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**CALIFORNIA STATE REHABILITATION COUNCIL (SRC)**

**Monitoring and Evaluation Standing Committee**

# MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

Tuesday, March 8, 2022 1:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.

**Participation Options**

* **Video Conference Link**:
	+ Zoom: <https://tinyurl.com/SRCMAR2022>
* Meeting ID: 834 9871 3532 and Passcode: 1Y+d9Bu+
* **Teleconference Number**: +1 669 900 6833 or +1 408 638 0968
	+ Meeting ID: 834 9871 3532 and Passcode: 41026155
* Phone controls for participants:
	+ - Mute or unmute press \*6
		- Raise hand press \*9
* **Email Your Comments**: **SRC@dor.ca.gov**

**Meeting Agenda**

Please note: Times are listed with the agenda items to assist attendees joining the meeting virtually and by phone. These times are estimates and subject to change. The SRC may act on any item listed in the agenda.

**1. Welcome and Introductions (1:00 – 1:05 p.m.)**

Susan Henderson, Monitoring and Evaluation Standing Committee Chair

**2. Public Comment (1:05 – 1:10 p.m.)**

Members of the public will have the opportunity to comment on issues and concerns *not* included elsewhere on the agenda.

**3. Approval of the August 26, 2021 Monitoring and Evaluation Committee Meeting Minutes (1:10 – 1:15 p.m.)**

**4. 2021 Consumer Satisfaction Survey (CSS) (1:15 – 1:35 p.m.)** The DOR The DOR Planning Unit team will present the 2021 CSS report. There will be an opportunity for discussion and questions and answers.

**5. Consumer Satisfaction Survey Dashboard (1:35 – 2:00 p.m.)**

The DOR Planning Unit team will demonstrate the CSS dashboard of 2021 CSS data.

**6. 2022 Consumer Satisfaction Survey (2:00 – 2:30 p.m.)**

Members will receive an update from the DOR Planning Unit on next steps for the CSS.

**7. Adjourn (2:30 p.m.) \***

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Public comment relating to a specific agenda item will be taken at the end of the applicable agenda item or prior to a vote. Public comments on matters not on the agenda are taken at the beginning of the meeting. A speaker will have up to three minutes to make public comments and may not relinquish his or her time allotment to another speaker. Non-English speakers who utilize translators to make public comment will be allotted no more than six minutes unless they utilize simultaneous translation equipment. The SRC is precluded from discussing matters not on the agenda; however, SRC members may ask questions for clarification purposes.

**MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA**

This meeting notice and agenda is posted on the [SRC webpage](https://dor.ca.gov/Home/SRC). Supplemental meeting materials will be available for public viewing at the meeting site. All times indicated and the order of business are approximate and subject to change.

\*The meeting will adjourn upon completion of the agenda. Interested members of the public may join virtually or use the teleconference line to listen to the meeting and/or provide public comment. The SRC is not responsible for unforeseen technical difficulties that may occur and is not obligated to postpone or delay its meeting in the event of unforeseen technical difficulties with the teleconference line or virtual meeting room.

**REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS**

If you require a disability-related accommodation, materials in alternate format or auxiliary aids/services, please call (916) 558-5897 or email SRC@dor.ca.gov five days prior to the meeting.Any requests received after this date will be given consideration, but logistical constraints may not allow for their fulfillment.

**CONTACT PERSON**

Regina Cademarti, SRC Executive Officer, SRC@dor.ca.gov, (916) 558-5897.



**Agenda Item 3**

**Tuesday, March 8, 2022**

# Item Name: Approval of the August 26, 2021 Meeting Minutes

**Item Type:** Action required. Motion and vote for approval.

**Background:**

The SRC Monitoring and Evaluation Standing Committee last met on

August 26, 2021. The minutes from this meeting are notes taken of the discussions and decisions made.

**Attachment(s):**

Attachment 1: August 26, 2021 Draft Meeting Minutes for Approval

**Agenda Item 3, Attachment 1**

## August 26, 2021 Draft Meeting Minutes for Approval



**California State Rehabilitation Council (SRC)**

**Monitoring and Evaluation Standing Committee Meeting**

Thursday, August 26, 2021

1:00 – 2:15 p.m.
Virtual meeting through Zoom with conference call option.

