

# Can the 704 Annual Performance Report be used for planning? A critical review

Douglas J. Usiak<sup>a</sup>, Machiko R. Tomita<sup>b</sup> and Jun-Yuan Tung<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Rehabilitation Research & Training Center on Independent Living Management, Western New York Independent Living Project, Inc., 3108 Main St., Buffalo, NY 14214, USA*

*Tel.: +1 716 836 0822 ext. 117; Fax: +1 716 835 3967; E-mail: dusiak@wnyilp.com*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Rehabilitation Science, University at Buffalo, State University of New York, Buffalo, NY, USA*

**Abstract.** Centers for independent living (CILs) that receive Title VII Part C federal funds must submit a Section 704 Annual Performance Report to the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA). In this paper, the most recent 704 Annual Performance Report data (2002) was analyzed, growth over the last five years was identified, and recommendations for future reporting methods were offered. In 2002, 354 federally funded CILs received \$464 million, served 193,000 consumers and provided 1.35 million individual services. These figures represent an increase of 3.6, 2.2, and 1.7 times more, respectively, than those reported for 1997. Recommendations are made to improve the 704 Annual Performance Report form to collect multi-dimensional data that may facilitate meaningful interpretation for planning.

**Keywords:** Independent Living, 704 Performance Report, Centers for Independent Living, data collection

## 1. Introduction

The mission of the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Independent Living Management (RRTC-ILM) is to enhance the management capacity of the national network of centers for independent living (CILs) and statewide independent living councils (SILCs). Towards this end, the RRTC-ILM seeks models relevant to the activities and responsibilities of this network and transfers these models to the CILs and SILCs by developing training programs and resource materials. Performance is a concept central to management and a key concept of reference to the accomplishment of the RRTC-ILM's mission. In fulfilling our mission, we set out to take stock of what the CILs have in place now: what funding sources they are utilizing, what programs and services they are providing, who they are providing them to, and how well they are doing.

To achieve this, we utilized the only pertinent database that currently exists and is generated by the majority of CILs. The Section 704 Annual Performance Report for Centers for Independent Living (com-

monly called "the 704 Report") is administered by the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA). Federally funded CILs fill out this report and submit it to RSA and their respective statewide independent living councils.

The 704 Report was developed by RSA to collect performance data on the Section 725 Standards and Assurances of the Rehabilitation Act Title VII and to monitor outcomes as required by the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) passed in 1993 to urge government agencies to manage for results [4]. The 704 Report served the purpose of reporting the independent living network's performance in terms of national aggregates on some selected variables (such as goals met). However, it has not been used by the CILs and SILCs themselves to evaluate their performance or to plan activities and improve practices.

As we began our search for state, regional and national trends in CIL training needs by aggregating the 704 report data, the question remained whether these reports could provide CILs with information to conduct strategic planning. Could the 704 data show where new funding streams could be found or what program

and service training needs CILs have? Could it inform CILs about why consumers came to them or what population communities, age groups, and persons with disabilities used CILs? This article examined what the 704 Report can offer, and whether it can be used as a management tool and play a significant role in strategic planning.

In 1978, Title VII (an amendment to the Rehabilitation Act of 1973) mandated allocation of funding to states to establish CILs. The law also required CILs to provide quantitative and qualitative information regarding how they were meeting the Section 725 Standards and Assurances defined in Title VII. For 17 years, CILs and states administering CILs, were left to their own interpretations regarding what information should be collected and presented to RSA. This non-uniform approach resulted in a quantity of information, the quality of which was difficult to interpret due to a lack of standardization. The 704 Report was developed to remedy this problem. It required centers to report on the activities, services, and demographics of all consumers in a structured document. In 2000, RSA required additional data to quantify community change goals, to track the number of goals set and met by the centers, and to count those goals set and met by the consumers receiving services. Even though some changes were made in the performance report, all CILs receiving federal funds are required to follow the 725 Standards and Assurances defined by Title VII [2].

The 704 Report measures performance on all of the 725 Standards and some of the Assurances. These Standards and pertinent Assurances are as follows:

#### *Standards*

##### (1) "Philosophy

The Center shall promote and practice the independent living philosophy of –

- (A) consumer control of the center regarding decision making, service delivery, management, and establishment of the policy and direction of the center;
- (B) self-help and self-advocacy;
- (C) development of peer relationships and peer role models; and
- (D) equal access of individuals with significant disabilities to society and to all services, programs, activities, resources, and facilities, whether public or private and regardless of the funding source.

##### (2) Provision of services

The center shall provide services to individuals with a range of significant disabilities. The center shall provide services on a cross-disability basis (for individuals with all different types of significant disabilities, including individuals with significant disabilities who are members of populations that are unserved or underserved by programs under this title). Eligibility for services at any center for independent living shall be determined by the center, and shall not be based on the presence of any one or more specific significant disabilities.

##### (3) Independent living goals

The center shall facilitate the development and achievement of independent living goals selected by individuals with significant disabilities who seek such assistance.

##### (4) Community options

The center shall work to increase the availability and improve the quality of community options for independent living in order to facilitate the development and achievement of independent living goals by individuals with significant disabilities.

##### (5) Independent living core services

The center shall provide independent living core services and, as appropriate, a combination of any other independent living services.

##### (6) Activities to increase community capacity

The center shall conduct activities to increase the capacity of communities within the service area of the center to meet the needs of individuals with significant disabilities.

##### (7) Resource development activities

The center shall conduct resource development activities to obtain funding from sources other than this chapter." [2, p. 204].

#### *Assurances*

- (5) "the applicant will use sound organizational and personnel assignment practices, including taking affirmative action to employ and advance in employment qualified individuals with significant disabilities on the same terms and conditions required with respect to the employment of individuals with disabilities under section 503;
- (6) the applicant will ensure that the majority of the staff and individuals in decisionmaking positions, of the applicant are individuals with disabilities;

- (7) the applicant will conduct annual self-evaluations, prepare an annual report, and maintain records adequate to measure performance with respect to the standards, containing information regarding, at a minimum –
  - a. the sources and amounts of funding for the operation of the center;
  - b. the number of individuals with significant disabilities who are employed by, and the number who are in management and decisionmaking positions in, the center;
- (8) individuals with significant disabilities who are seeking or receiving services at the center will be notified by the center of the existence of, the availability of, and how to contact, the client assistance program;
- (9) aggressive outreach regarding services provided through the center will be conducted in an effort to reach populations of individuals with significant disabilities that are unserved or underserved by programs under this title, especially minority groups and urban and rural populations;
- (10) staff at centers for independent living will receive training on how to serve such unserved and underserved populations, including minority groups and urban and rural populations . . .” [2, pp. 205–207].

### 1.1. Purpose

Currently, statewide aggregated data of the 704 Report are publicly available. The Independent Living Research Utilization (ILRU) program presents 704 Report data from FY1997 to FY2000 on their website (ILRU, 2003). The purpose of this paper was to examine the utility of the 704 Report as a tool for strategic planning, focusing on its strengths and limitations as revealed through its application to the RRTC-ILM’s initial stock taking phase. Guiding questions were: nationally and state by state, how did CILs perform in seven areas: 1) sources and amounts of funds and other resources, 2) profile of consumers served, 3) individual consumer achievements (ICA), 4) individual services (IS), 5) individual consumers in community based living, 6) community change achievements (CCA) and 7) compliance indicator-philosophy? In addition, how have CILs grown over the last five years? Does the current reporting method lead to meaningful interpretation regarding CILs? Is there a better method of reporting to identify consumer needs, to demonstrate CILs’ contributions to the disability community, and to guide future funding?

## 2. Method

We selected data from the 704 Report FY 2002. Three hundred fifty-four CILs in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands (CNMI) received federal funds during FY 2002 (October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2002). Prior to data analyses, duplicate and triplicate data entries with identical contract numbers were deleted. In all tables (Tables 1–6), the first row number (Total) is the national total of 354 CILs’ data. This is followed by statewide data, arranged alphabetically by state. Each category (column) is stated as a percentage of the total figure. The highest percentages in each category are noted. Percentages are to be interpreted within each state to understand the allocation for each category.

To identify changes in the last five years, rough comparisons of total figures between FY 2002 and FY 1997 (as reported by the ILRU program) were made where possible. Precise comparisons were not possible due to incompatibility of formats and duplication of some CILs’ data in the 1997 data. Nevertheless, recognition of general changes was achievable. Observations are presented with brief examples of tabulations.

