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>> TIM FUCHS: Good afternoon. I'm Tim Fuchs
with the national coin sill on independent living
here in Washington D.C. I want to welcome you all
to SILC-NET's newest webinar SILC needs assessment
survey: A discussion on current approaches and
practices and needs assessment at Centers for
Independent Living. Excuse me. Statewide
independent living councils. What a way to start
a call. Today's webinar is being presented by the
the SILC-NET, a program of the IL NET training and
technical assistance project for CILs and SILCs
around the IL NET is operated through a
partnership among ILRU, NCIL and APRIL with
support provided by RSA at the U.S. Department of
Education.
So we are recording today's call so we can awr
Clive it on ILRU's website and we're going to have
a different format today. For those of you that
posh dissipate in these calls from time to time
you know it's typically kind of a lecture-based
program with Q&A but we really do want today's
call to be an open discussion. We're going to
start off with a presentation. But after we
listen to Jeff Sheen's presentation we're going to
open the call up, have some panel questions from
our speakers today, and then take your comments
and questions to lead the discussion. So the
second half of the call is really intended to be
very interactive. We're going to open the line up
and hear from all of you, too.
So I'll give you some instructions about that when
we get there. Until that time your lines are
muted. When we open up the line I will ask you to
individually mute your lines so we don't have a
lot of background noise. I'll walk you through
that when we get there, about halfway through the
call.
Before we start I want to ask you to please fill
out the evaluation form for today's call. Despite
the fact it's a little less formal than some of
our other calls we still need to know what you
thought of it and if it was helpful for you in
your role with the SILC. And it only takes a few
moments to complete. It's very easy. We really
would appreciate your thoughts. That will be
included on the final slide of the webinar if
you're on the webinar today. If you're listening
on the phone you can access that link in the
confirmation email that was sent to you.
We do have a short PowerPoint today. If you are
on the webinar it's going to display automatically
but for those of you that have just called, which
is fine, you'll want to open up that PowerPoint
that was sent to you in the confirmation email.
If you don't have that in front of you, you can
email me. I'm at Tim@NCIL.org. Thanks.
That's as much housekeeping as I had to handle
today. I just want to introduce some of our
speakers before we begin. First and foremost I
want to thank Jeff Sheen for all of his work
organizing this call. Jeff is with us from Utah
State University's center for people with
disabilities, and Utah state is also an integral
part of the IL NET project, and Jeff has done a
lot of work putting together this SILC survey,
analyzing the results from many of you that
responded. So thank you for that. And helped us
put together our presenters for today that I'll
walk through now. And I want to thank all of
them, too, for responding to the survey. Jeff was
instrumental in helping us identify states that
really had some promising practices, and I'm
pleased to say that all five of the states that we
reached out to agreed to participate today. We're
excited -- were excited to participate today.
It's wonderful. Really, I think, it is a
testament to the peer support that happens in IL
on a macrolevel as well as on a service level at
centers. So thanks in advance to all of you.
With us from the Michigan SILC we have Valerie
Barnum-Yarger. From the Washington SILC Deb Cook.
From the DSU in Colorado, Susan Fager. From the
Arizona SILC we have Larry Wanger. And from the
New York SILC we have Brad Williams.
We had a call the other day to prepare and just a
wonderful discussion, and I know we'll repeat that
today. Thanks to all of you for being with us.
In the meantime I'm going to turn it over to Jeff
to get us started with the presentation. Jeff?
>> JEFF SHEEN: Thank you, Tim. Good afternoon,
everyone. It's nice to be here with you this
afternoon. I'm going to take just a few minutes
and go over some of the -- give you an overview of
the survey that we conducted and some of the key
findings that informed the recommendations that we
have come up with based on conducting this survey.
So to give you a sense, the overall purpose of
this survey was just to get a better understanding
of how the statewide independent living councils
are currently going about conducting their needs
assessment activities. In particular in relation
to their state plan development. So that the
folks at the IL NET project could get a better
sense of how we might shape training and technical
assistance efforts in the future to help the SILCs
do a job that they're comfortable with as far as
conducting needs assessments, can really help them
move forward in productive and comprehensive ways.
The basics of the survey, we developed a
23-question telephone survey that many of you
participated in. That was developed by staff here
at the center for persons with disabilities as
well as staff at ILRU, and we conducted these
surveys between July and August. The thing I'm
most excited about, we had 54 out of the 56 SILCs
that compleaptd this survey. So we almost had
100% response rate. That is fantastic. So we're
really pleased that so many of your colleagues and
yourselves participated when we called and helped
us complete this important survey.
As far as who we talked to when we reached the
Statewide Independent Living Councils, 39 of the
respondents were executive directors, six were the
designated states units liaisons and eight of the
surveys were completed by current SILC chairs or
vice chairs.
Just a little bit of demographic information, the
median number of years with the SILC was six. So
half of the people that we talked to had been at
the Statewide Independent Living Council for more
than six years and half had been there just under
six years. We had three that had been with the
SILC for less than a year and so you can imagine
this was a new experience for them. And then we
had three who have been with their Statewide
Independent Living Council essentially since the
inception, over 20 years ago. So kind of a broad
cross section of folks that we talked to.
I want to go into a few of the key findings from
this survey, and the ones that we selected to
present today are really because they tie into
some of the primary recommendations that we have
moving forward for how we can address these
issues.
So the first two bullet points on this shrined
this slide is dealing with key findings around
methods, methodology of conducting needs
assessments. Over half of the folks we talked to
use some form of survey to collect data, a mail
based survey, a web-based survey or telephone
survey. But only 5% of these folks knew actually
how many surveys were distributed. That's one of
the issues we have with web surveys. We send out
a link, and we ask people in our network to send
that link out to their network and then to their
network, and so it's really difficult to know how
many surveys actually get distributed or how many
people actually get the link to a -- in particular
to a web-based survey. That has some implications
for methodology as far as sample size that I'll
talk about in a minute.
The majority of the respondents didn't on the
other side have a good sense of how many responses
they ultimately received from not just their
surveys but other data collection activities which
often include focus groups or public hearings.
Part of that is because we caught people on the
phone and we were kind of asking how many
responses, and they might not have had the exact
number in front of them at the time. But most of
the folks we talked to had essentially an educated
guess but weren't certain really how many
responses their data collection efforts had led
to.
