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State of the Science - May 2016
• Ten regional ADA Centers, the ADA Knowledge Translation Center, and the ADA Collaborative Research Project.
  – Funded by NIDILRR to provide ADA training, technical assistance, and ADA-related materials

• The only federally-sponsored national network of technical assistance centers dedicated to providing information, training, and technical assistance on the ADA.

• [http://adata.org/](http://adata.org/)
ADA Knowledge Translation Center

- Facilitates coordination, organization, and collaboration among the ADA National Network grantees to generate new knowledge about optimal methods to enhance stakeholder's use of knowledge about their rights and responsibilities under the ADA.
Goals of ADAKTC

• Optimize efficiency and impact of the ADA National Network’s activities.
• Increase awareness and use of ADA research findings to inform behavior, practices, or policies.
• Improve understanding of ADA stakeholders’ need for and receipt of ADA Network Services.
Ada Implementation

• Occurs when entities and individuals are able to exercise their rights and responsibilities under the ADA.
Measuring ADA Implementation Outcomes

• Assess to what extent ADA implementation outcomes are achieved, and characterize outcomes.

• Increase understanding of how ADANN services support ADA implementation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Types of questions that can be answered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Outcome Measurement System (OMS)</td>
<td>WHAT types of ADANN services are provided (topics, intensity, audiences, sectors, location)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outcomes Survey</td>
<td>WHAT types of outcomes are achieved as a result of ADANN services?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. TA Evaluation Project</td>
<td>HOW do ADANN services (i.e., TA) facilitate ADA implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Success Stories</td>
<td>HOW do ADANN services (i.e., local collaborations) facilitate ADA implementation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why Are Multiple Measurement Strategies Needed?

- OMS and Outcomes Survey capture WHAT services were provided and WHAT resulted from services (outcomes).
- TA Evaluation Project and Success Stories help us understand HOW outcomes are achieved.
  - Rich accounts of process
  - Factors that supported or posed barriers to ADA implementation
OMS

• National database that captures activities of the ADANN including TA, training, public awareness, dissemination, etc.

• 10 regional centers enter data and review and verify reports quarterly.

• Quarterly reports of aggregate national data are disseminated to key stakeholders.
Outcome Measurement Survey

- Quarterly phone surveys are conducted on purposeful sample (n=250) of national TA records within OMS to measure outcomes.
- Qualitative data are coded into types of outcomes and beneficiary.
- Quarterly reports are disseminated to key stakeholders.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Type</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Outcome</td>
<td>No outcome resulted from TA event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Outcome</td>
<td>Better understanding, increase knowledge, increase awareness passing info along, better self-advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Outcome</td>
<td>Confident decision made, ensured ADA compliance, decision made but implementation not yet started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Outcome</td>
<td>Design change, accommodation requested and/or delivered, employee kept job, policy change to be in ADA compliance, legal action started</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Data</td>
<td>Incomplete record or insufficient descriptions in TA event or survey records to identify if records meets inclusion criteria and/or determine outcome type</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome Measurement Survey

• Demonstrates the extent to which TA services provided by the ADANN result in ADA implementation.

  – What types of outcomes are achieved after receiving TA? (e.g., increase in knowledge about the ADA, change in policy)

  – What topics and audiences are addressed by outcomes? (e.g., change in architectural design for hotel, change in policy at a place of employment)
TA Evaluation Project

• Qualitative evaluation project aimed to explore the role of TA providers in facilitating ADA implementation:
  – Increase understanding of the needs of recipients of ADANN TA services.
  – Increase understanding of how TA providers address ADA information requests.
TA Evaluation Project

• Recruited TA specialists to participate in interviews from all 10 regions.
• Conducted semi-structured interviews.
• Data validation
  – Participants review/refine interview summaries
• Data analysis
  – Iterative development of coding structure
  – Interview summaries coded by theme, topics and subtopics
Success Stories

- Successful regional cases of ADA implementation that are complex (entity, duration, large impact).
- Nominated by regional centers and ADAKTC.
- Document review and interviews with key implementers are conducted to gather the ‘story’.
- Written in plain language journalist style.
Snapshot of Results

• OMS
  – Year 4: 10/1/2014 – 9/30/2015

• Outcomes surveys
  – TA events from 2nd Quarter of 2015 (April–June)
    outcome surveys completed during Nov to Dec, 2015.

