f) Job-training programs	16% (N=7)	16% (N=7)	44% (N=20)	24% (N=11)	100% (N=45)
g) Housing organizations	12% (N=5)	14% (N=6)	49% (N=21)	25% (N=11)	100% (N=43)
h) Mental health organizations	7% (N=3)	17% (N=7)	50% (N=21)	26% (N=11)	100% (N=42)
i) Technical or vocational schools	10% (N=4)	10% (N=4)	49% (N=20)	32% (N=13)	100% (N=41)
j) State agency on developmental disability	11% (N=4)	18% (N=7)	45% (N=17)	26% (N=10)	100% (N=38)
k) Rehabilitation facilities	7% (N=2)	14% (N=4)	54% (N=15)	25% (N=7)	100% (N=28)

Note: Question 96 is the cross-referenced question, *In what type of area would you describe your CIL as being located?* *Urban/rural mix written in by respondents as other for Question 96.

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Survey Question

Question 62, Table A. Does your CIL have specific IL specialists dedicated to transitioning youth with disabilities who are eligible for IEPs and have completed their secondary education or otherwise left school to postsecondary life?

a) Yes	52% (N=70)
b) No	48% (N=64)
c) I don't know	0% (N=0)
	100% (N=134)

SECTION 3: DIFFERENCES IN TRANSITION SERVICES CILS PROVIDE TO YOUTH WITH AND WITHOUT IEPs TRANSITIONING TO POSTSECONDARY LIFE

Survey Question

Question 63, Table A. Does your CIL currently provide transition services for youth who are not eligible for IEPs but who have completed their secondary education or otherwise left school, to postsecondary life?

a) Yes	77% (N=102)
b) No	17% (N=22)
c) I don't know	6% (N=8)
	100% (N=132)

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Additional analysis for Question 63

Question 63, Table B. Percentage of CILs currently providing transition services to post-secondary life for both youth who are and are not eligible for IEPs

	% of CILs that say Yes, they provide transition services to non-IEP eligible youth	% of CILs that say No, they do not provide transition services to non-IEP eligible youth
a) Who say they do provide transition services to IEP-eligible youth who say	49% (N=50)	14% (N=3)
b) Who say they do not provide transition services to IEP-eligible youth	36% (N=37)	45% (N=10)
c) Who do not know if they provide transition services to IEP-eligible youth	15% (N=15)	41% (N=9)
	100% (N=102)	100% (N=22)

Survey Question

Question 64, Table A. Are the transition services for youth with disabilities who are not eligible for IEPs the same or different than those your CIL provides to youth with disabilities who are eligible for IEPs?

a) The transition services are the same.	77% (N=84)
b) The transition services are different - at least in part.	17% (N=19)
c) I don't know if the transition services for youth with and without IEPs are different or not.	6% (N=6)
d) Other (please specify)	0% (N=0)
	100% (N=109)

Note: Asked only of those who said Yes to Question 63, *CIL currently provides transition services for youth who are not eligible for IEPs but who have completed their secondary education or otherwise left school, to postsecondary life.*

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Survey Question

Question 65, Table A. How are these services different? Please briefly describe the difference here. If you do not know, please just write "I do not know."

a) The focus of support for youth without IEPs is broader, about independent living vs. education and employment	32% (N=6)
b) Services are tailored to individual somewhat differently for youth without IEPs	26% (N=5)
c) No difference	5% (N=1)
d) I don't know	21% (N=4)
e) Other	16% (N=3)
	100% (N=19)

Note: Asked only of those who answered *transition services are different* to Question 64.

