

**Individual Pursuits Day Program
Outcomes Management Report
2010**

April 15, 2011

Introduction

Individual Pursuits Day Program is a recreational-based day program that operates from Monday to Friday, from 8:30 AM until 3:00 PM. The day program focuses on supporting adults with one or more developmental disabilities. We operate in the Vic-West area and have been providing service since 1993.

Service is delivered through the creation and execution of a person-centered programming plan, known internally as an Individual Program Plan, or IPP. The IPP is developed by the individual's support team in consultation with the person served and their stakeholders. Goals for the program plan are set via input from all stakeholders and measures are determined. Progress reports are produced regularly and are distributed to approved stakeholders. Program plans are reviewed semi-annually by the support team of the person served to ensure continued effectiveness. Program plans are reviewed and modified at least annually by all appropriate stakeholders of the person served.

Outcomes

Outcomes can be defined as the benefits received by the person served by participating in our program. While each person served has their own unique goals, as outlined in their Individual Program Plan, there remains some level of commonality between each persons' program.

As each person served has their own unique program plan, each person served will also have unique expected outcomes from participating in the program. However, as a recreation-based day program with a strong focus on community inclusion, there are certain goals and activities that are common for persons served. For example, it is expected, both by the persons served and other stakeholders, that persons served will participate in community outings, or will be supported in maintaining their physical fitness by getting regular exercise. Our outcomes management plan focuses on these commonalities.

Our Outcomes Management Plan is designed to support quality improvement of our service delivery. By planning, measuring and analyzing the outcomes of our programs, we can ensure that we are providing true benefits to persons served and meeting the expectations of our stakeholders.

The purpose of the plan is to:

- Support the organization's mission, vision and values at all times
- Identify key performance measures related to effectiveness, efficiency, service access and satisfaction of person served and other stakeholders
- Support performance measurement by the organization's leadership
- Inform stakeholders about what outcomes persons served can hope to expect by participating in one of our programs.
- Inform stakeholders on how we plan to collect information and use it to improve the quality of the service we provide.

Demographics

The following tables shows demographic information for persons served in our programs as of Dec 31, 2010:

Persons served:	11
Gender:	
Men	6
Women	5
Age:	
Age 18 - 30	6
Age 31 - 39	1
Age 40+	4
Ethnicity:	
Caucasian	8
Asian	1
Indian	1
First Nations	1
Disability:	
Physical disability	5
Visual impairment	1
Developmental disability	11
Requires assistive technology	3

Notes:

1. Number of persons served has not changed in 2010.
2. Group activities are often restricted by individual abilities, thus hampering flexibility on many days. This is becoming more pronounced as persons typically enter the program as they become adults (18 - 19 years old), which can be seen from the age distribution.
3. The variety of disabilities, along with their severity, also of course restricts our flexibility when planning group activities.

Measures and Targets

Domain	Measure	Applied To	Data Source	Responsibility	Target
Service effectiveness	# of community outings per person per month	Persons served	Daily Communication Sheets	Program Director	> 20
Service effectiveness	# of exercise activities supported per person per month	Persons served	Daily Communication Sheets	Program Director	> last year; min 10
Service effectiveness	# of Critical Incident Reports filed	Persons served	Daily Communication Sheets	Program Director	< last year
Service efficiency	Total program expenditures per person-days of service provided	Program; all persons served	Financial Review; Daily Communication Sheets	Program Director	<= last year
Satisfaction	Overall satisfaction level of persons served	Program; Persons served	Client Satisfaction Surveys	Program Director	> last year; min 86%
Satisfaction	Overall satisfaction level of stakeholders	Program	Client Satisfaction Surveys	Program Director	> last year; min 86%
Accessibility	Program operates at capacity (10 persons served at facility)	Program	Management review, staff input	Executive Director	> 90% of the year

Results

Measure	Target	2009	2010	2011
# of community outings per person per month	> 20	22.81	25.27	
# of exercise activities supported per person per month	> last year; min 15	13.32	13.36	
# of Critical Incident Reports filed	< last year	30	29	
Total program expenditures per person-days of service provided	<= last year	\$298.26	\$201.62	
Overall satisfaction level of persons served	> last year; min 86%	88%	86%	
Overall satisfaction level of stakeholders	>= last year; min 86%	90%	91%	
Program operates at capacity (10 persons served at facility)	> 90% of the year	50%	100%	

Analysis

While overall the measures indicate that 2010 was a successful year for the day program, meeting nearly all of its targets, there were some significant concerns that require addressing.