## 3. Results

### 3.1. Sources and amounts of funds and resources

Table 1 summarizes some financial data. For each state and territory, the total was calculated by adding all funds from federal, state and local governments, private resources including foundations, corporation or trust grants, donations from individuals, membership fees, investment income or endowments, fees for services, and other resources. From the twelve different resources listed in the 704 Report, seven categories were created. They are: 1) Federal funds (Chapter 1, Part B, Title VII);<sup>1</sup> 2) Federal funds (Chapter 1, Part

<sup>1</sup>Chapter 1 Part B Funds - Chapter VII Independent Living Services. Part B funds provide financial assistance to states to provide, expand, and improve provision of independent living services. “The State may use funds received under this part . . . (1) to provide independent living services to individuals with significant disabilities; (2) to demonstrate ways to expand and improve independent living services; (3) to support the operation of centers for independent living . . . (4) to support activities to increase the capacities of public

Table 1  
704 Report 2002 – Fiscal

State	Total resources	Ch1B (%)	Ch1C (%)	Ch2 (%)	Other Fed (%)	Other Gov (%)	Private (%)	Fees Ser. (%)
Total	463791185	2.3%	12.2%	0.4%	8.0%	52.9%	5.3%	18.3%
Alabama	1888683	0.0%	38.5%	0.0%	33.4%	18.0%	6.3%	3.8%
Alaska	5311100	3.1%	11.5%	1.1%	7.3%	17.1%	1.3%	57.9%
Amer. Samoa	221097	12.2%	69.7%	18.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Arizona	18419262	0.3%	4.4%	0.0%	3.6%	88.2%	2.9%	0.2%
Arkansas	1506581	15.8%	40.6%	0.0%	30.9%	5.0%	3.0%	4.3%
California	33083792	1.7%	15.2%	0.7%	28.8%	36.5%	8.3%	7.5%
Colorado	5435521	5.9%	10.6%	2.6%	6.0%	14.6%	9.2%	48.9%
N. Marianas	70246	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Connecticut	2281666	6.4%	34.9%	0.0%	11.0%	42.1%	4.8%	0.1%
Delaware	730247	0.0%	83.7%	0.0%	10.5%	0.4%	5.4%	0.0%
DC	611176	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Florida	10093762	6.2%	25.2%	0.2%	13.3%	32.6%	13.3%	7.9%
Georgia	2745000	7.8%	42.6%	0.7%	14.4%	27.3%	2.6%	4.1%
Hawaii	1953724	11.8%	35.0%	10.5%	5.8%	20.4%	6.3%	1.2%
Idaho	4336943	1.4%	16.0%	0.0%	0.2%	1.9%	80.3%	0.1%
Illinois	10591809	2.2%	23.3%	2.3%	9.5%	39.0%	16.7%	4.5%
Indiana	2821960	11.5%	35.9%	3.3%	7.5%	10.1%	20.9%	9.7%
Iowa	1090223	7.2%	54.5%	0.0%	5.8%	16.3%	6.2%	8.2%
Kansas	28887791	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	16.9%	44.8%	1.5%	34.2%
Kentucky	3833935	6.3%	17.2%	0.0%	17.5%	54.5%	0.3%	4.2%
Louisiana	4482259	6.4%	12.4%	0.0%	0.0%	68.8%	0.7%	11.7%
Maine	6658730	10.7%	9.2%	0.0%	9.0%	59.5%	8.7%	2.9%
Maryland	3000719	5.2%	33.4%	0.0%	15.8%	42.4%	1.5%	0.2%
Massachusetts	110254151	0.2%	0.9%	0.0%	0.5%	97.4%	0.8%	0.2%
Michigan	9001768	4.7%	15.0%	0.0%	17.3%	32.9%	10.7%	18.0%
Minnesota	8791585	0.7%	8.5%	0.0%	0.0%	22.7%	4.1%	63.7%
Mississippi	1286666	0.0%	47.5%	0.0%	3.5%	1.3%	11.4%	0.0%
Missouri	12097534	0.0%	8.8%	0.0%	5.1%	48.3%	4.9%	31.3%
Montana	4683002	5.9%	13.1%	0.0%	16.5%	45.0%	0.4%	19.0%
Nebraska	2881095	0.0%	27.4%	0.0%	0.0%	67.4%	3.0%	0.7%
Nevada	1301805	4.7%	46.9%	0.0%	5.2%	20.3%	18.2%	4.0%
New Hampshire	6764597	4.2%	9.5%	0.0%	10.0%	2.5%	1.7%	71.8%
New Jersey	3010012	12.2%	50.8%	0.0%	0.0%	27.1%	4.9%	2.5%
New Mexico	3576134	0.0%	17.1%	0.0%	0.0%	72.5%	2.5%	6.6%
New York	33545724	0.3%	11.8%	0.0%	8.8%	36.8%	3.9%	38.0%
North Carolina	1987920	6.0%	64.0%	0.0%	0.4%	0.8%	8.2%	20.2%
North Dakota	1442266	25.2%	42.4%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	4.9%	7.4%
Ohio	5255072	13.0%	36.2%	0.0%	7.0%	21.4%	18.6%	2.8%
Oklahoma	1951835	7.9%	34.4%	0.0%	10.2%	14.8%	14.6%	16.7%
Oregon	2460946	11.9%	25.3%	0.0%	5.9%	19.5%	10.6%	22.9%
Pennsylvania	42846655	0.1%	4.7%	0.0%	5.4%	66.7%	1.1%	21.9%
Puerto Rico	1067942	8.4%	61.7%	0.0%	4.7%	16.4%	8.6%	0.0%
Rhode Island	5622034	3.0%	12.6%	0.0%	14.9%	30.7%	37.3%	0.4%
South Carolina	933567	21.1%	69.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.7%	0.0%
South Dakota	3053551	6.9%	20.0%	0.6%	4.7%	52.4%	10.5%	2.2%
Tennessee	2111428	8.8%	44.2%	0.0%	12.2%	20.6%	9.6%	4.0%
Texas	7215469	6.3%	42.2%	0.0%	21.3%	24.0%	3.2%	1.8%
Utah	2062206	7.0%	29.6%	6.8%	1.4%	49.0%	5.1%	0.2%
Vermont	2204792	10.1%	34.9%	0.0%	10.6%	39.6%	0.5%	0.0%
Virgin Islands	308303	80.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	17.8%	1.2%	0.2%
Virginia	4648732	2.6%	28.0%	0.0%	9.7%	46.8%	4.5%	8.1%
Washington	1419245	5.6%	61.4%	0.0%	0.0%	12.4%	10.9%	7.1%
West Virginia	2049959	6.7%	44.1%	16.0%	5.1%	18.7%	7.3%	1.9%
Wisconsin	26143672	0.1%	3.5%	0.0%	4.3%	7.2%	1.9%	82.8%
Wyoming	1755291	18.4%	34.8%	12.8%	0.0%	0.6%	20.6%	12.7%

The percentage of seven columns may not add up to 100%; donations from individuals and membership fees are missing from the table.