Survey Question

Question 66, Table A. Does your CIL currently provide services for youth with disabilities with IEPs who are still in school?

a) Yes	87% (N=117)
b) No	11% (N=15)
c) I don't know	2% (N=2)
	100% (N=134)

Survey Question

Question 67, Table A. Does your CIL currently provide services for youth with disabilities without IEPs who are still in school?

a) Yes	76% (N=100)
b) No	19% (N=26)
c) I don't know	4% (N=5)
	100% (N=134)

Survey Question

Question 68, Table A. Are these services for youth with disabilities with IEPs who are still in school the same or different than those your CIL provides to youth with disabilities without IEPs who are still in school?

a) The services are the same.	73% (N=95)
b) The services are different - at least in part.	15% (N=19)
c) I don't know if the services for youth with and without IEPs who are still in school are the same or not.	13% (N=17)
	100% (N=131)

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Survey Question

Question 69, Table A. How are these services different? Please briefly describe the difference. If you do not know, please just write "I do not know."

d) Funding for our services is more extensive for youth with IEPs	18% (N=3)
e) We don't advocate for or participate in implementation of the IEP	18% (N=3)
f) We teach advocacy specifically related to implementing the IEP	12% (N=2)
g) Services are focused more on independent living for students without IEPs	12% (N=2)
h) There are different requirements, responsibilities, and institutional relationships when working with youth with IEPs	12% (N=2)
i) Other	25% (N=2)
j) Don't know.	6% (N=1)
	100% (N=17)

Note: Asked only of those who answered *the services are different* to Question 68.

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

SECTION 4: FUNDING FOR CIL TRANSITION SERVICES PROVIDED TO YOUTH TRANSITIONING TO POSTSECONDARY LIFE

Survey Question

Question 70, Table A. What current sources of funding does your CIL use to provide transition services for youth with disabilities who are eligible for IEPs and have completed their secondary education or otherwise left school, to postsecondary life? Please mark all that apply. (N=131)

a) Existing IL funding from Title VII, Part C	65% (N=85)
b) Existing IL funding from Title VII, Part B	53% (N=69)
c) Funds from the State Vocational Rehabilitation agency	43% (N=56)
d) Funds from other State agencies	17% (N=22)
e) <i>Philanthropic*</i>	8% (N=10)
f) Funds from Money Follows the Person	6% (N=8)
g) <i>Funds from community, local or county grants*</i>	4% (N=5)
h) Funds from School Districts	5% (N=6)
i) Funds from one or more school districts	3% (N=4)
j) <i>Fundraising*</i>	2% (N=3)
k) <i>Fee for service*</i>	2% (N=2)
l) Funds from Managed Care Organizations	0% (N=0)
m) None of these	8% (N=11)
n) Don't know	2% (N=2)
o) Other (please specify the other types of funding sources)	0% (N=0)

Note: *Written in by respondent

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Survey Question

Question 71, Table A. Do you believe your CIL currently has sufficient funding to adequately provide transition services for youth with disabilities who are eligible for IEPs and have completed their secondary education or otherwise left school, to postsecondary life?	
a) Yes	6% (N=8)
b) No	90% (N=120)
c) I don't know	4% (N=5)
	100% (N=133)

Survey Question

Question 72, Table A. Based on your CIL's current budget, what percentage of budget increase do you estimate your CIL would need to adequately provide transition services for youth with disabilities who are eligible for IEPs and have completed their secondary education or otherwise left school, to postsecondary life? Please fill in % estimate here. If you do not know, please just write "I do not know."	
a) 1-10%	11% (N=13)
b) 11-20%	23% (N=27)
c) 21-30%	26% (N=30)
d) 31-40%	9% (N=10)
e) 41-50%	8% (N=9)
f) 51-75%	2% (N=2)
g) 76-100%	2% (N=2)
h) I don't know	19% (N=22)
	100% (N=117)

End of youth transition questions. See Institutional Transition and Institutional Diversion reports for findings for questions 1-24 and 25-49. Service context findings and respondent characteristics are reported on the following pages and repeated in each report.

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

SECTION 5: ENVIRONMENTAL CONTEXT FOR PROVISION OF 5TH CORE SERVICES

Survey Questions 73-87, Tables A.