That third bullet point, we only had three
respondents we talked to out of the 54 that had
actually established a predetermined response rate
for data collection. So they had looked at the
demographics of their state, and they had decided
that in order for their data collection to be
complete they needed to reach a certain number of
people, and that varied across respondents. But
most folks were simply using a cut-off date. The
surveys were open. Focus groups were held until a
certain point in the year, and then at that point,
whatever data had been collected was the data that
was going to be used. And so that has some
implications again, like I said earlier. Sample
size is -- having a Good Sam pull size when
you're -- a good sample size is important giving
confidence that you have a representative
understanding, a good representation of the
different opinions and thoughts and things that
are going on among the population that you're
trying to survey. So if we're not clear on how
many surveys we're not sending out, we're not
clear on how many we're getting back and we're not
establishing kind of ahead of time a number of
folks that we need to get to to get a
representative sample, it kind of makes our
methodology a little less rigorous, which can have
some implications for essentially how many
confidence we can place in the we're getting the
best information that we can. And so that's kind
of an interesting finding. And I'll come back to
a recommendation around that in just a minute.
As far as satisfaction, we asked respondents how
satisfied they were with the needs assessment
process and results of their most current needs
assessment, and if you look at this graph, we had
a small number that was not very satisfied with
the process. We had almost a third that were
somewhat satisfied. We had slightly higher,
another third, that was satisfied, 31%. And we
had 30% of our respondents that were very
satisfied. So the nice thing is two-thirds
essentially of our respondents were either
satisfied or very satisfied with the needs
assessment process and results. The group that is
the somewhat satisfied, you know, that's
essentially folks that have a recognition that
they would like to do things differently. They
maybe would like to tighten some things up or do a
better job of data collection, or something about
what they did this last round wasn't up to their
satisfaction. Those that were satisfied are more
in the group -- they felt like they did an
adequate job but realized there could still be
some things they could improve.
The next slide talks about some miscellaneous
findings but some things that I think are
important as far as how they relate to our
recommendations. We did have 33 respondents,
which is 61% of our sample, that indicated they
use center-level consumer satisfaction data as
part of the needs assessment. Just over half of
those, which is 18 respondents, indicated that the
center consumer satisfaction data is actually
standardized. And I'm going to come back to that.
So there's a number of centers, over half of the
SILCs, excuse me, are using consumer satisfaction
data, which we think is a good thing. But the
data they're getting is maybe not standardized
across the centers in their state. So that's an
issue that we'll try to address in the future.
The next bullet point, and this was really an
important one that we'll come back to as far as
promising practices and we'll talk about this in
our discussion... 20 respondents reported they
used the results of their needs assessment for
purposes beyond the state plan development. They
have invest add lot of time and resources in
completing the needs assessment and they have
proactively kind of found ways that they can use
that information for multiple purposes beyond
creating a nice state plan.
Finally, on this slide 14 respondents indicated
that members of the SILC had not received training
on how to conduct an effective needs assessment
and there was an additional 13 that were unsure.
If anybody on the council had actually received
training specific to needs assessment. So we had
just over half of our respondents that either did
not have any training or weren't sure if anybody
on the council had received training. So that
obviously gives us some information that we can
use to develop some additional targeted training
around this topic.
Got a handful of slides left and then I'll go
ahead and take questions regarding any of this
information.
When we looked a little bit closer at the data
from the survey, there was some interesting
relationships that we found, or correlations. We
found that the longer somebody had been with the
council, the greater chance that they had a higher
level of satisfaction with the needs assessment
process. There was a higher likelihood that they
had used CIL data as part of the needs assessment.
And they were more likely to have used the
information they collected for purposes beyond
developing the state plan. So that kind of tells
us the longer somebody has been around, they've
kind of figured out some things that increase
their satisfaction. They figured out that the CIL
data is good to pull in and they found some
additional ways to use all of the information that
they're gathering for purposes beyond developing
the state plan. So we felt that was a fairly
important relationship.
The next relationship we found was between folks
that expressed a higher level of satisfaction.
These folks were typically more likely to use
data -- collect data from sources beyond the
typical sources, such as VR data or CIL data.
They were a little bit more comprehensive in who
they worked with to get information about the
needs for people with disabilities in their state.
And these folks that had high levels of
satisfaction were also more likely to use -- again
to use their data for purposes beyond the state
plan. They essentially found a way to get more
bang for the buck. If you're going to already
conduct a needs assessment and put the time and
effort into it, the more you can leverage that
information, the more efficient that is for you
and your council.
So from these kind of key findings and results, a
couple of key recommendations. The first one is
based on the methods slide where we found out a
lot of folks didn't have a really solid sample
size in mind. They weren't sure how many surveys
had been distributed or returned. To work with
the councils to develop and provide training on
the fundamentals of really effective needs
assessment in order to improve the rigor of the
methods that are being used and the idea behind
that is to improve the quality of data that
ultimately is collected, and the reason we spend
this kind of time trying to collect good data is
we need good quality data and information to make
good strategic plans and decisions going forward.
So that's an issue that we think that we can
address in the future. The second piece is really
going back to the CIL consumer satisfaction data.
Where we don't have standardized data across the
centers in a state, and it's certainly not across
the country, we'd like to explore the pros and
cons of working towards that, that at least the
data is standardized at the state level. Whether
it makes sense to standardize that across the
country is a discussion to be had, but it does
make sense that at least at the state level there
would be some pros, there would be some benefit to
standardizing how the centers are collecting
consumer satisfaction data. That may be my bias
coming from a relatively small state that has six
centers. That may be a different discussion in
states that have many more.
The third recommendation is to encourage the
statewide independent living councils to really
broaden the sources of data they're pulling in,
and these are existing data sources. So figuring
out who in the community is gathering data that
could really help us get a more complete picture
of the service needs and the resources that are
available in our communities around
disability-related issues.
Fourth, finally, really shifting the mindset
beyond conducting needs assessments just to comply
and to develop the, you know, required state plan,
but really help folks connect. The power that's
behind a really well done needs assessment, the
opportunity to use that information for a number
of very strategic purposes, a number of day-to-day
activities that support the overall goals of not
just the council but the centers and the work that
they're doing with individuals, and that's rreally -- when we shift into discussion mode,
that's a topic we're going to cover in some
detail. I think for us as we looked at the
survey, it comes down to if we can help folks use
this information in more ways more effectively,
their satisfaction is going to go up and the
quality of what we are going to do is going to go
up.