Table 2  
704 Report 2002 – Consumer Profile

State	Age Total	Under 6 (%)	6 to 17 (%)	18 to 22 (%)	23 to 64 (%)	0 to 64 (%)	65 over (%)	Unknown (%)	Gender Total	Female (%)	Male (%)	Unknown (%)
Total	192582	1.2%	4.7%	6.2%	58.9%	70.9%	21.9%	7.2%	190062	54.7%	45.2%	0.0%
Alabama	1100	0.5%	1.8%	7.6%	69.2%	79.2%	14.2%	6.6%	1100	42.2%	57.8%	0.0%
Alaska	1394	1.1%	6.9%	4.6%	46.1%	58.7%	24.2%	17.1%	1394	55.9%	44.1%	0.0%
Amer. Samoa	378	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	23.0%	26.2%	73.8%	0.0%	378	59.3%	40.7%	0.0%
Arizona	3387	0.2%	1.2%	2.1%	55.8%	59.3%	36.9%	3.8%	3407	57.6%	42.4%	0.0%
Arkansas	1304	2.3%	3.8%	10.0%	64.9%	81.1%	14.1%	4.8%	1301	58.3%	41.7%	0.0%
California	44499	0.7%	2.5%	6.9%	60.3%	70.4%	25.6%	3.9%	43681	53.4%	46.5%	0.1%
Colorado	3084	3.8%	2.2%	3.0%	60.7%	69.7%	29.1%	1.2%	3092	55.2%	44.8%	0.0%
N. Marianas	21	4.8%	9.5%	9.5%	52.4%	76.2%	23.8%	0.0%	21	61.9%	38.1%	0.0%
Connecticut	949	1.3%	8.9%	7.7%	70.0%	87.8%	8.6%	3.6%	949	52.5%	47.5%	0.0%
Delaware	226	0.9%	5.8%	16.8%	65.9%	89.4%	10.6%	0.0%	226	52.2%	47.8%	0.0%
DC	210	2.4%	0.0%	6.2%	81.0%	89.5%	10.5%	0.0%	210	46.7%	53.3%	0.0%
Florida	13835	0.6%	5.0%	5.8%	52.1%	63.5%	31.1%	5.4%	13755	54.1%	45.9%	0.0%
Georgia	1930	0.8%	4.4%	2.4%	41.1%	48.7%	50.9%	0.4%	2071	63.8%	36.2%	0.0%
Hawaii	1574	2.7%	2.5%	5.5%	75.6%	86.3%	13.7%	0.0%	1574	49.9%	50.1%	0.0%
Idaho	935	0.1%	3.4%	3.7%	67.3%	74.5%	25.5%	0.0%	922	61.2%	38.8%	0.0%
Illinois	5672	3.2%	9.0%	6.0%	70.0%	88.3%	11.7%	0.0%	5672	55.4%	44.6%	0.0%
Indiana	880	3.4%	19.4%	7.4%	44.7%	74.9%	25.0%	0.1%	880	51.5%	48.5%	0.0%
Iowa	952	0.6%	3.7%	6.9%	78.5%	89.7%	7.6%	2.7%	941	50.5%	49.5%	0.0%
Kansas	8709	0.9%	3.3%	3.7%	62.7%	70.7%	16.9%	12.4%	8667	55.0%	45.0%	0.0%
Kentucky	2205	0.1%	2.5%	7.6%	53.0%	63.2%	15.4%	21.4%	2237	56.3%	43.7%	0.0%
Louisiana	675	0.0%	0.3%	4.3%	61.3%	65.9%	33.0%	1.0%	675	43.4%	56.6%	0.0%
Maine	654	0.3%	2.1%	3.8%	64.7%	70.9%	24.9%	4.1%	654	53.1%	46.9%	0.0%
Maryland	1866	2.9%	3.7%	4.8%	78.8%	90.2%	8.9%	0.9%	1924	50.8%	49.2%	0.0%
Massachusetts	12614	1.6%	3.8%	4.2%	66.1%	75.7%	17.7%	6.6%	12428	56.8%	43.2%	0.0%
Michigan	10879	1.0%	1.8%	7.3%	40.6%	50.7%	8.4%	40.9%	10593	55.3%	44.7%	0.0%
Minnesota	3537	0.8%	22.0%	19.1%	47.0%	89.0%	10.2%	0.8%	3537	49.3%	50.7%	0.0%
Mississippi	1997	1.8%	8.0%	7.6%	44.9%	62.2%	37.8%	0.0%	1997	55.6%	44.4%	0.0%
Missouri	7139	0.7%	2.3%	3.1%	44.9%	51.0%	33.2%	15.8%	6101	58.9%	41.1%	0.0%
Montana	1536	2.3%	4.2%	4.8%	59.4%	70.6%	29.1%	0.3%	1540	60.1%	39.9%	0.0%
Nebraska	1718	0.5%	1.0%	5.8%	74.9%	82.1%	17.4%	0.5%	1718	62.5%	37.5%	0.0%
Nevada	1158	0.4%	5.2%	9.6%	68.7%	83.9%	16.1%	0.0%	1158	54.8%	45.2%	0.0%
New Hampshire	784	0.0%	5.6%	4.6%	77.2%	87.4%	12.0%	0.6%	784	53.2%	46.8%	0.0%
New Jersey	3046	1.1%	4.1%	5.6%	56.7%	67.5%	24.1%	8.5%	3046	60.4%	39.6%	0.0%
New Mexico	1220	21.6%	0.8%	4.6%	58.7%	85.7%	10.1%	4.3%	1220	50.1%	49.9%	0.0%
New York	10656	1.5%	7.5%	7.4%	65.6%	82.0%	14.3%	3.7%	10934	51.8%	48.0%	0.1%
North Carolina	1256	0.8%	1.7%	3.0%	75.5%	81.0%	8.8%	10.2%	1256	58.8%	41.2%	0.0%
North Dakota	759	0.1%	4.7%	10.1%	56.1%	71.1%	15.5%	13.3%	759	55.5%	44.5%	0.0%
Ohio	4048	1.2%	11.0%	6.9%	59.6%	78.7%	18.0%	3.3%	4017	52.6%	47.4%	0.0%
Oklahoma	1403	0.9%	3.5%	7.3%	50.2%	61.9%	35.1%	2.9%	1409	59.0%	41.0%	0.0%
Oregon	1430	0.1%	4.3%	10.1%	75.6%	90.2%	6.7%	3.1%	1430	54.6%	45.4%	0.0%
Pennsylvania	4704	0.3%	2.7%	4.7%	72.3%	80.0%	10.8%	9.3%	4702	54.7%	45.3%	0.0%
Puerto Rico	495	0.0%	0.2%	9.7%	74.7%	84.6%	15.4%	0.0%	501	51.9%	48.1%	0.0%
Rhode Island	872	0.2%	0.7%	4.2%	57.8%	63.0%	35.9%	1.1%	872	59.5%	40.5%	0.0%
South Carolina	850	2.6%	4.6%	7.2%	57.8%	72.1%	26.9%	0.9%	850	58.2%	41.8%	0.0%
South Dakota	1166	0.7%	3.1%	6.9%	53.3%	63.9%	35.7%	0.4%	1166	62.7%	37.3%	0.0%
Tennessee	1614	1.6%	5.1%	6.8%	67.0%	80.5%	18.3%	1.2%	1598	55.1%	44.9%	0.0%
Texas	7073	0.2%	3.2%	6.8%	63.2%	73.5%	14.7%	11.8%	6258	52.1%	47.9%	0.0%
Utah	3881	0.7%	16.5%	4.1%	37.9%	59.3%	38.7%	2.1%	3871	54.8%	45.2%	0.0%
Vermont	1243	0.6%	3.3%	2.2%	75.0%	81.1%	15.4%	3.5%	1243	57.3%	42.7%	0.0%
Virgin Islands	32	0.0%	25.0%	12.5%	25.0%	62.5%	37.5%	0.0%	32	53.1%	46.9%	0.0%
Virginia	3559	1.0%	8.5%	11.0%	69.9%	90.4%	9.4%	0.2%	3553	54.5%	45.5%	0.0%
Washington	494	0.0%	2.0%	5.1%	83.0%	90.1%	5.1%	4.9%	497	55.1%	44.9%	0.0%
West Virginia	1143	1.4%	6.5%	3.9%	49.0%	60.8%	38.6%	0.6%	1143	61.9%	38.1%	0.0%
Wisconsin	2941	0.9%	12.9%	6.4%	48.5%	68.7%	29.4%	1.9%	3039	55.7%	44.3%	0.0%
Wyoming	896	1.0%	2.1%	2.2%	29.2%	34.6%	63.1%	2.3%	1079	60.0%	40.0%	0.0%