What went right

As a program with a large focus on community inclusion, the number of community outings supported for persons served not only remained high, but actually improved significantly over last year. This is attributable to an excellent effort by our staff, and a greater emphasis on group outings and activities, where more people can participate with fewer staff.

This emphasis on group outings also showed up as an increase in the number of exercise-focused activities supported. While short of our target of 15 per person per month, it was still an increase from the previous year and remains at a level we feel is acceptable.

Total program expenses show a reduction by almost 1/3rd, but much of that reduction was due to better alignment of expenses to programs on the balance sheet. The number shown is still an estimate as some organization-level expenses are difficult to assign to individual programs. There was, however, a real savings in terms of overall expenditures as compared with the previous year.

In general, satisfaction levels remain relatively high.

Also note that 2009's capacity was initially measured as full, but we were able to add two more persons to the program that year, so we re-adjusted what we thought of as "at capacity" for 2010, and subsequently downgraded 2009's measure to reflect this.

Areas for improvement

It is interesting to note that while satisfaction among stakeholders (not including the persons served) remains very high and has in fact increased over the previous year, client satisfaction has dropped. Understanding why this is requires a deeper look into the process for collecting client satisfaction data.

As many of the persons we serve are unable to either understand or meaningfully communicate their own level of satisfaction with the day program, we ask our staff to advocate for persons served and answer questions regarding satisfaction on their behalf (note some clients are capable and do respond themselves). We do not ask all staff to speak for all persons served, restricting this method of data collection to staff who knows a particular client well, either by working with them regularly or by having known them for a long time.

With budgets becoming tighter, all organizations are attempting to find ways to do more with less. For us, the necessary compromise was to reorganize program days to have more group activities and outings, which require a less demanding staff to client ratio. While this has been largely successful at restraining costs, we are starting to see the effects on service levels for individuals who may have needs or interests that do not align well with the group.

One example of this effect is for an individual who likes to swim but requires at least one staff person to be with them at all times while in pool. This individual cannot be monitored safely in a group setting and thus relies on our ability to have a dedicated staff person for them while swimming. The number of days that we can budget that staff ratio at the pool is restricted, therefore the individual's potential for swims are restricted in number. As staff who are advocating for persons served can often see, while an individual does go swimming once per week, they used to go twice or three times per week when staffing ratios were more favorable.

When staff provide answers to satisfaction survey questions on behalf of persons served, the answers often reflect these observations which of course drives satisfaction measures downward. This really comes as no surprise, as the relationship of money spent by the program to provide service and the quality of that service is directly proportional by its nature.

This greater emphasis on group activities is also reflected in our lower than expected number of exercise-focused activities. As exercise is relative to a person's abilities, doing more things that greater numbers of people are capable of can decrease the amount of exercise that persons with greater capabilities receive. Overall, we're still comfortable with the level of service provided in this area and were in fact able to increase it from the previous year, just not by as much as expected.

Another area we are looking at improving is our capability to accurately measure actual costs relative to service levels. We did make a number of changes to the way costs were assigned and tracked which moved us towards more accurate numbers. However, we feel that measuring dollars spent vs person-days of service provided does not really help us in gauging the changes in the quality of the service offered as budgets change, which is really something we want to carefully watch as our funding body (CLBC) has indicated that budgets are unlikely to get any better in the foreseeable future.

Action Plans

The following action plans will be implemented in 2011:

Action	Responsibility	Timeframe
Continue to work on more accurate budgeting to isolate program costs for finer-grained analysis.	Executive Director, Administrative Manager	1 st half fiscal 2012 (Oct 2011)
Design and implement a day planning process that includes more input from all staff	Program Coordinator, Program Director	1 st quarter 2011 (Mar 2011)
Design and implement a better system to be able to correlate program costs with service quality	Program Director	Implement by end of 2011.

Contact Us

If you have any questions or would like more information on our outcomes management planning, please contact:

Shawn Hart
Program Director
phone: 250-589-3276
fax: 250-391-1114
email: shawn.hart@individualpursuits.com

Sean Downey
Executive Director
phone: 250-480-0815
fax: 250-480-0817
email: sean.downey@individualpursuits.com

or visit us on the web: www.individualpursuits.com