There were some limitations of this study. This
is kind of a snapshot of current practices. We
didn't have the opportunity to have long, in-depth
conversations with everybody that we talked to.
We didn't have the opportunity to talk to multiple
members of each council in each state. You know,
in talking to different people we essentially have
a perspective of a council member on how this process has been working. There may be other
members that could have other perspectives that
could add additional detail. So this is a
snapshot, and that's why we kind of discussed the
title of this. It's the current approaches of
what's happening in one point and time. So there
are a few limitations like that to take into
consideration as you digest the results of this
survey and as we've looked through these.
I want to end with two of the promising practices
that we kind of identified as a group as we went
through the survey results. Practices that we
really -- that kind of helped some folks stand out
when we talked to them. And the first -- and
you'll see this is a pattern that's come through
the results through the recommendations to now
promising practices -- those folks that were
really using data from other sources, whether it
was their aging councils or developmental
disability down silings or census data, working
with local governments, we had folks getting data
from their parks and recreation department and
their brain injury associations and just a really
diverse set of local and state agencies that they
were pulling information from to help them as part
of their needs assessment. That is just something
that we think stands out as a promising practice,
that more folks could do a better job of those
kinds of things.
The second promising practice we identified, and
I've said this a number of times now, but it
really comes back to figuring out ways to use the
results of this needs assessment for purposes
beyond the state plan. For example, we have
respondents indicate, this is a big piece of how
they develop their media plan, what to put on
their website, what to put out to the newspapers.
Using these results for legislative advocacy.
Building partnerships with other related agencies
and not duplicating services. Using the
information to evaluate how well existing programs
are doing and making decisions on whether to
expand or contract those programs or perhaps
retool them. Use thatting the data to really
provide more coordinated services across these
diverse needs and working with those partners, and
going back to that correlation, those that are
doing this typically have a higher level of
satisfaction with what they are doing as far as
needs assessments.
So those are two promising practices that when we
have a -- the panel discussion we'll hit on in
some more detail.
Before I turn this back over to Tim and the panel,
though, we would be willing to take any questions
specifically related to the slides that I've just
gone through with you. Is there any questions
from the audience?
>> TIM FUCHS: If you have any questions for Jeff
regarding the initial presentation, you can press
star pound if you're on the telephone. And if you
are on the webinar you can type your question in
the chat below the list of attendees.
>> JEFF SHEEN: And certainly my contact
information will be at the end of this, and I'm
happy to address questions off the call if that's
more timely for folks.
>> TIM FUCHS: Patricia, any questions on the
phone before I move on?
>> OPERATOR: Not at the moment.
>> TIM FUCHS: Okay.
>> JEFF SHEEN: Tim, it's all yours.
>> TIM FUCHS: We're going to hear from our
panelists for a bit to add some real-life
experience to the presentation Jeff just gave and
then we'll open the call up for all of you. First
things first, I want to start sort of the ground
level here and we will walk through some nuts and
bolts with our panelists and with you all today.
But I know that for a lot of states one of the
challenges is figuring out where to get started
and seeing the value in doing this. So I'd like
to hear from a couple of our panelists about how
you got started and what the benefits you've seen
for people with disabilities in your state, and
I'm going to ask Brad if he could -- to share from
New York's experience about the value of doing the
needs assessment and ways that you all have used
the data both for the state plan and beyond it, as
Jeff alluded to. Brad?
>> BRAD WILLIAMS: Sure. Thank you, Tim.
I just want to also mention a plug in terms of
Jeff. I notice he said something about the need
for training. You know, we started off having to
learn ourselves, and we participated on an IL NET
training, a six-week course, which that's how we
learned. That's how we learned how to pull
together a needs assessment committee, a NAC, and
I would hily recommend that, first of all, if
that's the point where anyone is at. And
hopefully that will cycle back around, or if it's
archived, maybe that's something someone can get
into. But that's where we began in our conactual
opportunity participated on that as well. And it
brought us along the way.
But we then engaged a NAC and we went through the
process to create a needs assessment. I also
believe firmly not to recreate the wheel. We saw
the California SILC needs assessment, which was
fantastic, and we looked at different segments of
that, and what we thought was great, and we
utilized portions of their needs assessment, and I
would suggest that our colleagues do the same
thing. Look at other SILCs needs assessments and
see what lends well for their state.
But then what we did was, again, what's good for
our duties. You do your needs assessments, and
then what applies to our duties. It plugs into
our state plan in terms of 1.2B for
[indiscernible] populations, 2.1B, unserved,
underserved geographic area, 3.1 in terms of the
network for the -- you know, what could possible
ea be for competition if something takes place.
But then our consultant Alan Krieger always says
to us, he goes, so what? You want to build this
needs assessment. You want to have the
information. This useful information. If you get
to that point. But then it's just information.
Unless you do something with it. Unless you make
it actionable. So at least in the state plan
hopefully you make it into an objective or two,
you make it actionable in the objective section in
your state plan. But then there's more. Okay?
Alan Krieger, he then says, so what? You know,
let's hope you get it -- something in your state
plan that you've identified this need and it's in
your state plan and you're doing something within
your state plan. But your state plan, of course,
only has so much in terms of resources. Or maybe
you're in a state that doesn't have significant
Part B resources. What do you do, too in terms of
all this need? Well, we were able to identify
some significant items, and we had like three
particular things that we've been able to follow
through on. One of the first things is when you
think in terms of census data, it is the civilian
population. It's not the institutionalized
population. So in New York, they have not done
anything in terms of identifying the
institutionalized population. So we had to for
this needs assessment go through and all except
for one state agency FOIA all our state agencies
to get that data. We created what is probably the
best first attempt at identifying our state's
institutionalized population in our needs
assessment. We then turned that around and we had
Olmstead hearings going into the fall, used that
during testimony to kind of put the pressure back
to them for this Olmstead plan coming out and
saying you need to do this. In fact, you should
have every state agency like the office of mental
health put all this information online and
populate it for people shifting between settings
and try to make them accountable, and it's
utilizing this information which is a chart in the
needs assessment. So by county you can know how
many people there are in institutional settings
and be able to maybe start this process of getting
people in the most integrated setting. It's that
same information that then allowed us through our
emergency preparedness committee to start taking a
hard look at individuals impacted by Hurricane
Sandy. We had people on the ground down in
New York City who are communicating to us and
saying, you know, we're a little bit concerned
about people -- people have to go and be
relocated. We're beginning to hear about
potentially -- individuals going into like maybe a
nursing home or assisted living setting, which
temporarily, I suppose if that's what -- not
necessarily a nursing home, but you know, people
are going to have to go where they're going to
have to go, but we also got some long-term care
information where they were saying their
absenteeism rates were evaporating and we got
concerned. We started writing letters to
department of health trying to make the process
transparent, what's this information we're
hearing. This is based on the needs assessment,
you know, data that we FOIAed because it was
three, four, five months pre-Sandy and we got no
response after two letters until finally on one
year anniversary of Sandy we got a letter back
that said we know of no individual, in other
words, the response is, zero individuals, who have
been even temporarily housed, for which we were
like, oh, that's not a good response. So, you
know, we teamed up with the local disability law
clinic. They're looking into it. They have
FOIAed six months, one year, all the data and we
know for a fact and they're following through on
it there is like one individual that has already
been identified and they're making contact with an
individual on Long Island who has been in a
nursing home in Long Island for one year who has
been there, relocated because of Sandy. But this
comes from the needs assessment.