***Draft Meeting Minutes***

**Attendance**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SRC Members** | **DOR Staff** | **Members of the Public** |
| Inez De Ocio, Chair | Regina Cademarti | None identified |
| Benjamin Aviles | Molly Foote |  |
| Chanel Brisbane |  |  |
| Theresa Comstock |  |  |
| Ivan Guillen |  |  |
| Nick Wavrin |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Inez De Ocio, Standing Committee Chair, welcomed the committee members, DOR staff, and members of the public to the meeting.

**2. Public Comment**

There were no public comments on issues and concerns not included elsewhere on the agenda.

**3. Consumer Satisfaction Survey Communication and Transportation Comments**

At the July 14th SRC Meeting, the Planning Unit shared the Preliminary Consumer Satisfaction results with the SRC. It was decided by the SRC at this meeting for the Monitoring and Evaluation committee members to further explore the qualitative comments on communication and transportation from the ask at the end of the survey ‘*Please tell us if there is anything DOR or its service providers can do to improve services.’*

The top three topics in the communication comments were:

1. Failure to hear back from counselor/wanting a faster response time
2. Keep in touch with consumers
3. Better communication on what forms are needed and how the process of DOR works

Other communication themes mentioned were:

* Counselor did not provide them enough information
* Counselor keeps changing
* Offering consumers, a plan, or a job they felt they were overqualified for
* Counselor did not listen to what consumer needed

Committee members reviewed the DOR policy of when a consumer should hear back from the counselor.

* Section 7029.7 (b)(6) Rights of Individuals with Disabilities; Applicants; Eligible Individuals states any applicant or eligible individual, as appropriate, shall have the right to “receive appropriate services without **undue delay**, except where the delay results from circumstances beyond the Department’s control, such as the absence of training openings at schools or facilities, or unanticipated changes in the program due to new information or conditions:

Committee members discussed:

* The lack of a specific time frame for a counselor to return calls or emails, for example within 48 hours.
* Committee member Guillen stated the main complaint received from the Client Assistance Program (CAP) from DOR consumers is the lack of communication.
* Committee Chair De Ocio stated high case load is an issue for counselors. Prior to Student Services there were five counselors on a team. When Student Services came each team lost a counselor to perform student services. The counselors case load was then distributed to the other four counselors.
* Lack of a specific time frame in regulations of a specific time frame for a counselor to return communications to consumer or service provider.
* Service providers deal with not hearing back from counselors for extended periods of time.
* Consumers may not have the support to return calls to their counselors due to work or child care.
* Some districts will state a 48-hour time frame to return calls or emails, but it is not consistent statewide.
* The Individualized Plan for Employment (IPE) lists the responsibility for consumer to respond timely to the consumers. There is not a mutual explanation for a counselor’s role and responsibilities.
* The IPE lists the steps for a consumer to take if they have not heard from the counselor or do not agree with the counselor. The first step is talk to the counselor than Team Manager – what if a consumer does not have an IPE yet, how will they know what to do or who to contact?
* There were comments about an unproductive relationship with counselor or the consumer feels the counselor is not compassionate. It is important to ensure there is a good relationship with consumer and counselor. What are the consumers options if this is not a productive relationship with their counselor?

Ideas on how to resolve the communication challenges

* Obtain feedback from other counselors on why this is happening

The top three topics in the transportation comments were:

1. Provide more money for transportation, gas, or bus pass
2. Assist with transportation needs
3. Be more understanding of transportation needs

Committee members reviewed the DOR policy from the Rehabilitation Administration Manual Chapter 12 1287.2 Consumer-Owned Vehicle Mileage Reimbursement. Two items of discussion were:

* The consumer is required to operate his or her own vehicle to complete an IPE.
* Consumer-owned vehicle usage is paid at fifteen cents ($0.15) per mile, or at twenty cents ($0.20) for adapted vans.

Committee members discussed:

* Committee Chair De Ocio provided background of when transportation is provided to consumers. It can be provided from eligibility through placement. It is typically when the consumer is in IPE and/or in training or in college. Transportation can be provided before an IPE to get to an evaluation, or an assessment
* The requirement of a consumer to use their own vehicle to complete their IPE should be reconsidered.
* The low amount of 15-20 cents reimbursement per mile is not realistic
* Have virtual services have they affected transportation needs? Committee member Guillen stated before COVID the Client Assistance Program (CAP\_ would get many transportation calls, now they are less.
* Transportation may be good to provide it to help someone stay employed.