Table 3  
704 Report 2002 – Individual Consumer Achievements

State	ICA Total		Self Advocacy		Communication		Mobility		Community		Educational Service		Vocational		Self Care		Info Access		Personal Tech		Other Resource	
	Set	Met (%)	Set	Met (%)	Set	Met (%)	Set	Met (%)	Set	Met (%)	Set	Met (%)	Set	Met (%)	Set	Met (%)	Set	Met (%)	Set	Met (%)	Set	Met (%)
Total	238056	63.2	30801	65.2	13769	67.8	20067	68.5	22651	52.3	17516	66.9	16463	49.3	54755	66.2	13565	67.8	24481	59.3	23988	64.8
Alabama	888	56.1	50	70.0	20	60.0	114	58.8	51	74.5	66	27.3	131	73.3	132	40.9	189	84.1	57	3.5	78	21.8
Alaska	2058	74.5	150	67.3	22	54.5	262	79.8	142	57.7	51	70.6	38	39.5	1034	88.7	146	59.6	168	59.6	45	77.8
Amer. Samoa	432	42.4	15	53.3	8	62.5	334	31.4	5	100.0	0	N/A	0	N/A	56	85.7	0	N/A	5	80.0	9	88.9
Arizona	2942	40.4	437	16.5	42	47.9	144	47.9	324	45.1	135	11.1	132	11.4	1133	53.5	292	43.5	68	8.8	235	38.3
Arkansas	1503	42.6	130	73.8	96	51.0	243	19.3	51	45.5	141	43.3	453	35.3	80	43.8	40	82.5	54	64.8	215	47.0
California	53074	57.5	7705	60.2	3873	76.3	2966	75.2	7839	39.6	2706	57.5	3322	49.3	11119	55.8	1761	56.3	6685	55.6	5098	68.2
Colorado	1996	52.7	422	40.8	396	52.8	150	22.7	62	71.0	134	73.9	188	62.2	196	64.3	92	37.0	217	63.6	139	56.8
N. Mariana	15	40.0	2	50.0	3	33.3	5	20.0	2	100.0	0	N/A	0	N/A	3	33.3	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Connecticut	1261	59.8	186	74.2	28	53.6	139	52.5	231	45.0	67	53.7	113	53.1	145	53.1	152	83.6	146	62.3	54	61.1
Delaware	415	80.5	95	69.5	43	86.0	18	94.4	44	86.4	38	81.6	21	47.6	35	85.7	21	61.9	67	95.5	33	84.8
DC	313	24.0	24	8.3	2	0.0	47	72.3	94	9.6	11	9.1	34	8.8	47	31.9	11	36.4	43	16.3	0	N/A
Florida	16256	63.2	1057	69.3	1632	39.6	2038	84.3	835	56.4	2314	71.7	1488	43.7	3257	71.8	1347	71.8	1057	56.7	1231	26.5
Georgia	2653	39.1	161	49.1	169	43.8	443	44.9	268	32.1	139	41.0	200	28.0	740	35.5	164	74.4	59	37.3	310	25.5
Hawaii	1630	66.1	148	58.1	146	73.3	74	67.6	49	75.5	55	72.7	27	66.7	140	60.7	94	77.7	539	51.0	358	85.8
Idaho	1757	58.2	321	53.0	168	69.6	88	52.3	161	89.4	111	36.9	112	32.1	275	64.7	85	65.9	106	50.0	330	55.2
Illinois	9432	60.2	1776	62.1	313	68.1	540	50.9	1259	54.0	734	73.8	417	39.6	1735	57.9	227	63.4	1660	45.4	771	57.1
Indiana	2549	66.3	490	77.8	154	81.2	790	56.3	139	61.2	147	57.8	141	61.7	296	76.7	99	73.7	121	47.9	91	18.7
Iowa	1178	54.9	226	64.6	71	60.6	166	68.7	114	57.0	37	40.5	117	35.0	167	59.3	68	72.1	121	47.9	91	18.7
Kansas	6817	83.4	517	83.9	72	80.6	324	64.5	500	62.2	298	40.6	359	76.9	2727	93.0	349	76.5	502	83.5	1169	90.0
Kentucky	655	38.2	53	47.2	12	83.3	77	37.7	74	90.5	34	38.2	251	19.5	44	47.7	28	60.7	19	89.5	63	3.2
Louisiana	2296	87.2	387	75.2	102	76.5	147	76.2	545	100.0	110	63.6	25	76.0	607	89.8	172	100.0	77	84.4	124	84.7
Maine	1780	38.0	96	27.1	70	30.0	309	44.7	138	29.7	52	13.5	33	21.2	309	43.4	227	31.3	104	49.0	442	41.0
Maryland	3868	46.2	657	67.4	280	44.6	709	48.0	311	58.5	289	40.5	353	25.2	647	40.8	246	42.3	254	24.4	122	50.0
Massachusetts	13592	64.1	661	67.8	417	103.6	542	79.0	1053	50.2	186	43.5	230	41.3	7265	61.8	1201	74.7	1330	78.9	707	36.6
Michigan	6319	77.4	1717	66.4	143	94.4	568	79.0	424	79.2	678	80.1	924	80.5	909	78.1	248	95.4	407	88.0	201	71.6
Minnesota	7989	80.3	518	65.4	324	70.7	492	79.3	566	87.6	711	66.4	429	66.2	2686	89.5	228	84.2	1618	78.8	417	79.6
Mississippi	2274	52.0	1061	50.1	70	72.9	190	60.5	0	N/A	53	34.0	71	19.7	310	69.0	100	22.0	122	39.3	297	56.6
Missouri	7165	67.9	337	84.0	154	69.5	240	49.2	98	67.3	181	251.9	300	78.0	4138	57.7	58	48.3	1398	72.2	261	66.7
Montana	1782	69.3	326	74.8	13	23.1	235	73.6	38	50.0	86	60.5	38	47.4	502	84.3	66	39.4	355	58.0	123	57.7
Nebraska	3996	85.4	684	94.9	206	89.8	771	91.6	439	69.5	145	67.6	33	112.1	1104	92.8	185	82.2	318	44.3	111	101.8
Nevada	2852	62.8	1231	75.0	227	85.0	256	39.1	242	43.8	60	48.3	248	50.8	236	73.3	68	70.6	249	26.9	35	74.3
New Hampshire	2296	65.9	54	74.1	189	70.9	275	84.7	159	54.1	59	52.5	160	43.1	1042	65.3	205	67.3	153	66.7	0	N/A
New Jersey	2873	73.0	328	67.7	191	97.9	444	86.9	462	41.8	230	75.2	155	58.1	333	75.1	159	79.2	140	71.4	431	86.1
New Mexico	3486	67.2	611	74.8	289	77.5	113	69.9	318	73.0	152	49.3	144	59.7	433	52.4	23	34.8	234	37.2	1169	74.1
New York	13529	51.9	1918	60.1	556	36.9	752	53.2	1542	59.7	927	43.3	2001	39.3	2418	61.1	534	50.0	1472	55.2	1409	42.7
North Carolina	1325	39.4	134	30.6	33	30.3	51	27.5	32	15.6	83	20.5	102	35.3	212	53.3	256	42.6	313	49.8	109	19.3
North Dakota	1077	78.7	78	64.1	108	98.1	52	98.1	71	112.7	115	71.3	94	87.2	199	80.9	94	91.5	138	51.4	128	61.7
Ohio	2942	70.0	263	68.4	99	90.9	381	84.8	67	52.2	302	96.4	224	78.6	282	58.9	106	69.8	88	72.7	1130	58.4
Oklahoma	2564	80.1	197	64.5	66	86.4	536	88.2	133	86.5	233	73.0	58	58.6	647	79.3	176	83.5	141	48.2	377	92.8
Oregon	1546	47.3	104	62.5	182	47.3	57	68.4	25	56.0	171	31.6	205	37.6	205	48.8	104	52.9	73	54.8	420	48.1
Pennsylvania	3778	67.8	457	61.5	247	90.7	395	73.2	411	69.3	392	65.8	145	42.1	766	49.3	547	87.9	162	80.2	256	68.4
Puerto Rico	649	65.6	57	52.6	5	20.0	28	57.1	18	61.1	76	64.5	13	30.8	171	104.1	17	36.0	105	89.5	21	157.1
Rhode Island	954	60.1	96	19.8	86	63.3	161	70.2	139	34.5	56	32.1	70	30.0	202	97.5	175	94.1	9	22.2	198	51.0
South Carolina	750	38.8	75	46.7	67	62.7	78	51.3	0	N/A	39	48.7	65	26.2	96	24.0	101	47.5	221	28.1	8	62.5
South Dakota	2687	75.3	172	76.7	121	91.7	356	58.1	251	69.3	292	92.5	16	50.0	652	75.3	309	91.6	360	66.7	158	68.4
Tennessee	1093	45.6	85	23.5	10	10.0	180	57.8	184	28.3	87	42.5	77	18.2	82	53.7	104	53.8	219	68.9	65	29.2
Texas	12629	72.5	1744	75.6	1005	60.5	402	60.2	427	44.9	2074	80.0	1610	48.9	783	58.5	433	88.7	993	75.2	2931	88.6
Utah	3422	124.1	345	150.4	292	154.1	667	62.2	427	118.0	247	168.4	177	217.5	377	149.1	483	88.7	182	207.7	275	84.7
Vermont	3340	44.9	89	59.6	28	32.1	269	36.8	853	25.3	37	27.0	88	21.6	1127	77.0	303	39.3	478	15.7	68	47.1
Virgin Islands	54	75.9	8	37.5	10	70.0	9	100.0	3	66.7	5	100.0	7	57.1	4	100.0	3	66.7	5	100.0	0	N/A
Virginia	4931	38.3	826	29.1	119	24.4	295	47.1	512	32.3	892	49.4	313	23.6	936	41.0	327	30.3	213	26.8	498	52.6
Washington	655	57.1	113	75.2	32	50.0	20	80.0	76	39.5	100	23.0	65	46.2	42	83.3	11	63.6	33	57.6	163	69.3
West Virginia	4164	70.0	782	69.6	605	56.9	193	87.6	138	59.4	814	78.3	45									