In this section, we will ask several questions about the State and region your CIL operates in so that we can better understand the context in which your CIL will be providing the 5th core services. For the questions in this section, we will ask you to rate on a scale how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

	% of CILs saying strongly disagree	% of CILs saying disagree	% of CILs saying neither agree nor disagree	% of CILs saying agree	% of CILs saying strongly agree	
Question 73. In my State, Medicaid income eligibility criteria are too restrictive, making it hard for people with disabilities to qualify for Medicaid's community-based services.	6% (N=8)	14% (N=18)	30% (N=39)	35% (N=46)	15% (N=20)	100% (N=131)
Question 74. There are enough community-based service providers available in my CIL's region to respond to consumer demand.	33% (N=44)	34% (N=45)	14% (N=19)	14% (N=19)	5% (N=6)	100% (N=133)
Question 75. In my State, people with disabilities in nursing homes and other institutions have to wait a long time to transition to the community because there are long wait lists for Medicaid's community-based services.	7% (N=9)	17% (N=23)	20% (N=27)	33% (N=43)	23% (N=30)	100% (N=132)
Question 76. In my State, Medicaid pays for enough community-based service hours to meet people's needs.	40% (N=53)	43% (N=57)	11% (N=14)	6% (N=8)	0% (N=0)	100% (N=132)

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Survey Questions 73-87, Tables A.

(Continued) In this section, we will ask several questions about the State and region your CIL operates in so that we can better understand the context in which your CIL will be providing the 5th core services. For the questions in this section, we will ask you to rate on a scale how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

	% of CILs saying strongly disagree	% of CILs saying disagree	% of CILs saying neither agree nor disagree	% of CILs saying agree	% of CILs saying strongly agree	
Question 77. Most individuals living in the community are able to obtain the accessible technology and/or equipment services they need.	20% (N=27)	50% (N=67)	18% (N=24)	11% (N=15)	0% (N=0)	100% (N=133)
Question 78. Community-based services are too expensive for persons with disabilities who do not qualify for Medicaid in my state.	2% (N=3)	3% (N=4)	5% (N=7)	45% (N=59)	45% (N=59)	100% (N=132)
Question 79. Finding affordable housing is a challenge in the region my CIL serves.	2% (N=3)	1% (N=1)	5% (N=7)	10% (N=14)	81% (N=109)	100% (N=134)
Question 80. Finding accessible housing is a challenge in the region my CIL serves.	2% (N=2)	0% (N=0)	2% (N=2)	18% (N=23)	79% (N=103)	100% (N=130)
Question 81. In the region that my CIL serves, there is good accessible public transportation for most persons with disabilities.	35% (N=47)	28% (N=37)	11% (N=15)	22% (N=29)	4% (N=5)	100% (N=133)
Question 82. Social isolation is a common problem for persons that my CIL assists.	2% (N=2)	5% (N=6)	13% (N=17)	51% (N=67)	30% (N=40)	100% (N=132)

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Survey Questions 73-87, Tables A.

(Continued) In this section, we will ask several questions about the State and region your CIL operates in so that we can better understand the context in which your CIL will be providing the 5th core services. For the questions in this section, we will ask you to rate on a scale how much you agree or disagree with each statement.

	% of CILs saying strongly disagree	% of CILs saying disagree	% of CILs saying neither agree nor disagree	% of CILs saying agree	% of CILs saying strongly agree	
Question 83. The level of physical accessibility in my CIL's community is fairly high.	8% (N=11)	31% (N=41)	24% (N=31)	31% (N=41)	(5%) (N=7)	100% (N=131)
Question 84. There is a lack of affordable attendant care services in the area my CIL serves.	2% (N=2)	7% (N=9)	21% (N=28)	40% (N=53)	30% (N=39)	100% (N=131)
Question 85. There is a lack of participant-directed attendant care services in the region my CIL serves.	3% (N=4)	17% (N=22)	18% (N=23)	40% (N=53)	22% (N=29)	100% (N=131)
Question 86. In the area my CIL serves, there are good job training programs for persons with disabilities, including youth transitioning to post-secondary life.	16% (N=21)	44% (N=58)	20% (N=27)	18% (N=24)	2% (N=2)	100% (N=132)
Question 87. In the area my CIL serves, there are colleges and universities that offer good support to persons with disabilities, including youth with disabilities.	5% (N=6)	17% (N=22)	26% (N=34)	47% (N=63)	6% (N=8)	100% (N=133)

