VIRGINIA SIS® SATISFACTION SURVEY REPORT
July 2019 – September 2019
This report compiles the results of Ascend Management Innovations’ Supports Intensity Scale® satisfaction surveys for the time period of July 2019 through September 2019.

Background

Ascend, A MAXIMUS Company, contracts with the Department of Behavioral Health and Developmental Services (DBHDS) to perform SIS® interviews to transform Virginia’s Intellectual and Developmental Disability (IDD) service system by expanding service capacity, strengthening community-focused services, promoting self-determination, and encouraging individuals to actively participate in all aspects of community life. Virginia uses the conflict-free, objective SIS® assessment to establish individual resource allocation. The Virginia SIS® project began in October 2014. As a part of Ascend’s continuous quality improvement model, satisfaction data is collected for SIS® interviews. Satisfaction data is used to identify training opportunities and procedural changes for Ascend’s scheduling department and the independent contractor interviewers. Respondent feedback is also provided to DBHDS for program analysis and planning.

Methodology

Following each SIS® interview, all respondents including SIS® recipients, family members and guardians, support coordinators, and providers are offered a SIS® Satisfaction Survey form and invited to submit their feedback. Respondents may fax or mail the completed surveys to Ascend’s corporate office. Survey results are compiled and analyzed by Ascend’s Quality Improvement Department for review and trending. Result outliers, significant positive or negative feedback, are immediately forwarded to the VA SIS® Manager for review, action planning, or complaint resolution as appropriate.

Stakeholders are asked to identify their satisfaction for seven questions on a Likert scale of 1 to 5, 1 being disagree and 5 being agree. The questions identify respondent satisfaction with the process, effectiveness, and professionalism of Ascend’s scheduling department, as well as the professionalism and skill of the interviewer:

- The interview was scheduled at a convenient time/date.
- The scheduler was courteous and communicated clearly.
- The individual’s support team was well represented at the assessment.
- The interviewer was courteous and communicated clearly.
- The interviewer treated me/us with dignity and respect.
• The interviewer conveyed interest and took the time to learn about the individual’s support needs.
• The interviewer effectively captured the individual’s support needs.

In addition, respondents are asked to identify if the interviewer arrived on time to the interview and the length of the interview. These data points gauge the interviewer’s ability to meet professional expectations and his or her interview administration skills.

Finally, respondents are invited to provide narrative feedback regarding:

• The assessment tool and its uses (feedback to the state)
• Scheduling
• The interviewer

This report will detail the results of 145 satisfaction surveys received or 10% of the 1,401 SIS assessments completed from July 2019 through Sept 2019.
Survey respondent relationship to SIS® recipient

- Recipient: 1%
- Support Coordinator / Case Manager: 20%
- Direct Support Professional: 14%
- Family / Guardian: 32%
- Program Coordinator: 5%
- Provider / Other: 26%
- No answer: 1%

Did the interviewer arrive on time?

- Yes: 89%
- No: 1%
- No answer: 10%

Interview Length

- 1 to 2 hours: 50%
- 2 to 3 hours: 41%
- More than 3 hours: 2%
- No answer: 7%
Level of Satisfaction by Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The interview was scheduled at a convenient time/date</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scheduler was courteous and communicated clearly</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The individual’s support team was well represented at the assessment</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interviewer was courteous and communicated clearly</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The individual’s support team was well represented at the assessment</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interviewer was courteous and communicated clearly</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scheduler was courteous and communicated clearly</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The individual’s support team was well represented at the assessment</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interviewer was courteous and communicated clearly</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The individual’s support team was well represented at the assessment</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interviewer was courteous and communicated clearly</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interview effectively captured the individual’s support needs</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The interview effectively captured the individual’s support needs</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment tool and its uses:

- “A bit cumbersome in some areas especially when relating to this specific individual”
- “shorten it please”
- “The assessment tool was effective and was used to clarify confusing questions”
- “I feel it is unfair that a service provider pay is reduced when their client shows improvement”
- “Some of the questions appear to be redundant”
- “Please don’t waste/take up time reading to families. This used valuable time”
- “Assessment tool is what we have to work with. It has flaws, but it is what it is”
- “Seems appropriate”
- “Send questions in advance to family point of contact-unable to read complex questions in advance”

Scheduling:

- “Time was perfect for this family”
- “was patient and polite”
- “Interviewer handed me at the beginning of the meeting a one-page explanation of the SIS process and a 4-page document from DBHDS about SIS procedure/process. Lots of great information however recommend this info is mailed when the confirmation call is made. This way we have plenty of time to actually read it before the meeting and be more prepared to ask questions if needed”
- “difficult – but it did happen”
- “The meeting was held at the time and date that it was scheduled to occur”
- “Realize scheduler worked w/service coordinator and individual on planned meeting, but individual was informed after date locked in. So, we had to change family plans. Luckily it worked out”
- “Scheduling was great especially because it had to be re-scheduled due to medical needs”

The Interviewer:

- “The interviewer was incredibly helpful and understanding”
- “Great Job! Felt she really tried to understand the needs and goals of the individual. Was thoughtful with team’s input. Fostered a therapeutic working environment”
- “Interviewer explained categories, questions, etc. very thoroughly. Very patient and respective to the team’s questions”
- “Was awesome. The interviewer knew concise wording to present the questions to us”
- “The interviewer was friendly, cordial and completed the assessment in a timely manner”
- “Interviewer is always professional and takes the time to make sure she understands the needs and supports of the individual”
- “Interviewer was professional at all times. Attentive and listened very well”