Then finally, the last example is employment. We
all know employment is like one of the big issues,
but often we don't get to the issue of employment,
but they came out like the number one issue
because of the needs assessment. Well, because of
the national governors association, we then
facilitated a session at our September meeting.
We made it a priority. Sent a letter to the
governor. It's like hot now. We've got a
petition going. You know, you're able to actually
take this data and do something with it. So these
are just some examples.
>> TIM FUCHS: Thanks, Brad. That's great.
I'm turning my attention now to Debbie in
Washington, and, Debbie, I know when we spoke on
Monday, you talked a lot about taking the needs
assessment in Washington and using it to tell a
story, and I know that that's a really powerful
tool, whether it be with legislators or any
stakeholders in the state. Can you talk a bit
about that process in Washington and how you've
been able to use the data you've collected?
>> DEB COOK: Sure, I would be glad to do that.
So basically in Washington state needs assessment
is fairly new to our SILC, and in the past we
really have used our community forums and our
anecdotal data primarily to deal with needs
assessment. So it's not been very concrete, and I
don't want to say it's accurate or inaccurate. I
think it's as accurate as anyone knows the total
picture, but we all know that our own individual
abilities to know the total picture is always
pretty challenging. So data is a pretty
formidable tool and can be used to tell your story
in a variety of ways.
So we collected quite a wide variety of data
because this was our first time out. We did not
collect all of the data that we might have been
able to collect and that we should collect in the
future as we move through this process. But we
did do significantly more than we had ever done,
and we learned a number of things from our data
collection, and some of them corroborated the
story that we'd been telling. Some of them
said -- some of the data we had said, yep, that's
the story you have been telling with the an
extotal dot ayou have and community data you have
from the limited number of people who attend
public forums, and that data is supported by other
data that is specifically factual data that we can
use. And then we learned that some of the other
data that we had kind of been sharing around might
not be so readily substantiated. So then we were
able to spend some time looking at, well, does
that invalidate what we think is true? Not less.
But it might put a different spin on it. Or it
might mean that if we do still think it's true
that we need to think about how we're going to
sell that because data doesn't support it but our
experience does. So how do we go about that?
So I think that a powerful thing that we've been
able to do with the data is to discuss in a much
more concrete and reasonable way both the
strengths and the limitations of the IL service
delivery system in our state but also the
strengths and limitations of some of the other
systems in our state that become part of that data
collection and how those mesh with the IL system.
One of the things that was very, very interesting
for me as kind of a data collector by nature is
that we've been collecting data, of course, in the
DSUs for years. They're very good at it. And
actually in the older blind program we had been
collecting quite a bit of good data over time. So
it was very interesting to compare the center data
with some of that other data and, you know, not
too surprising to me, there was a great deal of
the same findings, which meant that we had some
real commonalities across some of the major
programs that serve people with disabilities in
our state. And so now that is impacting across
all of those programs what we do for our outreach
strategy, how we prioritize, where we focus even
the priority of some of our other initiatives in
the plan. It actually changed our priorities in
the network for what the SILC believes needs to
happen if ever new federal money should come down
the system. We have a different set of priorities
and some data to back that up. Now, that doesn't
mean it won't change again, and we have to
continue to visit that and see whether some of our
other efforts have had an impact on that, but we
now have established a baseline and very
significantly a story that we can use and that we
can back up to a variety of different audiences
about what the needs are and about the reality of
some of those with some fairly hard data in most
cases backed up in many cases with some supportive
anecdotal data like we've been collecting for
years.
>> TIM FUCHS: That's great. That's really good.
Thank you, Debbie.
I'm about to switch gears to talk about some more
nuts and bolts. Would any of the other states,
any other panelists like to share some of the
benefits that they've seen in their state since
they've started assessing needs statewide or ways
that you all have been able to use this beyond the
SPIL?
>> LARRY WANGER: This is Larry in Arizona. I
think one thing I would say is that this can be --
we've kind of said this already -- the data we
collect through this needs analysis is very useful
to the individual centers, but as you look at
doing needs analysis and implementing or improving
the program you have in your state, you know, one
experience we had here as part of the process was
trying to help a couple of the centers understand
the value in the data that we collect and
specifically part of what we do is, really quickly
here, is incorporate -- survey the consumers who
receive services from the individual centers and
that sort of thing, as we've talked about, and
there can be some degree of resistance sometimes
for centers to provide the information so you can
do that, and so one of the aspects of this is
certainly educating the centers individually about
the value of this information and how they can use
it to improve their services in their local
community, and we've been successful at that, and
I just throw that out there as something to think
about, that that's something that states might run
into as they teak to improve their efforts in this
area.
>> TIM FUCHS: Good point. Thanks, Larry. Okay.
Go ahead, Valerie.
>> VALERIE BARNUM-YARGER: This is Valerie from
Michigan.
One of the things that has been very valuable to
us is our comprehensive need assessment is done in
partnership with both of our DSUs as well as the
state rehab council, believing there's power in
numbers. We're also collaboratively using
Michigan State University's Project Excellence to
be a third party collector of the information, and
that has -- with the legislature -- provided all
involved with an unbiased, accepted way to move
our data forward so they're not questioning is it
different for one department versus another. It
helps give us consistency also at the state level
when looking at the total needs of individuals,
and then we can turn that around and support it
with what the DD council has -- what the
commission on aging has. So we're able to tie it
all in and show a larger need instead of just one
small program at a time.