Table 5  
704 Report 2002 – Community Change Achievements

State	CCA Total		Community Integration		Collaboration		Educational		Housing Home Mod.		Info Access Tech		Mobility		Personal Assistant		Barrier Removal		Vocational		Other	
	Set	Met (%)	Set	Met (%)	Set	Met (%)	Set	Met (%)	Set	Met (%)	Set	Met (%)	Set	Met (%)	Set	Met (%)	Set	Met (%)	Set	Met (%)	Set	Met (%)
Total	5055	96.1	3143	79.4	4186	123.3	4406	116.4	2307	78.2	2666	98.3	1752	70.8	3194	83.2	2293	76.7	1709	73.3	704	96.3
Alabama	43	84.4	2	100.0	13	100.0	5	100.0	5	40.0	2	100.0	5	100.0	3	33.3	2	100.0	6	100.0	0	N/A
Alaska	46	76.1	3	66.7	10	80.0	8	100.0	5	75.0	2	100.0	3	33.3	6	83.3	3	100.0	3	100.0	2	100.0
Amer. Samoa	31	87.1	9	100.0	4	100.0	0	N/A	5	80.0	0	N/A	3	60.0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
Arizona	400	74.0	97	61.9	11	90.9	4	75.0	157	80.3	44	102.3	22	40.9	28	46.4	9	77.8	11	72.7	17	88.2
Arkansas	369	54.5	21	33.3	16	81.3	111	6.3	7	85.7	3	33.3	12	83.3	18	88.9	45	60.0	136	83.8	0	N/A
California	2655	81.2	321	72.0	538	79.6	1099	86.4	228	80.7	312	75.6	333	72.0	175	74.9	312	92.9	190	91.1	57	108.8
Colorado	642	84.9	94	70.2	56	82.5	35	77.1	183	88.5	29	75.9	20	92.0	72	81.9	44	75.0	36	105.6	43	100.0
N. Carolina	59	69.5	15	80.0	8	67.5	0	N/A	1	100.0	0	0.0	20	70.0	3	66.7	5	60.0	1	100.0	0	N/A
Connecticut	435	72.2	58	79.3	59	84.7	31	80.6	54	66.7	84	61.9	34	76.5	41	82.9	56	62.5	12	50.0	6	66.7
DC	200	62.5	45	28.9	14	42.9	23	87.0	68	69.1	21	95.2	7	71.4	7	57.1	3	33.3	4	100.0	2	100.0
Delaware	60	100.0	20	100.0	18	100.0	42	90.5	62	93.5	58	79.3	39	76.5	25	76.0	48	100.0	35	85.7	9	88.9
Florida	582	92.1	102	93.1	162	102.5	42	100.0	14	100.0	6	100.0	17	76.5	1	0.0	18	88.9	10	80.0	0	N/A
Georgia	92	84.8	15	80.0	9	100.0	20	80.0	58	79.3	91	73.6	44	23.1	42	88.1	29	82.8	17	76.5	30	76.7
Illinois	656	79.6	47	83.0	278	93.1	244	46.7	51	100.0	1	100.0	13	23.1	2	100.0	10	100.0	0	N/A	14	42.9
Illinois	25648	110.9	78	56.4	496	370.6	244	46.7	51	100.0	1	100.0	13	23.1	2	100.0	10	100.0	0	N/A	14	42.9
Indiana	198	58.2	19	78.9	5	89.4	19	31.6	126	64.3	97	36.7	144	43.6	177	51.0	121	35.5	64	45.9	6	66.7
Iowa	236	80.1	30	86.7	43	88.4	20	80.0	48	89.6	17	57.9	7	28.6	4	25.0	27	70.4	7	28.6	18	61.1
Kansas	498	74.9	64	59.4	85	82.4	72	95.8	55	81.8	21	90.5	49	69.4	49	57.1	47	74.5	44	65.9	12	50.0
Kentucky	72	83.7	27	100.0	11	45.5	9	71.8	16	31.3	8	50.0	10	100.0	4	25.0	5	40.0	5	80.0	2	100.0
Louisiana	1761	83.7	227	91.6	146	94.5	87	42.5	6	45.0	99	92.9	240	85.8	798	83.6	17	94.1	21	76.2	65	100.0
Maine	102	71.0	7	57.1	8	63.5	6	82.5	5	100.0	5	50.0	3	100.0	4	50.0	8	62.5	8	62.5	0	N/A
Maine	1011	52.2	162	61.1	58	82.5	67	52.2	126	64.3	97	36.7	144	43.6	177	51.0	121	35.5	64	45.9	6	66.7
Massachusetts	3361	103.2	565	102.8	982	103.1	1418	102.1	22	95.5	22	95.5	144	97.7	135	103.2	77	97.4	53	90.6	1	100.0
Michigan	973	107.7	84	76.5	105	77.1	181	196.7	117	85.5	38	68.4	20	50.0	10	100.0	45	80.0	377	97.1	46	84.8
Minnesota	489	78.7	84	82.1	74	63.5	91	90.5	46	67.4	51	86.5	20	90.0	18	100.0	57	70.2	20	85.0	82	87.8
Mississippi	436	99.1	11	97.3	109	90.1	52	100.0	44	100.0	20	100.0	15	100.0	8	100.0	20	100.0	12	100.0	45	100.0
Missouri	134	21.8	10	91.1	5	89.0	17	35.3	9	55.6	26	71.1	3	80.0	6	83.3	6	100.0	3	100.0	1	100.0
Montana	98	73.5	10	66.0	22	77.5	0	N/A	5	40.0	2	50.0	0	0.0	12	83.3	5	100.0	5	100.0	1	100.0
Nebraska	20	65.0	3	66.7	2	50.0	2	100.0	4	75.0	2	100.0	2	100.0	4	100.0	4	100.0	2	100.0	2	100.0
Nevada	56	89.3	4	100.0	34	82.4	2	100.0	4	100.0	2	100.0	2	100.0	4	100.0	2	100.0	0	N/A	0	N/A
New Hampshire	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A
New Jersey	364	65.4	33	76.4	42	112.0	30	102.5	55	36.4	33	60.6	40	62.5	13	69.2	59	74.6	51	35.3	9	100.0
New Mexico	36	89.1	8	75.0	4	75.0	7	85.7	4	100.0	4	75.0	4	100.0	2	100.0	7	100.0	2	100.0	4	50.0
New York	329	86.9	43	37.2	42	69.0	44	83.1	53	54.7	32	65.6	22	50.0	13	33.8	49	59.2	16	31.3	15	75.3
North Carolina	57	77.0	14	82.9	17	76.5	18	85.3	4	75.0	7	85.7	4	75.0	4	25.0	9	77.8	5	40.0	5	80.0
North Dakota	225	87.4	39	89.7	20	43.0	14	92.9	12	100.0	31	87.1	10	120.0	4	100.0	31	87.1	13	76.9	49	93.9
Ohio	3117	93.8	77	71.4	122	83.6	1220	99.4	124	62.1	1241	101.4	43	93.0	20	40.0	169	80.3	77	80.5	24	75.0
Oklahoma	261	80.1	23	82.6	71	94.4	49	49.0	40	82.5	24	75.0	13	93.0	6	100.0	26	80.8	6	100.0	1	100.0
Oregon	156	24.4	39	97.4	42	95.2	11	81.8	10	90.0	10	100.0	8	100.0	5	100.0	20	95.0	9	88.9	2	100.0
Pennsylvania	1519	24.4	136	47.8	76	94.7	29	96.6	42	81.0	138	45.7	108	21.3	814	4.7	100.0	23.0	23.0	65.2	53	18.9
Puerto Rico	321	59.2	45	53.3	27	100.0	42	95.2	5	100.0	14	92.9	7	71.4	41	97.6	44	54.5	96	12.5	0	N/A
Rhode Island	18	77.8	2	50.0	5	100.0	1	0.0	3	100.0	3	100.0	1	0.0	1	0.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	0	N/A
South Carolina	30	50.0	7	57.1	2	100.0	4	100.0	0	N/A	8	25.0	3	33.3	3	0.0	3	0.0	0	N/A	0	N/A
South Dakota	85	41.2	0	N/A	5	100.0	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	0	N/A	30	0.0	50	60.0	0	N/A	0	N/A
Texas	327	59.0	20	45.0	19	78.9	10	50.0	85	47.1	32	93.8	41	97.6	104	85.6	69	92.8	29	82.8	13	69.2
Tennessee	448	90.2	35	97.1	68	101.5	26	88.5	31	71.0	32	93.8	18	66.7	47	21.3	118	72.0	13	61.5	10	100.0
Tennessee	799	79.8	248	92.7	53	88.7	71	87.3	119	86.6	102	69.6	2	100.0	2	100.0	6	66.7	2	100.0	2	100.0
Utah	38	84.2	2	100.0	14	88.7	5	60.0	4	50.0	4	50.0	2	100.0	14	71.4	8	37.5	9	44.4	0	N/A
Vermont	59	80.0	7	42.9	12	83.3	5	60.0	8	50.0	5	40.0	12	58.3	14	71.4	14	85.7	7	100.0	0	N/A
Virginia	132	91.1	16	84.4	25	106.0	8	87.5	16	106.3	19	78.9	12	77.5	15	86.7	14	77.5	9	44.4	0	N/A
Washington	176	88.1	28	96.4	32	90.6	24	91.7	20	95.8	6	100.0	13	69.2	2	100.0	18	72.2	7	85.7	16	100.0
West Virginia	149	73.2	55	80.0	21	57.1	21	84.4	16	43.8	6	100.0	4	100.0	2	100.0	10	80.0	6	33.3	6	75.0
Wisconsin	279	83.5	23	21.7	27	125.9	31	83.9	116	125.9	23	82.6	14	50.0	10	40.0	16	100.0	12	100.0	1	100.0
Wyoming	30	100.0	2	100.0	9	100.0	1	100.0	5	100.0	2	100.0	1	100.0	1	100.0	6	100.0	1	100.0	2	100.0