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Additional analysis for Survey Questions 73-87, Tables B

Question 73, Table B. In my State, Medicaid income eligibility criteria are too restrictive, making it hard for people with disabilities to qualify for Medicaid's community-based services: response by region (N=130)

	% of CILs saying strongly disagree/ disagree	% of CILs saying neither agree nor disagree	% of CILs saying strongly agree/agree	
CILs in urban areas	29% (N=6)	29% (N=6)	42% (N=9)	100% (N=21)
CILs in suburban areas	23% (N=5)	27% (N=6)	50% (N=11)	100% (N=22)
CILs in rural areas	18% (N=10)	29% (N=16)	53% (N=29)	100% (N=55)
CILs in mixed urban/rural* areas	16% (N=5)	34% (N=11)	50% (N=16)	100% (N=32)

Note: *Urban/rural mix written in by respondents as other for Question 96.

Question 74, Table B. There are enough community-based service providers available in my CIL's region to respond to consumer demand: response by region (N=132)

	% of CILs saying strongly disagree/ disagree	% of CILs saying neither agree nor disagree	% of CILs saying strongly agree/agree	
CILs in urban areas	48% (N=10)	24% (N=5)	28% (N=6)	100% (N=21)
CILs in suburban areas	59% (N=13)	18% (N=4)	23% (N=5)	100% (N=22)
CILs in rural areas	68% (N=38)	14% (N=8)	18% (N=10)	100% (N=56)
CILs in mixed urban/rural* areas	85% (N=28)	6% (N=2)	9% (N=3)	100% (N=33)

Note: *Urban/rural mix written in by respondents as other for Question 96.

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Question 75, Table B. In my State, people with disabilities in nursing homes and other institutions have to wait a long time to transition to the community because there are long wait lists for Medicaid's community-based services: response by region (N=131)

	% of CILs saying strongly disagree/ disagree	% of CILs saying neither agree nor disagree	% of CILs saying strongly agree/agree	
CILs in urban areas	19% (N=4)	24% (N=5)	57% (N=12)	100% (N=21)
CILs in suburban areas	14% (N=3)	18% (N=4)	68% (N=15)	100% (N=22)
CILs in rural areas	31% (N=17)	25% (N=14)	44% (N=24)	100% (N=55)
CILs in mixed urban/rural* areas	24% (N=8)	12% (N=4)	64% (N=21)	100% (N=33)

Note: *Urban/rural mix written in by respondents as other for Question 96.

Question 76, Table B. In my State, Medicaid pays for enough community-based service hours to meet people's needs: response by region (N=131)

	% of CILs saying strongly disagree/ disagree	% of CILs saying neither agree nor disagree	% of CILs saying strongly agree/agree	
CILs in urban areas	71% (N=15)	19% (N=4)	10% (N=2)	100% (N=21)
CILs in suburban areas	91% (N=20)	9% (N=2)	0% (N=0)	100% (N=22)
CILs in rural areas	82% (N=45)	13% (N=7)	5% (N=3)	100% (N=55)
CILs in mixed urban/rural* areas	88% (N=29)	3% (N=1)	9% (N=3)	100% (N=33)

Note: *Urban/rural mix written in by respondents as other for Question 96.

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Question 77, Table B. Most individuals living in the community are able to obtain the accessible technology and/or equipment services they need: response by region (N=132)

	% of CILs saying strongly disagree/ disagree	% of CILs saying neither agree nor disagree	% of CILs saying strongly agree/agree	
CILs in urban areas	55% (N=11)	30% (N=6)	15% (N=3)	100% (N=20)
CILs in suburban areas	61% (N=14)	22% (N=5)	17% (N=4)	100% (N=23)
CILs in rural areas	77% (N=43)	14% (N=8)	9% (N=5)	100% (N=56)
CILs in mixed urban/rural* areas	76% (N=25)	15% (N=5)	9% (N=3)	100% (N=33)

Note: *Urban/rural mix written in by respondents as other for Question 96.