• TA evaluation project
  – Data collected: March–June 2015
  – Validation and analysis: August 2015 – February 2016

• Success Stories
  – Four case summaries of ADA implementation
    published 2014-16
## OMS: Year 4

### ADANN Activities by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
<td>18231</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL(S)</td>
<td>19943</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>38533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Course</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>6088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Training Topics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title II</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General ADA Information</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title III</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability Awareness/Education</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Access</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Center Information</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective Communication</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible Technologies</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable Accommodation</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Animals</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Access</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OMS: Year 4

TA Recipients

- Individual with a disability: 6626
- Family member of person with disability: 2039
- Business: 1535
- Architect or design professional: 1496
- State/local government agency: 1370
Outcomes Survey

Chart 1. TA Events by Outcome Type (see Section B for Definitions of Outcome Types)

- Implementation Outcome: 125
- Knowledge Outcome: 62
- Decision Outcome: 21
- Insufficient Data: 11
- No Outcome: 7
Outcomes Survey

Chart 2. Outcomes by Entity vs. Individual

- Implementation Outcome: Entity 95, Individual 30
- Knowledge Outcome: Entity 29, Individual 33
- Decision Outcome: Entity 12, Individual 9
- No Outcome: Entity 4, Individual 4

Frequency of Outcomes (Entity vs. Individual)
Outcomes Survey

**Table 4. Primary Role of Contact**
One primary role of contact was identified for each TA event records.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Role of Contact</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architect or design professional</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual with a disability</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State/local government agency</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA Coordinator</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family member of person with disability</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer advocate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service provider</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TA Project Participants (N=17)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Years as TA Specialist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 5 yrs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5 yrs to 10 yrs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 yrs to 15 yrs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 15 yrs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New England ADA Center</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast ADA Center</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Atlantic ADA Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast ADA Center</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Lakes ADA Center</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest ADA Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Plains ADA Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountain ADA Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific ADA Center</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest ADA Center</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TA Project

• Characteristics of TA requests
  – Most common recipients of TA are people with disabilities.
  – Common ADA topics: Service animals, parking, housing, employment, building design, transportation.
  – Non-ADA topics also common (related federal laws, requests for financial or social support).
  – Requests have become more complex, nuanced, individualized over time.
  – More people getting basic/easy ADA info online.
TA Project

• Characteristics of TA requests
  – Emerging topic areas in recent years
    • Intersection of ADA with other laws (FMLA/Fair Housing)
    • Web accessibility
    • Mental health and ADA
    • Public transportation
    • Criminal justice system (accessible police/courts)
    • Public education and ADA
TA Project

• How information requests are addressed?
  – First step is to answer ‘How does issue X apply to ADA?’
  – Researching and synthesizing info from multiple sources is common
  – Information on ADA, related federal laws, and regional laws/regulations often provided
  – Addressing complex cases often requires consultation with other TA specialists, ADA experts or federal agency liaisons (DOJ, Access Board, EEOC)
TA Project

• How information requests are addressed?
  – TA specialists provide more than just information
    • Help people understand how information applies their situation
    • Help people know what options they have/next steps
    • Offer option of calling/emailing back if they hit dead end, or have additional questions
  – TA specialists often provide regional information:
    • Regional regs/laws (e.g., building codes, parking)
    • Referrals to resources, organizations or specific people/experts in community (e.g., CILs)
    • Refer to regional case law
TA Project

Why people seek TA from ADANN

– No other option for individualized TA with real person.
– Good consumer service – high quality, useful, accurate information; consistently follow-up/call back
– Strong regional relationships (repeat callers).
– ADANN is only resource that covers all info related to ADA, including ADA-related federal laws and regional regulations/resources.
– TA providers are bridge to federal agencies – TA providers have access to DOJ, Access Board, other federal contacts that consumer don’t.
“You want to bring these large federal laws back home to people because they trust sources that are closer to them, they trust people they know.”

“The types of questions are getting more complex. I believe people with disabilities, HR specialists, and others that implement the ADA are more savvy about the ADA... The level of the questions and the complexity has increased as the years have gone by, and people have been educated in many ways: through their employer, in their community, with their HR specialists, with their own research on the web.”
Success Stories

Hattiesburg, Mississippi: Going Above and Beyond the ADA

Renovating the St. Louis Arch Complex to Welcome Everyone

The Pendleton Project: Making Health Care Accessible to All

Community Collaboration Ensures Access to Art for All

http://adata.org/regional-success-stories
Success Stories

• Characteristics of ADA implementation based on Success Stories:
  – Strong regional relationships.
  – Clear vision of ADA implementation at early stages of project.
  – Meaningful and sustained engagement of community organizations, people with disabilities and accessibility/ADA experts.
ADA Implementation: Lessons Learned

• Trusted regional relationships are key ingredient to ADA implementation.

• Implementation requires information and guidance on ADA, and how ADA intersects with regional law/regulations and other federal laws (IDEA, Fair Housing Act, Rehab Act, Air Carriers Act, etc.).

• Information alone is not sufficient. Recipients of ADANN services need to know how information applies to their specific situation.
Next Steps

- Continue increasing data quality in OMS and Outcomes Surveys.
- Conduct detailed qualitative analysis to better characterize outcomes.
- Analyze subsequent cycles of OMS and Outcomes Survey data to identify trends over time.
- Apply TA Project findings to improve ADANN services.
Questions?
Contact Info

Kurt Johnson  kjohnson@uw.edu

ADA Knowledge Translation Center
http://adakt.washington.edu/

Department of Rehabilitation Medicine
University of Washington
Box 357920
Seattle, WA 98195