Table 6  
704 Report 2002 – Philosophy

State	Total decision making staff	Decision making disabilities (%)	Decision making minorities (%)	Total staff	Disabilities staff (%)	Minorities staff (%)
Total	1407	72.6%	22.5%	4405	65.7%	26.2%
Alabama	9	66.7%	33.3%	32	54.6%	47.2%
Alaska	9	47.1%	11.8%	27	47.4%	3.7%
Amer. Samoa	3	100.0%	100.0%	5	100.0%	100.0%
Arizona	23	56.5%	30.4%	69	53.6%	31.9%
Arkansas	11	81.8%	18.2%	28	71.4%	46.4%
California	150	76.8%	37.6%	503	71.2%	38.0%
Colorado	30	70.8%	23.6%	90	69.9%	27.7%
N. Marianas	4	100.0%	100.0%			
Connecticut	7	100.0%	0.0%	33	74.4%	18.2%
Delaware	4	75.0%	50.0%	11	54.5%	45.5%
DC	6	66.7%	100.0%	14	71.4%	100.0%
Florida	55	72.5%	14.7%	177	67.8%	37.3%
Georgia	30	77.3%	33.6%	50	90.9%	42.4%
Hawaii	18	77.8%	77.8%	42	69.0%	61.9%
Idaho	8	88.0%	0.0%	22	77.7%	18.6%
Illinois	64	64.1%	15.6%	176	69.3%	21.6%
Indiana	24	77.1%	16.7%	45	68.5%	29.2%
Iowa	38	76.3%	23.7%	88	64.6%	17.1%
Kansas	46	69.6%	4.3%	248	55.2%	10.5%
Kentucky	17	64.7%	0.0%	33	52.1%	14.4%
Louisiana	28	75.0%	50.0%	53	64.2%	49.1%
Maine	3	66.7%	0.0%	14	50.0%	0.0%
Maryland	14	85.7%	14.3%	58	77.6%	32.8%
Massachusetts	68	64.7%	10.3%	252	60.3%	26.2%
Michigan	43	67.4%	18.6%	186	67.2%	15.6%
Minnesota	29	71.0%	3.4%	82	66.0%	11.0%
Mississippi	4	100.0%	0.0%	24	70.8%	33.3%
Missouri	94	72.3%	16.0%	143	63.6%	14.0%
Montana	4	100.0%	0.0%	35	72.7%	8.9%
Nebraska	13	76.9%	7.7%	47	57.0%	10.6%
Nevada	9	64.9%	43.2%	19	80.4%	26.0%
New Hampshire	10	50.0%	0.0%	39	59.0%	0.0%
New Jersey	18	88.9%	27.8%	54	61.1%	35.2%
New Mexico	20	70.0%	50.0%	106	61.3%	52.8%
New York	104	66.2%	15.5%	493	63.7%	19.0%
North Carolina	21	67.3%	9.9%	28	56.6%	16.1%
North Dakota	15	64.0%	13.6%	18	83.7%	11.3%
Ohio	45	71.1%	2.2%	74	78.2%	16.6%
Oklahoma	14	71.5%	21.4%	34	63.8%	32.2%
Oregon	19	89.5%	10.5%	41	68.3%	7.3%
Pennsylvania	82	69.5%	20.7%	214	62.6%	23.4%
Puerto Rico	6	50.0%	100.0%	32	50.0%	100.0%
Rhode Island	3	100.0%	0.0%	27	66.7%	11.1%
South Carolina	10	80.0%	30.0%	18	83.3%	27.8%
South Dakota	9	88.9%	11.1%	34	55.9%	23.5%
Tennessee	17	82.4%	11.8%	39	67.0%	12.9%
Texas	50	82.0%	51.0%	132	71.5%	51.2%
Utah	11	90.7%	0.0%	35	56.2%	5.7%
Vermont	9	88.9%	0.0%	45	77.8%	0.0%
Virgin Islands	1	0.0%	100.0%	7	57.1%	100.0%
Virginia	24	66.7%	45.8%	85	68.6%	41.4%
Washington	10	100.0%	10.0%	41	79.3%	12.2%
West Virginia	10	90.0%	10.0%	38	71.1%	0.0%
Wisconsin	35	62.9%	17.1%	150	60.1%	19.4%
Wyoming	2	100.0%	0.0%	16	73.9%	6.4%

C, Title VII);<sup>2</sup> 3) Federal funds (Chapter 2, Title VII);<sup>3</sup> 4) Other Federal funds; 5) Other Government funds (state,<sup>4</sup> local,<sup>5</sup> and other); 6) Private resources – foundations, corporations or trust grants, investments income/endowment, and other resources; and 7) Fees for Service. Since donations from individuals and membership fees are not included in the analysis, adding all the percentages does not total 100 percent. In FY 2002, 354 federally funded CILs reported total resources of approximately \$464 million. The largest amount of funding (52.9%) came from Other Government Funds (State and Local) with wide ranges of 0% to 97% (Massachusetts). The second largest funding source was Fees for Service (18.3%) ranging from 0% to 83% (Wisconsin), followed by Part C funding (12.2%) ranging from 0% to 100% (D.C. and CNMI). Other Federal Funds accounted for 8.0%, Private Funding was 5.3% (with the high of 80% in Idaho) and Part B funding was 2.3% (with the high of 80% in the Virgin Islands). The smallest percentage was Chapter 2 funds, which accounted for 0.4%.

In 1997, total funding was \$168 million. Funding grew 3.6 times in the last five years. The largest growth was in the category of Other Federal Funds (State and

Local), which was 4.6 times that of 1997. Fees for Services, Other Federal Funds and Federal Chapter 2 funds grew more than 2 fold (2.6 times, 2.4 times and 2.0 times, respectively). Federal – Chapter 1 Part C funds were 1.8 times greater and part B funds were 1.3 times greater than in 1997. The least growth was found in Private Resources, which grew only 7% (1.07 times).

### 3.2. Profile of consumers served

For each state and territory, the number of consumers served was reported for age, gender, race, and disability types. Theoretically, the total number of consumers served should be identical across age (under 6, 6–17, 18–22, 23–64, 65 and over, and unknown), gender (female and male), race and disability types (Cognitive, Mental/Emotional, Physical, Hearing, Vision, Multiple Disabilities, and Other). However, due to missing reports, some states show various frequencies. Race is defined as follows: “(a) American Indian or Alaska Native – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of North America and who maintains cultural identification through affiliation or community identification; (b) Asian – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia or the Indian subcontinent; (c) Black or African American – A person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa; (d) Hispanic or Latino – A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture origin; (e) Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Hawaii or other Pacific Islands, and who maintains cultural identification through affiliation or community identification; (f) White – A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East; and (g) Unknown – Consumers who chose not to disclose their race or were unable to determine it” (US Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services, 2003). Table 2 summarizes consumer profile data. It shows a total of 192,582 consumers served. CILs work with people of all ages to empower and educate. The age demographics were: Under 6, 1.2% of the total consumers; 6–17, 4.7%; 18–22, 6.2%; 23–64, 58.9% and 65 and over, 21.9%. The largest percentages are in: Under 6, 22% (New Mexico); in 6–17, 25% (Virgin Islands) and 22% (Minnesota); in 18–22, 19% (Minnesota); in 23–64, 83% and 81% (Washington and District of Columbia) and 65 and over, 74% (American Samoa) and 63%

---

or nonprofit agencies and organizations and other entities to develop comprehensive approaches or systems for providing independent living services; (5) to conduct studies and analyses, gather information, develop model policies and procedures, and present information, approaches, strategies, findings, conclusions, and recommendations to Federal, State, and local policymakers in order to enhance independent living services for individuals with disabilities; (6) to train individuals with disabilities and individuals providing services to individuals with disabilities and other persons regarding the independent living philosophy; and (7) to provide outreach to populations that are unserved or underserved by programs under this title, including minority groups and urban and rural populations. (Rehabilitation Services Administration, 2002d).

<sup>2</sup>Chapter 1 Part C Funds – Title VII Centers for Independent Living. Part C funds are meant to support CIL operations. After the initial award is made, these funds are allocated annually to CILs. The center may budget these dollars to any or all expenses that support the center’s goals and activities.

<sup>3</sup>Chapter 2 of Title VII Independent Living Services for Older Individuals Who are Blind. These funds are used for the purposes of “(1) providing independent living services to older individuals who are blind; (2) conducting activities that will improve or expand services for such individuals; and (3) conducting activities to help improve public understanding of the problems of such individuals.” (Rehabilitation Services Administration, 2002e).