Question 78, Table B. Community-based services are too expensive for persons with disabilities who do not qualify for Medicaid in my state: response by region (N=131)

	% of CILs saying strongly disagree/ disagree	% of CILs saying neither agree nor disagree	% of CILs saying strongly agree/agree	
CILs in urban areas	5% (N=1)	10% (N=2)	85% (N=18)	100% (N=21)
CILs in suburban areas	5% (N=1)	9% (N=2)	86% (N=19)	100% (N=22)
CILs in rural areas	4% (N=2)	4% (N=2)	91% (N=51)	99% (N=56)
CILs in mixed urban/rural* areas	6% (N=2)	3% (N=1)	91% (N=30)	100% (N=33)

Note: *Urban/rural mix written in by respondents as other for Question 96.

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Question 79, Table B. Finding affordable housing is a challenge in the region my CIL serves: response by region (N=133)

	% of CILs saying strongly disagree/ disagree	% of CILs saying neither agree nor disagree	% of CILs saying strongly agree/agree	
CILs in urban areas	0% (N=0)	5% (N=1)	95% (N=20)	100% (N=21)
CILs in suburban areas	4% (N=1)	0% (N=0)	96% (N=22)	100% (N=23)
CILs in rural areas	2% (N=1)	7% (N=4)	91% (N=51)	99% (N=56)
CILs in mixed urban/rural* areas	6% (N=2)	6% (N=2)	88% (N=29)	100% (N=33)

Note: *Urban/rural mix written in by respondents as other for Question 96.

Question 80, Table B. Finding accessible housing is a challenge in the region my CIL serves: response by region (N=129)

	% of CILs saying strongly disagree/ disagree	% of CILs saying neither agree nor disagree	% of CILs saying strongly agree/agree	
CILs in urban areas	0% (N=0)	14% (N=3)	86% (N=18)	100% (N=21)
CILs in suburban areas	5% (N=1)	23% (N=5)	72% (N=16)	100% (N=22)
CILs in rural areas	2% (N=1)	21% (N=11)	77% (N=41)	99% (N=53)
CILs in mixed urban/rural* areas	6% (N=2)	12% (N=4)	82% (N=27)	100% (N=33)

Note: *Urban/rural mix written in by respondents as other for Question 96.

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Question 81, Table B. In the region that my CIL serves, there is good accessible public transportation for most persons with disabilities: response by region (N=132)

	% of CILs saying strongly disagree/ disagree	% of CILs saying neither agree nor disagree	% of CILs saying strongly agree/agree	
CILs in urban areas	33% (N=7)	10% (N=2)	57% (N=12)	100% (N=21)
CILs in suburban areas	52% (N=12)	4% (N=1)	43% (N=10)	99% (N=23)
CILs in rural areas	80% (N=44)	11% (N=6)	9% (N=5)	99% (N=55)
CILs in mixed urban/rural* areas	61% (N=20)	18% (N=6)	21% (N=7)	100% (N=33)

Note: *Urban/rural mix written in by respondents as other for Question 96.

Question 82, Table B. Social isolation is a common problem for persons that my CIL assists: response by region (N=131)

	% of CILs saying strongly disagree/ disagree	% of CILs saying neither agree nor disagree	% of CILs saying strongly agree/agree	
CILs in urban areas	5% (N=1)	19% (N=4)	76% (N=16)	100% (N=21)
CILs in suburban areas	18% (N=4)	18% (N=4)	64% (N=14)	99% (N=22)
CILs in rural areas	4% (N=2)	7% (N=4)	89% (N=49)	99% (N=55)
CILs in mixed urban/rural* areas	3% (N=1)	15% (N=5)	82% (N=27)	100% (N=33)

Note: *Urban/rural mix written in by respondents as other for Question 96.

