

Final Report
2016

Consumer Satisfaction with Aging & Disability Resource Connection of Oregon: Round 5

Part 2: Pathways to the ADRC

Submitted to
Oregon State Unit on Aging, Department of Human Services



Diana L. White, PhD
Sheryl Elliott, MUS



Consumer Satisfaction with Aging & Disability Resource Connection (ADRC) Services: Round 5

Diana White and Sheryl Elliott
Portland State University Institute on Aging
April 2016

Part 2. Pathways to the ADRC

Learning about & contacting the ADRC

Patterns for learning about the ADRC have changed somewhat over the past year. Referrals from another agency remained the major source of information and increased from 24% in 2014 to 36% in 2015. About 30% reported learning about the ADRC from informal sources spread evenly among family, friends, and word of mouth. Referrals from hospitals/clinics/primary care declined somewhat from 12% in Round 4 to 8% during the past year, and referrals from brochures and fliers had a slight increase. Other sources remain similar. Across all years, about 9% of participants could not recall how they learned about the ADRC (Table 2.1¹).

It is notable that in the first year of the survey, 20% reported learning about the ADRC through the media. By Round 2, the percentage declined to 2% where it remained in 2015. “Other” sources reported by participants included already being aware of the ADRC because they work or have worked in social services, or have been a caregiver. Some participants indicated that someone from the ADRC contact them.

Access

Call Center. The ADRC Call Center is the “front door” into the aging and disabilities service system. As with previous surveys, most participants in 2015 (61%) came into contact with the ADRC by phone (Table 2.2). Of those, 65% reported that the phone was answered by a person (Table 2.3). This is down from 72% in 2014. More reached an automated message system (21%) than in 2014, but the percentage reporting reaching an answering machine stayed about the same (15%).

At the same time, of the 58 participants who did not reach a person with their first call, 26% received a call back on the same day and just over a third received a call back on the next

¹ Tables 2.1 – 2.11 are presented at the end of this report. All tables are presented in Appendix B.

day (Table 2.4). About a third (30%) waited between two and four days for a return call. Only 9% waited five or more days, a substantial decrease in waiting time from prior years; in 2014 14% reported waiting five or more days. Most important, when asked about the response time (Table 2.5), the majority of participants reported that the return call was prompt and timely (55%) or reasonable (41%). Just 4% of respondents reported that the wait time was much too long. For the first time in five years, the standard that “no more than 15% will report the wait is much too long” was met.

ADRC Building. Going to the ADRC building was the initial point of contact for 24% of participants, higher than in previous years (Table 2.6). Additionally, 31% of all participants reported that they have been to the ADRC building at least once. Of those, 94% reported the building being somewhat or very easy to find. Similarly, 89% reported that the ADRC building was in a convenient location (Table 2.7). Most people going to the ADRC received assistance promptly; 50% within 5 minutes and 40% between 5 and 20 minutes (Table 2.8). The vast majority (96%) reported their wait time to be prompt or reasonable (Table 2.9). Very few reported needing to arrange another time to visit the ADRC or that they did not see anyone at all. Comments about ease of access and wait time included:

I do think one factor that made it accessible is that there was a nice sized parking lot, and I was able to park and enter easily.

If I have transportation, it is very convenient.

I knew where it was.

We were in our power chairs and had to go on the main road.

It is important to keep in mind that the ADRC was most convenient if a person lived close, had transportation, and had prior experience with the building. Some other participants made comments that suggest reasons why more people may not choose to go to the ADRC including the distance of the building from where they live, “it is about 20 miles away, so we have to plan our trip”, and difficulty accessing the building once they arrived, “I could barely walk to the building.”

Website. The proportion of survey participants using the ADRC website remains low. As reported in Table 2.1, just 6% of participants first learned about the ADRC through the Internet. Twenty percent reported ever visiting the ADRC website, an increase over previous years (Table 2.10). Of those who did, 23% used it only once. The majority (82%) of those who did use the website, however, reported it was somewhat or very easy to use. It is possible that people use the website and are able to get services on their own; they are not reflected in this sample.

Contacting the ADRC. Most participants indicated that it would be very easy (71%) or somewhat easy (19%) to contact the ADRC again (Table 2.11).