Per regulations says DOR can pay for employment for up to a month and the consumer is expected to contribute to their transportation costs.

* It has been helpful when Lyft or Uber was paid for consumers due to a consumer not being able to use public transportation due to their disability.
* Transportation is not a qualified item to close a case. A counselor should not close a case successful if the consumer is having issues with job. A post-employment case cannot be opened just for transportation, there needs to be additional services needed.

**4. Recommendations**

Committee members reviewed the items and discussed:

Areas of improvement for communication:

* Need for improved response time from counselor to return calls/emails from consumers.
* Regulations should have a time-frame to return calls/emails from consumers.
* Ensure the consumer/counselor is a productive relationship. What are the consumers options if it is not?
* Inform consumers on the communication options on who to contact if they have not heard from their counselor.
* Potential issues with consumers may not read English, not have an IPE developed to know.

Discussion:

* There needs to be a place they can reach out to if there are issues.
* There is a DOR email for consumers to email if they have not heard back if they application if they applied.
* There was a customer service hotline if they haven’t heard from DA. Unsure of practice. Unsure if the hotline still works.
* Training for counselors to improve interacting with consumers with communication disabilities
* Include something in policy ram includes uniform communication procedure. A mechanism so there are no gaps in communication
* It was suggested that each SRC member have a conversation with their Regional Director to help research this issue if timeliness of communication is an issue in their region. If yes, what are they doing to resolve this. Members then can report back at their next meeting.
* There must be a better protocol then undue delay.
* There should be information in the IPE on the process for a grievance separate section of the process if you haven’t heard back from counselor these are the steps you can take to get answers.
* What is being taught in districts on timely communication? What is the expectation for communication for new counselors?

Areas of improvement for transportation:

* 15 cent per mile is an outdated amount.
* Alternative transportation needs such as Lyft and Uber to get consumer to employment should be used.
* Can transportation be used for longer during than one month in employment

Discussion:

* Take a deeper look at the 1287.2 Consumer-Owned Vehicle Mileage Reimbursement amount consumers receive per mile.

Based on discussion recommendations would be brought forward to the full SRC committee. Future Committee work includes:

* SRC members to ask their assigned Regional Directors during the Adopt-a-Region meeting if they know of any issues with the delay of consumers hearing back from their counselors.
* Is there a way to know if the surveys returned identify the district the consumer is assigned?
* In the IPE have a section and the steps to take when not hearing any input. Ensure it is understood by the consumer.
* Is there a phone number or email address be identified that the consumer can contact if they have not heard back from their counselor
* Exploring the 1287.2 Consumer-Owned Vehicle Mileage Reimbursement regulations

**5. Next Steps for Moving Forward**

It was acknowledged this meeting will be Committee Chair De Ocio’s last meeting due to her position terming out. A new chair will be selected by the SRC Chair.

**6. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.



**Agenda Item 4**

**Tuesday, March 8, 2022**

**Item Name: 2021 Consumer Satisfaction Survey**

**Item Type:** Information.

**Background:**

The DOR Planning Unit team will present the 2021 CSS report. There will be an opportunity for discussion and questions and answers.

**Attachment(s):**

Attachment 1: Consumer Satisfaction with the Department of Rehabilitation PowerPoint - Accessible Version

**Agenda Item 4, Attachment 1**

## Consumer Satisfaction with the Department of Rehabilitation PowerPoint - Accessible Version

1. **Consumer Satisfaction with the Department of Rehabilitation**
* March 8th, 2022
* State Rehabilitation Council: Monitoring and Evaluation Committee
* Topic #1
1. **Consumer Satisfaction Survey**
* DOR is responsible for providing high-quality, effective services to its consumers that lead to successful employment outcomes through its Vocational Rehabilitation programs.
* DOR conducts the Consumer Satisfaction Survey annually (in collaboration with the State Rehabilitation Council).
* This anonymous survey allows consumers to report their satisfaction with services provided by DOR in the previous state fiscal year.
* Results from the survey are shared publicly and used as a tool to help improve DOR’s service delivery process.
1. **Recent Survey Modifications**
* Standardized Survey Sample Size
* Captured Demographic Information
* Expanded Satisfaction Rating Scale
* Reduced Survey Cognitive Load
* Improved Analysis of Results
1. **Survey Delivery and Consumer Engagement**
* 5,731 consumers were invited to complete the survey (5.2% of DOR’s total consumer population in SFY 2020/21)
* Surveys were sent using electronic or surface mail and available in seven translated languages
* 849 responses were received (16.6% response rate)
1. **Measuring Consumer Satisfaction**
* Survey Questions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Number of Questions** |
| 1. DOR Experience
 | 1 |
| 1. DOR Counselors
 | 5 |
| 1. Service Providers
 | 4 |
| 1. Employment Services
 | 4 |
| 1. Current Employment
 | 4 |
| 1. Employment Opportunities
 | 1 |
| ***Total Questions*** | ***19*** |