>> TIM FUCHS: That's great. A good tip. And
that's a nice transition, too.
I know, Valerie, you're not the only one who has
found success using a third party. Brad alluded
to their consultant. And, Larry, I believe you
all in Arizona have an agreement with Arizona
State University just down the road from you to
help conduct the needs assessment, is that right?
>> LARRY WANGER: Yes, that's correct.
>> TIM FUCHS: And, Brad, you all have found and
individual consultant to help you do that work, is
that right?
>> BRAD WILLIAMS: Right. I mean, it sounds like
Valerie has like this amazing partnership. I
mean, that's -- I mean, I can't imagine getting to
that level of a partnership. We've started with
just a consultant, someone who can, since we were
just starting up with this, who was really good
with outcomes. He is actually our SPIL evaluator,
someone we developed an excellent relationship
with who now understands our state plan and
understood how to work with needs assessment and
these types of tools. So that's someone who we
felt comfortable with.
>> TIM FUCHS: Good. Good. I think for those of
you that are on the phone, and we'll hear from you
in a moment, you might think about who you have in
your community or in your state, I should say,
that may be able to full ill that role for you. but
if you think it's best to do it yourselves you
might consider what Colorado has done. Sue, can
you talk about how you all have done your needs
assessment on your own, so to speak?
>> SUSAN FAGER: Yes, we are the do it
yourselfers in Colorado. For our last SPIL, not
the one we just completed, but the previous one,
the SILC actually worked very closely, very long
and very hard with the local university on
developing a needs assessment, and the results of
the needs assessment were pretty disappointing.
So, Jeff, as you folks are thinking about what
would be helpful for other SILCs across the
country, maybe some helpful hints on how to work
with a contractor or a university and just lessons
learned from other people. Or other SILCs. So
based on the results of that needs assessment for
this round of our SPIL, we decided -- the SILC
decided it was going to do it ourselves. So we
did a three-pronged approach. The first and the
one that we put the most energy into was designing
Survey Monkey that could go out into the networks
of all of the SILC members, the -- as we -- we
sent it out to the SRC. We put it on voc. rehab's
website. And as Jeff was saying earlier, when you
do that, you don't really know how many people are
actually getting the survey, but for Colorado we
got a pretty good return on that investment. I
think we had 74 people respond to it, and a nice
mixture of service providers, consumers,
independent living center staff. So that was
pretty good. We also provide add $250 stipend to
independent live young centers in the state --
living centers in the state so they could conduct
their own focus groups. That had mixed results.
Some of the centers chose to do it. Some of the
centers chose not to. And the third thing we did
was to tack public forums onto SILC meetings. In
that Colorado the SILC goes around the state. It
doesn't just stay in the front range, in the big
cities. But, again, not a lot of folks came to
those meetings. So the biggest bang for our buck
in Colorado was the Survey Monkey. With the
understanding that particularly in a state like
Colorado in which the majority of the counties are
rural and frontier and some counties don't yet
have anything more than dial-up, some counties
don't have Internet service at your home, and
understanding that computer access isn't a reality
for all consumers with disabilities in this state,
we also worked with some techy folks to make sure
our survey was accessible to folks who used screen
readers and came up with some different options
for people who couldn't access it online via the
Survey Monkey, including a phone number of someone
to call who could read the survey to you and
record your answers.
But I just want to say, Tim, I know you didn't ask
this question yet, but one of the biggest things I
feel like the SILC in Colorado has learned, both
from the previous needs assessment and this
current needs assessment, is that we're still
struggling with how do you do a needs assessment
and struggling with the results that we've gotten
from both two needs assessments so much that we've
written a goal into our current state plan to
conduct additional needs assessments around the
state to just go out where folks are and figure
out who are you and what services do you need and
how is your center doing providing services?
Teuksz that's a critical part of getting started
to determine what yes to be done. So I'm glad you
mentioned that. Good.
Well, I have another couple questions that I
wanted to get into, however, I think I'm going to
save them for our larger discussion. I've been
promising we would open up the line and I'm eager
to hear from all of you. One of the other things
I wanted to walk through were some of the
challenges that states have had in starting out
and, of course, the goal there is to talk about
solutions to that. So I want to go ahead and open
up the lines with that question. I want to hear
from some of you. Those of you that when you
responded to the survey you said that you weren't
currently doing this, and I want to know what the
barriers are, whether it's that you didn't know
where to get started, or you weren't sure of the
value in doing it, and then let's talk about some
ways to get beyond that.
In opening up the lines we're going to unmute your
lines. That means we'll be able to hear all of
you whether it's papers in the background or
whatnot, typing on keyboards. So if you could, if
you have a mute feature on your phone and you're
not actively commenting or asking a question, if
you could press your mute feature now. If you
don't have a mute feature on your phone, that's
fine, you can press star-pound and that will mute
your line and then it's a toggle. So if you would
like to unmute and ask a question you can press
star-pound. For those of you on the webinar,
again your comments and questions can go into the
chat underneath the list of attendees and I'll
voice those as we walk through the discussion in
the order they're received.
Okay. Patricia our operator is telling me all our
lines are now unmuted. Please don't be shy. Jump
right in. Who of you have had big problems doing
this and let's walk through some solutions.

so
everyone that's sign up for this has had just a
fantastic experience doing needs assessment in
their state. Don't worry, it's a small call. We
can be honest with each other here.
>> DEB COOK: This is Debbie. I was on the panel
but I have a big problem I would like to bring to
the group. I believe it was Larry who mentioned
it. That is bringing the centers on board to feel
safe with this process and to embrace the data and
the process, because in our state it's been very
challenging. Centers are reluctant to really
share data with the SILC. They don't really have
consistent data collection. We don't have a
consistent satisfaction process, consumer
satisfaction process. I would be a huge advocate
for having that for a variety of data reasons.
And so it was very, very challenging for our
centers when the SILC began to ask me how can we
get more data on the statements we're making
around here or the things we say are needs in our
plan are, et cetera. So it was a really hard --
it was a hard thing for organizations who are
sometimes a little bit afraid of data and think
that data has been used against them at times,
which was not our intent, of course, but how have
people brought centers on board?
>> TIM FUCHS: That's a great question and great
place to start. Larry, you alluded to that. Can
you share some of the ways you found success with
getting centers to buy in in ArArizona?