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Question 83, Table B. The level of physical accessibility in my CIL's community is fairly high: response by region (N=130)

	% of CILs saying strongly disagree/ disagree	% of CILs saying neither agree nor disagree	% of CILs saying strongly agree/agree	
CILs in urban areas	20% (N=4)	25% (N=5)	55% (N=11)	100% (N=20)
CILs in suburban areas	36% (N=8)	14% (N=3)	50% (N=11)	99% (N=22)
CILs in rural areas	55% (N=30)	18% (N=10)	27% (N=15)	99% (N=55)
CILs in mixed urban/rural* areas	30% (N=10)	39% (N=13)	30% (N=10)	99% (N=33)

Note: *Urban/rural mix written in by respondents as other for Question 96.

Question 84, Table B. There is a lack of affordable attendant care services in the area my CIL serves: response by region (N=130)

	% of CILs saying strongly disagree/ disagree	% of CILs saying neither agree nor disagree	% of CILs saying strongly agree/agree	
CILs in urban areas	19% (N=4)	14% (N=3)	67% (N=14)	100% (N=21)
CILs in suburban areas	9% (N=2)	29% (N=6)	62% (N=13)	99% (N=21)
CILs in rural areas	7% (N=4)	24% (N=13)	69% (N=38)	99% (N=55)
CILs in mixed urban/rural* areas	3% (N=1)	18% (N=6)	79% (N=26)	99% (N=33)

Note: *Urban/rural mix written in by respondents as other for Question 96.

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Question 85, Table B. There is a lack of participant-directed attendant care services in the region my CIL serves: response by region (N=130)

	% of CILs saying strongly disagree/ disagree	% of CILs saying neither agree nor disagree	% of CILs saying strongly agree/agree	
CILs in urban areas	10% (N=2)	19% (N=4)	71% (N=15)	100% (N=21)
CILs in suburban areas	23% (N=5)	32% (N=7)	45% (N=10)	99% (N=22)
CILs in rural areas	26% (N=14)	15% (N=8)	59% (N=32)	99% (N=54)
CILs in mixed urban/rural* areas	15% (N=5)	12% (N=4)	73% (N=24)	99% (N=33)

Note: *Urban/rural mix written in by respondents as other for Question 96.

Question 86, Table B. In the area my CIL serves, there are good job training programs for persons with disabilities, including youth transitioning to post-secondary life: response by region (N=131)

	% of CILs saying strongly disagree/ disagree	% of CILs saying neither agree nor disagree	% of CILs saying strongly agree/agree	
CILs in urban areas	38% (N=8)	29% (N=6)	33% (N=7)	100% (N=21)
CILs in suburban areas	48% (N=11)	22% (N=5)	30% (N=7)	99% (N=23)
CILs in rural areas	70% (N=38)	17% (N=9)	13% (N=7)	99% (N=54)
CILs in mixed urban/rural* areas	64% (N=21)	21% (N=7)	15% (N=5)	99% (N=33)

Note: *Urban/rural mix written in by respondents as other for Question 96.

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Question 87, Table B. In the area my CIL serves, there are colleges and universities that offer good support to persons with disabilities, including youth with disabilities: response by region (N=132)

	% of CILs saying strongly disagree/ disagree	% of CILs saying neither agree nor disagree	% of CILs saying strongly agree/agree	
CILs in urban areas	9% (N=2)	24% (N=5)	67% (N=14)	100% (N=21)
CILs in suburban areas	17% (N=4)	13% (N=3)	69% (N=16)	99% (N=23)
CILs in rural areas	31% (N=17)	27% (N=15)	42% (N=23)	99% (N=55)
CILs in mixed urban/rural* areas	15% (N=5)	33% (N=11)	52% (N=17)	99% (N=33)

Note: *Urban/rural mix written in by respondents as other for Question 96.