* Rating Scale

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Satisfaction Level** | **Score** |
| 1 | Not at all Satisfied | (0.0% - 14.3%) |
| 2 | Dissatisfied | (14.4% - 28.6%) |
| 3 | Somewhat Dissatisfied | (28.7% - 42.9%) |
| 4 | Neutral | (43.0% - 57.1%) |
| 5 | Somewhat Satisfied | (57.2% - 71.4%) |
| 6 | Satisfied | (71.5% - 85.7%) |
| 7 | Extremely Satisfied | (85.8% - 100.0%) |

1. **Overall Consumers were Satisfied with DOR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Categories** | **Score** | **Satisfaction Level** |
| DOR Experience | 79.4% | Satisfied |
| DOR Counselors | 80.0% | Satisfied |
| Service Providers | 80.3% | Satisfied |
| Employment Services | 77.4% | Satisfied |
| Current Employment | 75.7% | Satisfied |
| Employment Opportunities | 72.0% | Satisfied |
| ***Overall*** | ***78.6%*** | ***Satisfied*** |

1. **Distribution of Survey Responses by Consumer Disability Type**
* **Image Description:** Comparison of the percent of the total DOR population size (A, gray) and CSS responses (B, blue) by Disability Type are illustrated using bar charts. The total DOR population size for SFY 2019-20 was 109,845 and the total disabilities reported for the SFY 2020-21 CSS was 1,195. Figure data are listed in table format below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Disability Types** | **Population Size****(Percent of Total)** | **Responses Received****(Percent of Total)** |
| Psychiatric Disability | 22.9% | 21.8% |
| Physical Disability | 13.9% | 22.0% |
| Intellectual/Developmental Disability | 11.9% | 8.5% |
| Learning Disability | 11.3% | 19.9% |
| Cognitive Impairment | 5.3% | 4.4% |
| Deaf/Hard of Hearing | 4.8% | 9.5% |
| Blind/Visually Impaired | 4.3% | 7.9% |
| Traumatic Brain Injury | 1.0% | 4.4% |
| Not Reported | 24.5% | 1.6% |
| ***Total (count)*** | ***109,845*** | ***1,195*** |

1. **Satisfaction and Consumer Disability Type**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Survey** **Categories**  | **Deaf/ Hard of Hearing** | **Learning Disability** | **Blind/ Visually Impaired** | **Psychiatric Disability** | **Cognitive Impairment** |
| DOR Experience | 80.3% | 81.3%\* | 80.3% | 80.1% | 78.3% |
| DOR Counselor | 82.1%\* | 81.7% | 79.3% | 79.6% | 79.9% |
| Service Providers | 83.4%\* | 80.7% | 79.8% | 80.8% | 79.6% |
| Employ. Services | 78.8% | 79.5%\* | 77.2% | 76.9% | 77.3% |
| Current Employ. | 77.9% | 73.7% | 81.5% | 75.4% | 72.7% |
| Employ. Opport. | 71.2% | 74.3% | 74.3% | 77.1% | 68.3% |
| ***Overall*** | ***80.5%\**** | ***79.5%*** | ***79.1%*** | ***78.7%*** | ***77.8%*** |

*Table continued.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Survey** **Categories**  | **Disability Not Reported** | **Physical Disability** | **Intellectual/ Dev. Disability** | **Traumatic Brain Injury** |
| DOR Experience | 68.6% | 77.7% | 78.5% | 74.4% |
| DOR Counselor | 74.9% | 77.2% | 78.0% | 74.1% |
| Service Providers | 80.1% | 76.9% | 79.6% | 72.9% |
| Employ. Services | 77.1% | 76.5% | 72.5% | 72.1% |
| Current Employ. | 86.1%\* | 70.2% | 69.2% | 70.1% |
| Employ. Opport. | 67.1% | 70.7% | 68.7% | 64.9% |
| ***Overall*** | ***77.7%*** | ***75.9%*** | ***75.6%*** | ***72.5%*** |