>> LARRY WANGER: Yeah, absolutely. So I think,
just as background really quickly, we don't -- we
conduct the survey of consumers and what we're
requesting from the centers is statistically valid
number of consumers. So if you served "X" number
of people, we need "X" number of consumers' phone
numbers, because they do it by phone. And there
was some -- and then we do the survey. So -- and
there was some hesitancy and the way we overcame
that was how we went about reporting the data when
it came time to send it out and begin using it.
So one of the things you need to do is make the
centers feel safe in participating in this effort.
And the best way to do that, really, is to say --
take an approach that says in the larger picture
your data will be incorporated with all of the
other data, but you as a center will receive
specifically the results for the surveys that were
done on your consumers, but only you, center, no
other center will see your individualized data.
So we took that approach, you know, so that each
center individually sees their survey results.
And that, in turn, does help them. I think that's
the biggest thing we were able to do to help them
to feel more comfortable. But beyond that, it's
sort of like the context of this call, helping
them to understand why we want this information,
the value of it, that they will in turn be able to
use this data in their advocacy with legislators
and out in the community and potentially even when
seeking funding and that kind of thing. So
helping them to understand the all-purpose uses,
if you will, of the data that comes back is hugely
important and I think once you work and have a
process in place that's working and you're getting
meaningful data, that's a big selling point as
well.
>> TIM FUCHS: Great. Good tips.
Anyone else had resistance, not just from centers,
but any other groups and found ways to overcome
that?
>> PARTICIPANT: This is pat Stewart in Indiana.
I'm a center director here. One of the -- let me
just explain a little bit about our particular
area that we serve. There's a lot of poverty.
One of the problems is when you tell me telephone
numbers, I really get squeamish. Many of our
consumers use disposable phones. So,
consequently, they don't have the same number many
time. They also in an effort to keep in front of
the utility bills tend to move quite often.
Another difficulty. Now, this has only come up
lately because our state is trying to do a needs
assessment or come up with a way to do a needs
assessment most effectively and, of course, the
obvious answer is a telephone survey. Not that I
have any others that are any better either for the
same reasons. So I guess our problem is,
especially if you're talking about getting
research research or results from centers in
various areas, there's going to be some
significant problems for various reasons where the
different centers are.
>> LARRY WANGER: I'll tell you, Pat, I'll tell
you, you'll get a significant number of -- and we
do in the approach we use with this phone survey,
we do get a significant number of consumers that
we can't reach. And precisely, I believe, because
of that very issue, that people move and people
change phone numbers constantly. It is a problem.
>> PARTICIPANT: I'm glad to hear you say that
because our state people don't seem to understand
that.
>> DEB COOK: This is Debbie. Maybe it would
work well to provide the -- ask the centers to
provide the surveys to a certain percentage of
individuals when they exit services, when they
complete their service plan, and do it that way,
and then somebody mentioned giving the centers a
stipend to kind of support doing that, which I
thought was a great incentive. That seems to
help. And -- because I do appreciate the
telephone problem. And what you don't want to do
is -- one answer could be find other consumers.
If we don't reach those consumers, we'll find
others, but if we really want to capture a
cross-section of the consumers, then that group of
people who might be homeless or who might be in
pretty dire straits in some other way do represent
a pretty significant number of people served by
centers. So maybe an exit survey would be easier
than a telephone survey in those areas.
>> PARTICIPANT: This is Pat again. That's
exactly what we have developed for our own center
to get satisfaction, is basically after they --
when they've completed their plan or after they've
succeeded in attaining a goal, we do a
satisfaction survey then, and, you know, when
they're either absolutely delighted and proud --
pleased with themselves, and they're more apt to
respond. And that is a very successful approach
for us.
>> TIM FUCHS: That's great. Good. Good
solution.
>> SUSAN FAGER: Tim, this is sue in Colorado,
before we move on, one thing that the SILC has
done to address concerns of directors of centers
in the state that the SPIL was being developed
without their input was to open up and invite onto
the SPIL subcommittee of the SILC as many center
directors as wish to participate. So I think
there were seven members of that committee and
three of them were center directors. So maybe if
a state -- or if a SILC was going to have a needs
assessment committee, it could ensure that the --
than there was adequate representation of center
directors on that committee.
>> TIM FUCHS: That's great. I would imagine
that would be fairly essential and a good chance
to walk through solutions for problems like Pat
just brought up as well. More input, more problem
solving and better buy-in. So...
good. Good idea. >> PARTICIPANT: This is Linda from California.
I'm with the SILC. I have a question regarding
along the lines of diversity. California is a
very diverse state. Many different languages.
People with disabilities who are homeless. And
other studies conducted apart from the SILC, which
I either participated in or supported in my
communities, these challenges entered into the
construction of the way in which we surveyed
people to gather information, and I'm wondering if
you could please or someone could comment along
the lines of what you tried, how did this work.
I'm concerned about using too much technology when
we might have people who can't afford it or access
it, may not know how to use it. So comment would
be appreciated. Thank you.
>> TIM FUCHS: Sure. So from our panelists and
from the whole audience, anyone that has ideas
about reaching out to diverse communities, whether
it be reaching out as some of you indicated to
people that may not have Internet access, or
whether we're talking about non-native English
speakers. Anyone had success there?
>> BRAD WILLIAMS: This is Brad. I can try my
best to explain how we approach that subject
through our committee. In New York we actually
address it two different ways. First of all, we
have a needs assessment committee, which kind of
addresses the overarching issues. Then we have a
consumer satisfaction survey committee, which
addresses the consumer satisfaction issues. I
think some of these recent questions, in New York
we would look at them as the consumer satisfaction
survey. So even though they do tend to -- even
though they are two separate items, sometimes
people approach them similarly, and certainly the
surveying aspects of them definitely overlap.
But if I'm going to take like the consumer
satisfaction aspect of this, you know, we have a
committee, and we have a committee much like it's
been recommended, you know, of SILC members, SILC
members who are diverse and also come from the
center network, but also of other members. They
might be front line staff at centers, which makes
sense, because they're the people who have the
direct contact with a lot of the consumers. And
you need some of those key individuals because
they have the practical contact in advice of, you
know, this isn't going to work, you know, in terms
of implementing a survey. Nice idea. But, you
know, this just isn't going to happen, and this
isn't going to work, not at my center. Okay? And
so you need that, you know, presence on the
committee. Along with other folks who have been
doing it for a while. And then in terms of what
you're talking about, New York, just like
California, is just -- is diverse -- it's diverse
in pockets. Okay? Which means we have to be very
situational or functional because there are
certain places where you have to provide for it
but you may not need it as much. And then there's
other places where you absolutely need it, like,
for instance, Amsterdam in Fulton County has a
very large Hispanic community, but it's in a very
rural setting and you wouldn't know it otherwise.