<sup>4</sup>State Funds. State funds may include monies that support the federal network of centers and state agencies that support programs and services that may provide disability specific or general assistance to community organizations.

<sup>5</sup>Local Funds. Local funds include those from either the county or city governments. They may be allocated for a specific disability service or program or for general operational funds to support CILs.

(Wyoming). In 1997, 89,500 consumers were served. In FY 2002, this number more than doubled.

The age category changed over time. In 1997, the oldest was 56 and over. In 2002, the oldest was 65 and over. Percentages in age category appear to be similar.

The ratio of gender was Female 54.7% and Male 45.2% in FY 2002. The highest percentage of Females served was 64% (Georgia) and Males was 58% (Alabama). In 1997, Females were 52.8% and Males, 47.2%.

FY 2000 racial breakdowns were as follows: American Indian or Alaska Native, 2.0%; Asian, 2.0%; Black or African American, 18.7%; Hispanic or Latino, 10.6%; Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, 0.9%; White, 63.7% and Unknown 2.1%. The highest percentages of American Indian or Alaska Native were 23% (South Dakota), 20% (Montana) and 14% (Alaska). The highest percentages of Asians served were 34% (Hawaii) followed by 5% (California). The highest percentages of Black or African American served were 100% (Virgin Islands) and 89% (District of Columbia). Highest percentages of Hispanic or Latino was 100% (Puerto Rico) followed by 50% (New Mexico), of Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander was 100% (CNMI) followed by 26% (Hawaii) and the highest percentages of White was 98% (New Hampshire) and 97% (Maine). Race categories were different in 1997. American Indian, Alaska Native, and Hawaiian were in one category and Asian and Pacific Islanders were together. White accounted for 66.4% in 1997 and accounted for 63.7% in 2002. Other categories appear to be the same.

Seven categories of disabilities are used to describe functional limitations. The data reflects the consumers' self report. Consumers served fall into the following categories: Cognitive, 10.2%; Mental/Emotional, 11.6%; Physical, 42.5%; Hearing, 7.5%; Vision, 5.0%; Multiple Disability, 18.8% and Other, 4.4%. The highest percentage of the total for Cognitive was 33% (Minnesota), for Mental/Emotional was 24% (New York) and 22% (Washington), for Physical was 65% (Georgia), for Hearing was 46% (Delaware), for Vision was 29% (West Virginia), for Multiple Disability was 45% (Arizona) and for Other was 30% (Alabama). In 1997, Vision and Hearing were combined in a category called Sensory. In addition, for 1997, Physical was 47.7%; Cognitive was 11.1%; Mental, 9.9%; Sensory 13.6%; and Multiple, 17.6%. At that time, the categories of Other or Unknown did not exist.

### 3.3. Individual consumer achievements

Centers track the number of people who receive specific services. In addition, CILs track the goals that consumers set for themselves in the following service categories. The consumer determines whether a goal is met or not. The ten service categories are: (a) Self-Advocacy/Self Empowerment, (b) Communication, (c) Mobility/Transportation, (d) Community Services, (e) Educational, (f) Vocational, (g) Self-Care, (h) Information Access/Technology, (i) Personal Resource Management, and (j) Other.

Data for Individual Consumer Achievements (ICA) for FY 2002 is shown in Table 3. Total goals set by consumers were 238,056. 63.2% of these goals were reported met. The ten categories were (in the order of largest Set to smallest Set category): Self-Care (54,755), Self-Advocacy/Self-Empowerment (30,801), Personal Resource Management (24,481), Other (23,988), Community Services (22,651), Mobility/Transportation (20,067), Educational (17,516), Vocational (16,463), Communication (13,769) and Information Access/Technology (13,565). The category with the highest Met percentage was Mobility/Transportation (68.5%) and the lowest Met percentage was found in Vocational (49.3%). One state (Utah) reported higher numbers of goals Met than goals Set in seven out of 10 categories.

In 1997, 124,687 goals were set. 62.9% of these goals were reported met. The figures almost doubled in 2002 despite the rate of Met remaining about the same. Categories varied between 1997 and 2002. In 1997, there were no categories for Self Advocacy, Community Service, Information Access/Technology, or Personal Resource Management. There was a category called Residential. The largest category was Self Care (28,550 Set and 65.4% Met). The second largest was Educational (15,685 Set and 73.4% Met), which was the largest percentage. Residential (14,801 Set and 56.3% Met), Communication (12,299 Set and 72.2% Met), and Mobility (11,009 Set and 66.1% Met) followed. The smallest category was Vocational (10838 Set) with the smallest percentage of Met (50.4%). This category remains the smallest with the lowest Met in 2002.

### 3.4. Individual services

There are 23 types of individual services (IS) that CILs may offer to their communities: (a) Advocacy/Legal Services, (b) Assistive Devices/Equipment

Services, (c) Children's Services, (d) Communication Services, (e) Counseling and Related Services, (f) Family Services, (g) Housing, Home Modifications and Shelter Services, (h) IL Skills Training and Life Skill Training Services, (i) Information and Referral Services, (j) Mental Restoration Services, (k) Mobility Training Services, (l) Peer Counseling Services, (m) Personal Assistance Services, (n) Physical Restoration Services, (o) Preventive Services, (p) Prostheses and Other Appliances, (q) Recreational Services, (r) Rehabilitation Technology Services, (s) Therapeutic Treatment, (t) Transportation Services, (u) Youth Services, (v) Vocational Services, and (w) Other Services.

Table 4 summarizes the 2002 individual services (IS) data. 1,352,950 individuals received services. This number reflects the number of consumers receiving each service during the reporting year. A consumer may receive several different services during the year but an individual is counted only once for each service received. In FY 2002, the largest individual service category was Information and Referral with 47.3% of all individuals receiving services. The highest percentage in this category was 93% (Minnesota) followed by 80% (North Carolina). The second largest category was IL Skills Training and Life Skills Training Services (8.8%) with the highest percentage of 38% (Wisconsin) followed by 33% (Nebraska). The third largest category was Other (6.4%). The fourth largest category was Advocacy/Legal Services (5.9%) with the highest percentage being 38% (District of Columbia). The fifth largest category was Peer Counseling (5.3%) with the highest percentage of 23% (Arkansas). Personal Assistance Services was 5.0% with the highest percentage of 82% (Montana). The remaining categories accounted for less than 5% each. The category of Housing, Home Modifications, and Shelter Services was 3.8% with the highest percentage of 12% (Kentucky) and Assistive Devices/Equipment Services was 2.9% with the highest percentage of 31% (Rhode Island). Transportation Services (2.7%) was ranked ninth and the highest percentage was 17% (Alaska) and 16% (CNMI). Counseling and Related Services (2.3%) was tenth with 24% (Kansas) and Vocational (2.1%) followed with the highest percentage of 19% (Kentucky). The remaining 12 categories accounted for less than 2% each. Noteworthy among these, the highest percentages were 11% (Maine) and 10% (Oklahoma) in Recreational Services (1.8%), 5.3% (New Mexico) in Children's Services (0.3%), 27% (Louisiana) in Physical Restoration Services (0.3%), 29% (Indiana) in Preventive Services (0.8%), 6.0% (Wyoming) in Rehabil-

itation Technology Services (0.3%), and 3.9% (New Mexico) in Therapeutic Treatment (0.1%).

In 1997, 784,518 individual services were provided. This grew 1.7 times in 2002, with notable changes in Communication Services. Five years ago, Communication accounted for 22.3% but dropped to 1.4% in 2002. Information Referral was 30.7% in 1997 but increased to 47.3% in 2002.

### 3.5. Individual consumers in community-based living

This section of the 704 Report measures two areas: a) how many individuals were successfully relocated from nursing homes or other institutions to community-based living arrangements, and b) how many individuals continued living in community-based living arrangements because IL services prevented the necessity of entering nursing homes or other institutions.

A total of 2,023 individuals were relocated from institutions and 21,986 individuals were prevented from institutionalization in FY 2002. Ohio (236), New York (219), California (196), and Nebraska (162) relocated more than 100 individuals from institutions. California (2,567), Missouri (1,856), Pennsylvania (1,789), Illinois (1,532), Arizona (1,510), Kansas (1,460) and Nebraska (1,071) prevented more than 1,000 individuals from institutionalization. In 1997, the 704 Report did not measure this data.

### 3.6. Community change achievement

A total of 50,355 community change achievement (CCA) goals were set and 96.1% of these goals were met in FY 2002. The categories (in the order of the largest number of goals Set to the smallest number of goals Set) are: Information Access/Technology (26,661 Set and 98.3% Met), Educational (4,406 Set and 116.4% Met), Collaboration (4,186 Set and 123.3% Met), Personal Assistant Services (3,194 Set and 83.2% Met), Community Integration (3,143 Set and 79.4% Met), Housing Opportunities/Home Modifications (2,307 Set and 78.2% Met), Physical/Attitudinal Barrier Removal (2,293 Set and 76.7% Met), Mobility/Transportation (1,752 Set and 70.8% Met), Vocational (1,709 Set and 73.3% Met) and Other (704 Set and 96.3% Met). For total CCA, five states reported 100% or more goals Met. FY 2002 data is presented in Table 5.