* Note: For each category (row), the consumer group (column) with the highest satisfaction score was denoted with an asterisk (\*).
1. **Distribution of Survey Responses by Consumer Age**
* **Image Description:** The percent of total DOR population (109,845 consumers, Panel A) and the percent of total CSS responses received (849 responses, Panel B) by age range are illustrated using bar charts. Figure data are listed in table format below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Age Range** | **Population****(Percent of Total)** | **Responses Received****(Percent of Total)** |
| Below 20 | 29.5% | 8.0% |
| 20-29 | 29.1% | 25.7% |
| 30-39 | 13.7% | 19.3% |
| 40-49 | 10.6% | 19.0% |
| 50-59 | 11.0% | 16.6% |
| 60-69 | 5.3% | 8.7% |
| 70 and Above | 0.7% | 1.5% |
| Age Not Reported | 0.002% | 1.2% |
| ***Total (Count)*** | ***109,845*** | ***849*** |

1. **Comparing Satisfaction Scores by Consumer Age**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Survey Categories** | **Below 20** | **20-29** | **30-39** | **40-49** | **50-59** | **60-69** | **70 and Above** | **Not Reported** |
| DOR Experience | 78.0% | 84.4%\* | 78.1% | 77.4% | 76.3% | 80.0% | 80.2% | 73.0% |
| DOR Counselors | 76.9% | 84.9%\* | 77.4% | 79.1% | 77.7% | 80.7% | 83.3% | 82.5% |
| Service Providers | 77.2% | 85.2%\* | 79.4% | 80.6% | 76.9% | 75.4% | 82.7% | 80.2% |
| Employment Services | 74.6% | 80.7% | 76.1% | 77.8% | 74.1% | 78.9% | 83.3%\* | 70.0% |
| Current Employment | 71.6% | 80.8% | 76.7% | 72.7% | 72.8% | 73.4% | 88.0%\* | 75.3% |
| Employment Opportunities | 66.8% | 77.6% | 71.0% | 72.6% | 67.2% | 71.8% | 57.1% | 79.4%\* |
| ***Overall*** | ***75.3%*** | ***83.1%\**** | ***77.3%*** | ***77.9%*** | ***75.5%*** | ***77.8%*** | ***83.0%*** | ***77.2%*** |

* **Note:** For each survey category (row), the consumer age group (column) with the highest satisfaction score was denoted with an asterisk (\*).
1. **Distribution of Survey Responses by Consumer Location**
* **Image Description:** A) Map of California showing the locations DOR Offices. B) Map of California showing the locations of Consumers reported in the CSS, in which size indicates the frequency. C) Bar chart illustrating the distribution of CSS consumers who live in a city with or without a DOR office (data listed in table below).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Locations** | **Count** | **Percent of Total** |
| Consumer City with DOR Office | 402 | 47.3% |
| Consumer City without DOR Office | 429 | 50.5% |
| Consumer City Not Reported | 18 | 2.1% |
| ***Total*** | ***849*** | ***100.0%*** |

1. **Comparing Satisfaction Scores by Consumer Location**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Survey Categories** | **Consumer City** **with DOR Office** | **Consumer City without DOR Office** | **Consumer City** **Not Reported** |
| DOR Experience | **79.7%\*** | 79.5% | 70.6%  |
| DOR Counselors | 79.7% | **80.8%\*** | 70.2%  |
| Service Providers | 80.1% | **80.9%\*** | 67.9%  |
| Employment Services | **78.0%\*** | 77.3% | 67.0%  |
| Current Employment | **76.3%\*** | 76.1% | 55.2%  |
| Employment Opportunities | 72.3% | **72.4%\*** | 58.2%  |
| ***Overall*** | ***78.6%*** | ***79.0%\**** | ***66.3%***  |

* **Note:** For each survey category (row), the consumer location group (column) with the highest satisfaction score was denoted with an asterisk (\*).
1. **Unemployment Reasons were reported by 76.1% of Consumers**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Unemployment Reasons** | **Count** | **Percent of Total** **Reasons Reported** |
| Currently a Student\* | 314 | 22.7% |
| Still Looking for Employment\* | 255 | 18.4% |
| Need Additional Help | 169 | 12.2% |
| Lack of DOR Assistance | 121 | 8.7% |
| Prevented by Disability | 112 | 8.1% |
| Not Ready for Employment | 98 | 7.1% |
| Prevented by Transportation Issues | 83 | 6.0% |
| Lack of Desired Jobs Available | 81 | 5.8% |
| Lack of IPE-consistent Jobs Available | 68 | 4.9% |
| Retaining SSI/SSDI Benefits | 43 | 3.1% |
| Prevented by Family Issues | 41 | 3.0% |
| ***Total Reasons Reported*** | ***1,385*** | ***100%*** |
| ***Total Consumers*** | ***646*** | - |