But you need to be able to provide for this. And
so you do need translation. You need translation
services. And translation services other than
going online and having that kind of translation,
because for someone who actually reads that,
that's not really fluent, and that actually can
offend the community. So you actually have to
invest and have someone who knows the language be
able to convert your documents. So you ever to
make a call based on your population. At a
minimum, you know, based on your state, you have
to know that, well, there's a large Hispanic
community and that we have to convert our
documents into Spanish. Is it Spanish -- Puerto
Rican or Spanish Mexican? And then you have to
say, well, we also have mandarin Chinese. We also
have Russian. You know, there's also many other
populations when you get down near New York City
that you might have to consider, but, I mean, you
have to make a call in terms of what you might
need in terms of translation for your physical
materials. Online might allow you some
conversion, but you have to think of those types
of -- those types of things.
Also, if you're in a really concentrated situation
and you're going to do like phone survey, you need
that translation because you might -- much like
you would have the phone contact for an individual
in English, you would probably be doing outreach,
right? So to that -- to that community. So you
would want someone to voice translate in that
language. I mean, these are all things we kind of
think about and we provide about. I can go on and
on. I understand exactly what you're talking
about, and we try to provide for these
situation -- we try to provide for the resources
and these types of things. We're actually going
through this right now. Our consumer satisfaction
survey was just let out, and we're in the
preparation phase, and it's -- it starts in
January 2014, but, yes, there's many things that
you have to consider along the lines you're
talking about.
>> TIM FUCHS: Thanks, Brad.
>> VALERIE BARNUM-YARGER: This is Valerie from
Michigan. I want to tell you I I support
everything Brad just said and we do some of that,
but one of the things that we've taken a step
farther to do, and, again, part of it is because
of limited resources that we have, most of the
special interest groups or special populations,
where they're located has some type of a
association for their membership in their own
respective areas. So the council makes a
conscientious effort to develop linkages with each
one of those communities, be it the CALDEAN,
Vietnamese, so that when they're out in their
community and they're surveying their own needs we
volunteer to participate with them, to support
their activities and ask them to expand their
survey to also include disability issues, and
that's worked twofold for us as far as giving us
an economical way to get into different
populations around the state, but it's also been
an excellent tool at educating those populations
regarding some of the special needs that their own
community has that they might not routinely think
of.
>> TIM FUCHS: That's a great point.
>> DEB COOK: This is Debbie. I was just going
to very quickly say that one of the items from our
story that we learned was that we had two
non-English or perhaps less English speaking populations that our state was probably
underserving, and, again, was very consistent with
all of the other service delivery. And so we have
some efforts in place in collaboration with them
to increase that everywhere, but it means that
right now clients satisfaction or customer
satisfaction is not really much of an issue for
the language issue because we're not serving them
yet -- or not enough significantly to matter.
We're only serving the ones who have English. But
what we also did was some very targeted focus
groups and kind of a different aspect of what
Valerie talked about where we actually went and
met in those communities, and in those particular
meetings we arranged for whatever interpreting and
et cetera he would be needed to facilitate that to
make sure people had an opportunity to participate
and share and be understood and accurately have
their communication expressed and ours expressed,
too. So we thought that that was really helpful
for us not only in terms of getting that input but
also really making an effort to reach out and being well received for having made that extra
effort. And it wasn't terribly expensive. We
just don't have ways to spend a lot of money on
this because we don't have any money, and so we
really did try to use the community resources to
conduct some additional focus group activities.
>> BRAD WILLIAMS: I also wanted to add that one
of our front line members recommended that we need
to take all our materials at the end and convert
them all to an 8th grade reading level, which I
thought was a very practical recommendation, which
we hadn't considered for a while, and I thought it
was great, and -- and we initiated.
>> TIM FUCHS: Right. Good. Good. All good
tips and a reason why when you think about
planning for this you really need a broad
definition of inclusivity. That's great.
Good tips. We've been talking a lot about the
reaching out to consumers and consumer
satisfaction aspect of this. One thing I want to
talk about is the method of using what you have
available to you. We alluded to this earlier, but
is to get a little more detail on using the data
that already exists and complementing that, and
I'm going to ask Debbie first to expand a little
bit on what you touched on earlier, Debbie, about
the variety of data that you all have pulled from
and what you found when you looked at that data
that was available to you in Washington.
>> DEB COOK: Well, we started with looking at
some census data and looking at some specific data
that Cornell and others have gathered about
disability populations and numbers, and we also
looked at our 704 data across the state in an
aggregate. So every center had their own data,
but they had never done any analysis about what
that data really looks like. So they knew they
served this many people and this many of them had
this characteristic or this particular disability
or ethnicity but didn't really know what that
meant in terms of the population. So we looked at
that to see what populations in a different -- in
a variety ways, somewhat driven by the 704,
because it only collects certain kinds of data,
and so we used that, we said that those are the
data that we can readily get from this particular
data set. There may be other data sets we can
use. But this is the data set that's easy. So we
looked at the trending across the state and then
we compared that to census data and other data to
see how we were performing in lieu of the entire
population. So I don't want to use the term
overserve and underserve. We all like overserve
was we don't like to think of overserving because
we don't overserve anywhere but we do sometimes
disproportion lit provide services to a population
or part of a state, and that doesn't mean we
should start but it means maybe that's not the
target for our outreach. So we established some
new outreach priorities and some other new kinds
of things.
Then -- that were part of our state plan and
really our data collection infuses every single
part of our state plan. There's almost not an
item in our state plan that doesn't have some
relationship to our data collection.
Then we've also been able to use that data in some
other ways to work collaboratively on activities
with some of our other partners and notably the
SRCs and the DSUs in our state to try to look at
service delivery across state because, as I said,
we found a variety of things that were in common.
In addition to all the census data and that kind
of general population data that we used, we also
looked at the service delivery data of other
organizations who had data that we could easily
capture and move into our demographic. So we
looked at some of the data that transportation
agencies had. We looked at some of the data that
was available to us about housing. And we looked
at some of the data that was available to us from
some aging and disability services and from a
variety of other agencies to see whether that data
was consistent with the data that we had or
whether they, in fact, had some things going for
them in terms of the populations they were able to
reach and the ways they were able to reach them
that might be useful to us to tag on to. So we
made some recommendations to centers based on that
and then in terms of our own SILC outreach and
activity we also developed a variety of
strategies.