SECTION 6: RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS

Question 88, Table A. What is your job title?

a) Executive director	81% (N=107)
b) Program manager	11% (N=15)
c) IL specialist	4% (N=5)
d) Other administrator	4% (N=5)
	100% (N=132)

Question 89, Table A. Some CIL staff work at more than one CIL or CIL location as part of their regular work. Do you work for more than one CIL?

a) Yes, I work at one CIL that has multiple regional sites. I also work at those regional sites	25% (N=34)
b) Yes, I work at two or more distinct CIL organizations. Each one is its own non-profit corporation	1% (N=1)
c) No, I work at one CIL only.	74% (N=99)
d) Other. Please provide response here.	0% (N=0)
	100% (N=134)

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Question 90, Table A. How long have you worked at this CIL?	
a) Less than 1 year	5% (N=7)
b) 1-5 years	17% (N=22)
c) 6-10 years	21% (N=28)
d) 11 or more years	57% (N=76)
	100% (N=133)

Question 91, Table A. How long have your worked in the IL and/or disability services field?	
a) Less than 1 year	0% (N=0)
b) 1-5 years	6% (N=8)
c) 6-10 years	11% (N=14)
d) 11 or more years	83% (N=110)
	100% (N=132)

Question 92, Table A. What is your gender?	
a) Female	62% (N=82)
b) Male	34% (N=45)
c) Transgender	1% (N=1)
d) I would prefer not to disclose this	4% (N=5)
e) Other (please specify)	0% (N=0)
	100% (N=133)

Question 93, Table A. Do you identify as a person with a disability?	
a) Yes	84% (N=111)
b) No	10% (N=13)
c) I would prefer not to disclose this	6% (N=8)
	100% (N=132)

Question 94, Table A. What is your highest level of education?	
a) High school diploma/GED	8% (N=10)
b) Associate's degree	11% (N=14)
c) Bachelor's degree	40% (N=53)
d) Graduate degree	42% (N=56)
e) Other. Please indicate other level of education here:	0% (N=0)
	100% (N=133)

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Question 95, Table A. How would you rate your level of knowledge about contracting with other organizations (like managed care organizations or other community-based organizations) to provide services to persons with disabilities transitioning from institutions, persons who are at risk of entering institutions, and youth with disabilities who are transitioning to post-secondary life?

a) I have a lot of knowledge about how to do this	40% (N=53)
b) I have some knowledge about how to do this	45% (N=59)
c) I have a little bit of knowledge about how to do this	13% (N=17)
d) I have no knowledge about how to do this	2% (N=3)
	100% (N=132)

Question 96, Table A. In what type of area would you describe your CIL as being located?

a) Urban area	16% (N=21)
b) Suburban area	17% (N=23)
c) Rural area	42% (N=56)
d) Urban-suburban-rural mix*	25% (N=33)
	100% (N=133)

Note: *Written in by respondent

Question 97, Table A. How many paid staff members does your CIL have?

a) Less than 5	8% (N=11)
b) 6-10	29% (N=39)
c) 11-20	38% (N=50)
d) 21-40	17% (N=22)
e) 41 or more	8% (N=11)
	100% (N=133)

Question 98, Table A. How many volunteer staff members does your CIL have?

a) Less than 5	61% (N=80)
b) 6-10	20% (N=26)
c) 11-20	15% (N=19)
d) 21-40	1% (N=1)
e) 41 or more	4% (N=5)
	100% (N=131)

DETAILED SUMMARY FINDINGS: YOUTH TRANSITIONS

Question 99, Table A. Is your CIL part of a formal network or consortium of community-based organizations that work collaboratively to provide services to people with disabilities?

a) Yes	68% (N=90)
b) No	30% (N=39)
c) I don't know	2% (N=3)
	100% (N=132)

Question 100, Table A. Over the past 3 years, have you seen your CIL's annual budget increase, decrease, or stay about the same?

a) Increase	15% (N=20)
b) Decrease	56% (N=75)
c) Stay about the same	25% (N=34)
d) I don't know	3% (N=4)
e) I would prefer not to disclose this	1% (N=1)
	100% (N=134)