* **Note:** Consumers were able to report multiple unemployment reasons. Asterisk (\*) identifies unemployment reasons added from the SFY 2019/20 CSS modifications.
1. **Reporting an unemployment reason was associated with lower satisfaction with DOR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Consumers who reported Unemploy. Reason(s)** | **Consumers who did not****report Unemploy. Reason(s)** |
| DOR Experience | 77.3% | **86.0%\*** |
| DOR Counselors | 78.1% | **86.8%\*** |
| Service Providers | 78.7% | **86.2%\*** |
| Employment Services | 75.4% | **84.1%\*** |
| Current Employment | 69.9% | **86.1%\*** |
| Employment Opportunities | 71.0% | **86.5%\*** |
| ***Overall*** | ***76.3%*** | ***85.9%\**** |

* **Note:** For each category (row), the consumer group (column) with the highest satisfaction score was denoted with an asterisk (\*).
1. **Reviewing the Success of the Recent Survey Modifications**
* Standardized Survey Sample Size
* Smaller sample size, reduced DOR workload, while maintaining a statistically confident representation of the DOR total consumer population
* Captured Demographic Information
	+ - High consumer response rates for Age (98.8%) and Location (97.9%)
		- Currently a student and still looking were the most frequently reported unemployment reasons in the survey
* Expanded Satisfaction Rating Scale
	+ - Allowed for a wider distribution of satisfaction ratings
* Reduced Survey Cognitive Load
	+ - Organization of questions allowed for DOR to assess general satisfaction of a category
* Improved Analysis of Results
	+ - Satisfaction was compared using consumer demographic information
1. **Summary of the SFY 2020/21 Consumer Satisfaction Survey Results**
* Overall, consumers were satisfied with the services they have received from DOR in SFY 2019/20.
* Comparison of satisfaction scores by various consumer demographics
* Recent modifications to the survey have improved our understanding of consumer satisfaction.
1. **Finalizing the SFY 2020/21 Consumer Satisfaction survey**
* SRC may give DOR feedback and/or recommendations based on results of the Executive Summary
* DOR will respond to SRC’s recommendations and incorporate into Executive Summary
* DOR to publish Executive Summary on dor.ca.gov public webpage
1. **Q&A - Topic #1: Results of the SFY 2020/21 Consumer Satisfaction Survey**



**Agenda Item 5**

**Tuesday, March 8, 2022**

**Item Name: Consumer Satisfaction Survey Dashboard**

**Item Type:** Information.

**Background:**

The DOR Planning Unit team will demonstrate the CSS dashboard of 2021 CSS data.

**Attachment(s):**

Attachment 1: Exploring Consumer Satisfaction PowerPoint - Accessible Version

**Agenda Item 5, Attachment 1**

## Exploring Consumer Satisfaction PowerPoint - Accessible Version

1. **Exploring Consumer Satisfaction: Demonstration of the Consumer Satisfaction Survey Results Dashboard**
* March 8th, 2022
* State Rehabilitation Council: Monitoring and Evaluation Committee
* Topic #2
1. **Sharing Survey Results**
* Summarize survey design and methodology
* Assess consumer survey engagement
* Quantify consumer satisfaction with different aspects of DOR
* Explore how demographics may influence consumer satisfaction with DOR
* Summarized in an Executive Summary and Dashboard
1. **Dashboard Goals**
* Secure
* Interactive
* Accessible
1. **Dashboard Security**
* Anonymous survey responses are de-identified and not associated with Aware, DOR’s case management system, or consumer information.
* Users will have limited capabilities to export, copy, share, and download dashboard.
* Access will be limited to DOR staff by posting only on DOR Intranet. [Future: Share Publicly

]