The most recent thing that we were able to do with
our data that was just kind of a side piece and
not planned for was that a variety of disability
organizations decided to take on a major
transportation initiative, the legislature was
going to have a special session to deal with
transportation, public transportation, because
they wanted to capture a big contract from Boeing,
and they might not capture it, but, anyway, they
wanted to do this, and so they decided that
transportation was a key piece to that. So a
variety of disability consumer organizations who
were in a better position to lobby than we were
were able to get on the bandwagon and join this
effort, but behind the scenes we were able to join
the effort by providing quite a bit of really
useful data about how the transportation systems
in our state worked and what we had and didn't
have and whether people use them and a variety of
things we were able to learn from parts of our
needs assessment.
We also saw some gaps in the needs assessment in
the course of doing that,nd we already knew we
had a bunch of gaps, but we saw some particular
ones. So, fortunately, we were able to give them
enough data along with the other data they had to
be fairly successful with the effort, but we know
we can gear up better.
This was really good, too, in our sort of public
relations with our centers because they actually
saw us use the data for something that made us
very powerful in a way that we would not have
otherwise been and that people hadn't expected
from us.
>> TIM FUCHS: Great. Thank you, Debbie.
Anybody else want to share data that's been useful
for them? Or issues that they've identified
outside of the traditional process? Okay.
We're at 4:15. I wonder if any of you on the
phone have any questions for our panelists or for
each other as we begin to wrap up here? Again,
this is a small group and we really want it to be
interactive, so please don't be shy.
>> SUSAN FAGER: This is sue in Colorado. I have
a whole bunch of questions but I'll restrain
myself.
One question that I have for Jeff, when you
interviewed everybody, was one of the questions
included in your interview, because I don't
remember, you and I talked, does your SILC have
paid staff or does your SILC consist primarily of
volunteers? Because I think about the really big
efforts that my fellow colleagues on this call
have done around needs assessments but in Colorado
there really aren't any paid staff, and that could
be a pretty huge undertaking. So I would be
interested, Jeff, to hear what you learned, and
then also from folks who are on the call if your
SILC doesn't have any paid staff how do they go
about doing a really comprehensive needs
assessment?
>> JEFF SHEEN: Sue, this is Jeff in response.
We did not ask that question, so I'm not able,
unfortunately, to give you any feedback. We did
not ask whether -- we asked whether the SILCs were
few of 01C3s, but we did not ask the question
about paid staff. That could be a great follow-up
question for our next round, though.
>> TIM FUCHS: I would love to hear from folks on
the phone. I know that a lot of you don't have
paid staff. So how are you able to do this?
>> PARTICIPANT: We're not going to tell you, Tim
if that.
>> DEB COOK: This is Debbie. I'm only 40% with
the SILC and right now I am their only staff.
They're supposed to have one full-time FTE. I'm
in the position interim. In fact, I will be done
at the end of December. So that's kind of my
world and looking for work. But, anyway,
basically I'm 40% with the SILC, and it's not just
doing this. It's kind of doing everything, and I
would say the key to this is, of course, firing up
your SILC members to actually take on some of the
tasks, and then the second piece is actually
really developing a strategic plan for doing the
strategic plan, if you will. So sitting down and
really figuring out what do you have the resources
to do, what is the best way to get it done, what
will it take, and is that realistic for me right
now. And there were a lot of things we wanted to
do. Remember I said earlier that this was our
first time out to do anything, and we did actually
quite a bit. There's a whole lot of other stuff
I'd like to do, but that requires either a little
more staff or a little more savvy volunteers or a
little more time or a little more upfront
planning. You know, it requires some change in
the resource. So I think one of the most helpful
things that a consultant can probably do for
someone if I don't have' never done any of this at
all is to help you figure out the plan for the
plan, as I call it, because that, for us, was the
challenging part, was to figure out, and what will
we do by when, and what will do if we can't?
Because our plan was really going to hinge on some
of this being in place, and we had a check-off and
a tick-off, and basically had to do that. But I
don't can actually -- if you do put that in place
with whatever assistance it takes to get that in
order and you stick to it and you're very
unswerving, you definitely can do an amazing
amount in a short amount of time.
>> TIM FUCHS: That's great. Thank you, Debbie.
Okay. Well, we're at 4:20 here. I'm going to
begin to wrap up the call. I really hope this has
been helpful. I've enjoyed our discussion today.
Look, this isn't the end of it, either. We were
really intrigued by the results that we saw on the
needs assessment, and, again, we invited these
five states because of some of the diversity of
their approaches. Some were new. Some had been
doing it for longer. But many of you had really
stepped into this as well, and that's admirable.
So let us know how we can support you, in addition
to doing these webinars, we're always working on
technical assistance to SILCs, and we would love
to hear from you. So if you want to follow up on
any of this, and whether it be with any of our
presenters or from us, please let us know.
I know that Brad alluded to the training that he
did with IL NET and a lot of those resources are
online. So you can access them on the IL NET
Wiki, on ILRU's archives, and in fact Brad
mentioned that he learned from an IL NET training,
but Brad also did an outstanding training on needs
assessment himself last year. Let us know if you
need a hand finding any of the resources so that
we can help you as you move along. Speaking of
which, our presenters have been generous enough to
provide their contact information that's on this
next slide here. And I'll offer my own as well.
So if you need help finding any of those training
resources, please don't hesitate to reach me at
Tim@NCIL.org. You can find my phone number on the
NCIL website.
Finally, here on the last slide is our evaluation
form. Please let us know what you thought of
today's discussion. You can click on this link.
This is a live link and it will take you to the
evaluation form. It's easy to complete. If you
participated in a small group today, that's
fantastic, but please fill it out as an
individual. We want to know what each of you
thinks. If you're not on the webinar, you're just
oat phone, that's fine, you can find this link in
the confirmation email sent to you ahead of the
call. Please take a minute to fill it out.
Before we break, I want to thank Jeff Sheen, Brad
Williams, Debbie, Valerie, Larry and Sue for
taking the time to be with us. I really
appreciate your willingness to dive in and to be
on this call today. And I want to thank all of
you for signing up as well. So let us know how we
can support you going forward. Hope you have a
wonderful afternoon. Bye-bye.