In the category of Information Access and Technology, the highest number of goals Set was 92.9% (Illinois) of the total figure for CCA, followed by

39.8% (Ohio). The highest percentage for Education Set was 42.1% (Massachusetts) and 39.1% (Ohio). The highest percentage for Collaboration was 60.7% (Nevada), for Personal Assistant Services was 53.6% (Pennsylvania), for Community Integration was 31.0% (Utah), for Housing Opportunities/Home Modification was 41.6% (Wisconsin), for Physical/Attitudinal Barrier Removal was 58.8% (South Dakota), for Mobility/Transportation was 41.3% (Tennessee) and for Vocational was 38.7% (Michigan). CCA data categories did not exist in 1997.

### 3.7. *Compliance Indicator 1 – Philosophy*

Title VII Assurances insure that CILs are designed and operated by persons with disabilities. The 704 Report collects data about consumer control by asking for the number of employees in decision-making positions and in staff positions, for the number of these individuals who have disabilities and for the number who are minorities. FY 2002 data for Compliance Indicator 1 – Philosophy is shown in Table 6. The total number of decision-making staff is 1,407. The percentage of these individuals with disabilities was 72.6%. The percentage of these decision makers in racial minorities was 22.5%. Samoa, the CNMI, Connecticut, Mississippi, Montana, Rhode Island, Washington and Wyoming indicated 100% of their decision-making staff were persons with disabilities. In 1997, the total number of decision-making staff was 969. By 2002, this number increased 1.5 times. The rate of decision-making staff with disabilities remained the same and the rate of minorities increased slightly.

The total number of staff members is 4,205, and 65.7% of them were people with disabilities with 26.2% from racial minorities. American Samoa indicated that 100% of its CIL staff members were disabled. The total number of staff was 2,402 in 1997, reflecting a growth of 1.8 times by 2002. The rate of minority staff and the rate of staff with disabilities were similar to the rates of 2002.

## 4. Conclusion

The current 704 Report form collects data that provides rich information and a way to identify CILs' performance in their work. Comparing FY 1997 and FY 2002 data clearly shows growth in centers for independent living as well as in their finances and services. The financial data shows growth in federal and state funding

and in fees for service, and reveals significant activity and growth in CILs' efforts to implement consumer-directed personal assistant services. Data regarding consumer services, achievements, demographics, and community activity provides an opportunity to track the growth and progress of a CIL. However, the current 704 Report form stops short of providing a center, state, and national picture of information needed to identify consumer needs, realize service patterns, support future funding, identify training needs, and demonstrate CILs' contributions to the disability community. If CILs have to offer important and significant services to people with disabilities and are charged to advocate for the disability community, a slightly revised 704 Report form would be instrumental in showing federal, state, and local governments what is happening, what is working, and what is still needed by people with disabilities. The current 704 Report form collects data that provides a way to identify CILs' performance in their work.

However, it does not collect data that assists in the identification of consumer needs and the realization of service patterns, nor does it provide bases for future funding and training needs or demonstrate the contributions of CILs to the disability community. Two types of reports from each CIL may serve to better track and interpret performance. One is using the current method. An overall center report could collect the data on sources and amounts of funds and other fiscal resources, on individual consumers in community based-living, community change achievements and compliance indicator 1 – philosophy. A second form, that includes a multi-dimensional reporting method about consumers served, individual consumer achievements, and individual services based on each consumer's record would be instrumental in interpreting current activities and achieved goals, and would identify needed areas of planning and effort to be made by CILs.

### 4.1. *Consolidating Individual Consumer Achievements (ICA) and Individual Services (IS)*

Individual Consumer Achievements (Table 3) and Individual Services (Table 4) are two sections in the 704 Report that could be consolidated to validate CILs' contributions to the consumers they serve. Currently, the section on Individual Consumer Achievements lists ten areas within which a consumer can set many goals. A CIL reports the number of goals set and met by tabulating each consumer's report. For Individual Services, twenty-three areas are listed. Numbers of con-

sumers served in each area is reported. Due to different listings of programs and/or services in these two sections, it is not possible to track the number of people participating in a service and compare these findings to the numbers of goals set and met. In addition, a CIL is prevented from identifying the success of consumers and the average number of consumer goals set in a specific service area. Consolidation of these two sections is recommended by reporting the number of goals set and met while also reporting the number of consumers served. This would allow CILs to determine their populations' service priorities. Consumer and staff training needs related to the services could be determined. SILCs, which monitor and develop three-year state plans, would be able to track statewide service need patterns and possibly direct Part B funds or assist CILs in directing state support to needed services and training. Combining these two categories would also facilitate the identification of service patterns and goal achievement success. Local, state and national decision makers would be able to define their constituents' needs and make allocation decisions based on the data collected.

#### *4.2. Matching categories to census data categories*

To insure that CILs are upholding their mission of providing services to all people regardless of age and disability, consumer demographics are important to CILs and to governmental fund sources. In the current 704 Report, age demographics are separated into ranges that reflect educational and rehabilitation age intervals such as Under 6, 6–17 (school age), 18–22 (college level age), etc. Although this classification system can reflect how CILs are working in the traditional educational and rehabilitation areas, it does not allow for identifying what CILs must do as outlined by 725 standards. CILs are focused on facilitating community change for people with disabilities and empowering people with disabilities to take control of their own lives to work for total equality. To collect data that supports this focus, it is suggested that the 704 Report adopt the US Census Bureau's age classifications. This would facilitate comparing the community population data in a particular segment and the served population. In addition, it would support planning for unserved and underserved populations, designing services, outreach and community networking, and targeted fund development. The same suggestion can be applied to the categories of Race and Ethnicity.

Linking consumer demographics and being able to access official records on community demographics (US Census data) would allow the CIL network to see who is accessing CILs and who is not. Outreach efforts at the regional, state and national levels would no longer be hit and miss. CILs could provide impact findings to their local and state planning boards. They could work individually or collectively to insure that their services and programs are reaching all people equally. The ability to identify the service impact of CILs on their communities provides SILCs with hard data for tracking and planning. Consumers' successes, CIL best practices, and the national network of CILs would be enhanced by linking this data together.

#### *4.3. Satisfaction scale*

The 704 Report requires centers to gather consumer satisfaction information but does not provide a uniform method to do so. Each CIL must determine what kinds of information they will seek from consumers and how to gather consumer feedback. It is recommended that the RSA develop a list of questions for CILs to ask their consumers. These questions should be meant for consumers to evaluate how well the CIL meets the 725 standards, how well the CIL meets its mandate to promote the independent living philosophy, how the CIL provides services and programs to persons with all disabilities, and how the CIL works toward community change. Consumers will report the level of their satisfaction with services and their degree of satisfaction with their ability to set and meet their own goals. In establishing a uniform consumer evaluation for CILs, the SILCs and RSA will be able to evaluate levels of satisfaction within states or nationwide.

#### *4.4. Multi-dimensional data collection method*

It is recommended that RSA develop a multi-dimensional database by collecting each center's report based on individual consumer's records. The RSA would develop a computer-based reporting system for centers to enter data for each consumer. Each record would contain an individual profile such as demographic information, goals set and met, level of satisfaction with each service received, and level of overall satisfaction with the CIL. By creating an easy method to tabulate aggregated data, each center can develop a service program and service plan, conduct appropriate outreach efforts, and determine community and systems change. By compiling this information, the RSA

will be able to identify CIL performance individually and nationwide. SILCs can evaluate and monitor their three-year plan and develop future plans.

The aggregated data collected in this manner will provide strategic information not only to the RSA but also to the network of centers for independent living.

## References

- [1] Independent Living Research Utilization Program, *RSA 704 Report for ILCs Fiscal Year 1997 State by State*. [Electronic database]. Houston, TX: Independent Living Research Utilization Program, 2003. Available: <http://www.ilru.org/704/CIL97.html>.
- [2] Rehabilitation Services Administration, *Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as Amended by the Rehabilitation Act of 1992 (P.L. 102-569)*. Washington DC: US Dept. of Education, 2002.
- [3] US Department of Education. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services. Rehabilitation Services Administration. *Instructions. Part II. Section 704 Annual Performance Report for the Centers for Independent Living*, 2003, p. 16.
- [4] J.S. Wholey, Improving performance and accountability: Responding to emerging management challenges, in: *Evaluating social programs and problems*, S.I. Donaldson and M. Scriven, eds, NJ: Erlbaum, 2003.