1. **Dashboard Interactive Features**
* Filter all survey results by consumer demographics.
* Review results for individual survey questions by selecting a category.
* Review distribution of survey responses by selecting a consumer demographic.
1. **Dashboard Accessibility**
* Utilized Tableau’s Built-in Accessibility Features
	+ [(VISIT TABLEAU FOR MORE INFORMATION)](https://community.tableau.com/s/question/0D54T00000C6nsjSAB/faq-accessibility)
	+ <https://community.tableau.com/s/question/0D54T00000C6nsjSAB/faq-accessibility>
* Applied DOR and Tableau Guidelines for Creating Accessible Documents
* Simplified Organization of Results and Limited Chart Comparisons
* Results are Available in Alternative Formats
1. **Preview the Dashboard to Explore Consumer Satisfaction!**
* **QUESTION 1:** Which survey category was rated the highest from consumers who were served by the Van Nuys/Foothill District?
	+ Q1 STEPS: Filter by DOR District, then navigate to the Satisfaction Results Summary Table to review the data
	+ Q1 ANSWER: DOR Counselors (79.8% satisfied)
* **QUESTION 2:** Of those consumers, what was their most frequently reported unemployment reason?
	+ Q2 STEPS: Navigate to the Survey Responses by Consumer Demographics section, then change the demographic, and review the data in the table.
	+ Q2 ANSWER: Still Looking for Employment (36 consumers)
* **QUESTION 3:** Of those consumers, what percent were Extremely Satisfied with the level of respect they received from their Service Providers?
	+ Q3 STEPS: Add a filter for Unemployment Reason, then navigate to Satisfaction Results by Question Category, change the question category and review the data in the table.
	+ Q3 ANSWER: 20 consumers (55.6%)
1. **Dashboard Next Steps**
* Publish the pilot-version of the dashboard internally upon approval.
* Build public-version of the dashboard to serve as a supplemental tool to the Executive Summary in the future
1. **Q&A: Topic #2 - Dashboard Demonstration**



**Agenda Item 6**

**Tuesday, March 8, 2022**

**Item Name: 2022 Consumer Satisfaction Survey**

**Item Type:** Information and action – motion and vote for approval on SFY 2021-22 CSS sample size recommendation

**Background:**

Members will receive an update from the DOR Planning Unit on next steps for the CSS.

**Attachment(s):**

Attachment 1: Next Steps SFY 2021/22 Consumer Satisfaction Survey PowerPoint - Accessible Version

Attachment 2: SFY 2021-22 CSS Sample Size Recommendation

**Agenda Item 6, Attachment 1**

## Next Steps SFY 2021/22 Consumer Satisfaction Survey PowerPoint - Accessible Version

1. **Next Steps: SFY 2021/22 Consumer Satisfaction Survey**
* March 8th, 2022
* State Rehabilitation Council: Monitoring and Evaluation Committee
* Topic #3
1. **Looking Ahead for SFY 2021/22 Consumer Satisfaction Survey**
* **Image Description:** Bar chart illustrates the estimated timeline for completing the Consumer Satisfaction Survey for SFY 2020/21. Data is presented in table format below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SFY 2021/22 CSS**  | **Estimated Timeline** | **Details** |
| Survey Planning | January – March | Sample SizeRandom SelectionUpdate Survey MaterialsDelivery Method Preparations |
| Response Collection | April | Send beginning of AprilCollect Responses for 2-3 weeksSend 1-2 Reminders |
| Data Analysis | May – August | Analysis of Results |
| Reporting | August - December | Executive SummaryDashboardPresentations |

1. **Survey Engagement Over Time Has Declined**
* **Image Description:** The line graph represents the CSS response rates (y-axis) over time (x-axis). The CSS was not conducted in SFY 2019-20 and is represented as a dashed line. Figure data is listed in table format below.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **SFY 2016/17** | **SFY 2017/18** | **SFY 2018/19** | **SFY 2019/20** | **SFY 2020/21** |
| **Response** **Rate** | 23.3% | 23.4% | 18.7% | N/A | 16.6% |

1. **Survey Sample Size for SFY 2021/22**
* 101,879 individuals were served by DOR in SFY 2020/21 (total population)
* 1,030 survey responses will need to be received for the sample size to accurately represent DOR’s consumers (represents 1.0% of DOR’s total population)
* 7,357 survey invitations will be need to be sent to achieve the minimum sample size based on an estimated 14% response rate (represents 7.2% of DOR’s total population)
1. **SFY 2021/22 Survey Planning Progress**
* **COMPLETED** – Pending Approval
	+ Sample Size Recommendation
	+ Identify most prominent languages used by DOR consumers for translation
* **NEXT STEPS**
	+ Request random sampling of consumers and their contact information from IT
	+ Update survey materials (cover letters, surveys, hyperlinks, etc.)
	+ Prepare survey materials for distribution (printing, envelope stuffing, email scheduling, etc.)
1. **Q&A: Topic #3 - SFY 2021/22 Survey Planning**
2. **DOR’s Planning Unit: Contact Information**
* Alicia Lucas, Manager, Alicia.lucas@dor.ca.gov
* Molly Foote, Ph.D., Research Data Analyst II, molly.foote@dor.ca.gov
* Judy Gonzalez, Research Data Analyst II, judy.gonzalez@dor.ca.gov
* Avantika Sharma, Associate Governmental Program Analyst, avantika.sharma@dor.ca.gov
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## SFY 2021-22 CSS Sample Size Recommendation

**Sample Size Recommendation for the State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2021/22 Consumer Satisfaction Survey (CSS)**

By DOR - Planning Unit, February 2022

**Survey Design Recommendations**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Count** | **Percent of DOR’s Total Population1** |
| **Required Sample Size** | 1,030 | 1.0% |
| **Survey Invitations** | 7,357 | 7.2% |

1. DOR served a total of 101,879 consumers in SFY 2020-21.

**Explanation of Recommended Sample Size**

In SFY 2020/21, DOR’s total population served was 101,879 consumers. To ensure that the results of the CSS accurately represent the total population with a high level of confidence (99%) and low margin of error (4%), the Planning unit recommends that at least 1,030 responses should be collected from consumers.

**Explanation of Recommended Number of Invitations**

The Planning unit recommends sending the SFY 2021/22 CSS to 7,357 consumers who had an open DOR case during SFY 2020/21. The total number of survey invitations was calculated using the required sample size (1,030) and an estimated survey response rate (14%). Previously, the estimated response rate is determined by the previous year’s CSS response rate, however SFY 2020/21 had a 16.6% response rate which was 2.1% lower than the previous iteration of the survey. This decline in response rate prompted the Planning Unit to recommend a lower estimated response rate (14%) as a precaution to increase the number of survey invitations to be sent and, therefore, increase the number of responses received.

**Distribution of Survey Invitations**

For each DOR district, the total number of surveys will vary and be proportionate to the total number of consumers in SFY 2020/21 by that district. The table below reports the total number of consumers served in SFY 2020/21 and the recommended number of survey invitations to send in SFY 2021/22 for each DOR district.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DOR District** | **Total Population Served in SFY 2020/21 (N)** | **Percent of Total** | **Invitations for SFY 2021/22 CSS (N)** |
| 110 - Redwood Empire District | 4,733 | 4.6% | 342 |
| 130 - Northern Sierra District | 8,046 | 7.9% | 581 |
| 150 - San Joaquin Valley District | 8,385 | 8.2% | 606 |
| 210 - Greater East Bay District | 8,138 | 8.0% | 588 |
| 230 - San Francisco District | 3,701 | 3.6% | 267 |
| 250 - San Jose District | 3,707 | 3.6% | 268 |
| 320 - Santa Barbara District | 5,389 | 5.3% | 389 |
| 340 - Inland Empire District | 9,840 | 9.7% | 711 |
| 350 - San Diego District | 9,170 | 9.0% | 662 |
| 410 - Van Nuys/Foothill District | 11,868 | 11.6% | 857 |
| 440 - Greater Los Angeles District | 6,170 | 6.1% | 446 |
| 511 - Achieving Community Employment (ACE) | 43 | 0.0% | 3 |
| 530 - LA South Bay District | 7,117 | 7.0% | 514 |
| 550 - Orange/San Gabriel District | 9,451 | 9.3% | 682 |
| 560 - Blind Field Services | 4,660 | 4.6% | 337 |
| 880 – PE Caseload | 1,461 | 1.4% | 106 |
| ***Total*** | ***101,879*** | ***100.0%*** | ***7,357*** |

**References**

* BFFR’s Sample Size Recommendation for SFY 2020-21 CSS
* DOR’s total population served in SFY 2020/21 was sourced from BFFR Caseload Dashboard SFY 2020 (as of 06-30-2021).
* The sample size was calculated using the following Sample Size Calculator: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/sample-size-calculator/>