Conclusions and Recommendations

Nearly 50% of referrals to the ADRC came from agencies, hospitals, and clinics, an increase from 2014, indicating that outreach efforts to partner with these organizations continue to be successful.

Access to services has improved over time. The ADRC Advisory Committee established consumer-based standards and expectations for accessing services. These standards were met in 2015. Furthermore, although the number of respondents reaching a person when they contacted the ADRC decreased in 2015, a greater number of consumers and family members alike indicated that the wait time for a return call was prompt or reasonable, an improvement from 70% in 2014 to 96% in 2015. This is significant progress. It is important to note, however, that these data do not reflect consumers who reached a voice mail or automated system and did not leave a message.

Recommendations include:

- Continue outreach to health and social service providers.
- Continue efforts improve response time for returning telephone calls.
- Outreach efforts through news media, and awareness of ADRC services through brochure distribution continue to be low relative to other sources. Increase media outreach to consumers, including information about the website, and distribute print material more widely.
- Increase training efforts to help older adults and people with disabilities learn to use the website.

Part 2. Pathways to the ADRC

Table 2.1 How did you first learn about the ADRC?

	Round 1 (n=247)	Round 2 (n=303)	Round 3 (n=298)	Round 4 (n=283)	Round 5 (n=302)
Referral from another agency	11%	21%	23%	24%	36%
Family ^a	1%	8%	8%	11%	11%
Friend	15%	13%	16%	13%	10%
Recommendation/word of mouth	4%	6%	6%	1%	10%
Hospital/clinic/doctor/nurse	13%	9%	8%	12%	8%
Brochure/flyer	6%	5%	3%	4%	7%
Internet	4%	6%	6%	6%	6%
Phone book ^b	7%	2%	2%	1%	3%
Nursing home/assisted living	4%	2%	3%	2%	-
Media/newspaper/TV/radio	20%	2%	3%	2%	2%
Other (please specify)	15%	20%	22%	24%	11%

Note: 8- 9% each year reported that they did not know.

^aFamily somewhat more likely to report this source than consumers in 2015.

^bConsumers somewhat more likely to report this source than family members in 2015.

Table 2.2 How did you first come in contact with the ADRC?

	Round 1 (n=230)	Round 2 (n=87)	Round 3 (n=283)	Round 4 (n=291)	Round 5 (n=322)
By telephone	66%	59%	60%	62%	61%
Went to the office, in person	17%	21%	16%	16%	24%
They called me	6%	12%	7%	12%	11%
Through the website	1%	1%	3%	1%	2%
Other (please specify)	9%	8%	14%	10%	3%

Table 2.3 [For those whose first contact was by phone] When you called the ADRC, was the phone answered by...

	2011-2012 (n=134)	2012 (n=146)	2013 (n=144)	2014 (n= 153)	2015 (n= 164)
A person	63%	66%	69%	72%	65%
An answering machine	12%	17%	10%	13%	15%
An automated message system	25%	17%	21%	15%	21%

Table 2.4. When did someone from the ADRC get back to you?

	2011-2012 (n=44)	2012 (n=48)	2013 (n=47)	2014 (n=42)	2015 (n=57)
Response categories in 2011-2012					
On the same day	20%				
In the same week	68%				
More than a week	11%				
Response categories in 2012-2015					
On the same day		15%	21%	32%	26%
The next day		42%	45%	22%	35%
2 to 4 days		29%	23%	32%	30%
5 or more days		15%	11%	14%	9%

Note: Family members (43%) were significantly more likely to get a return call on the same day than consumers (26%) in 2014.

Table 2.5 Do you think that the ADRC's response time was . . .

	2011-2012 (n= 48)	2012 (n=49)	2013 (n=48)	2014 (n=40)	2015 (n=59)
Prompt and timely	23%	35%	46%	40%	55%
Some wait, but was reasonable	48%	45%	38%	30%	41%
Much too long	29%	21%	17%	30%	4%

Note: The standard is that no more than 15% will report the wait is much too long.

Table 2.6 Did you ever go to the ADRC building?

	2011-2012 (n=207)	2012 (n=245)	2013 (n=251)	2014 (n= 259)	2015 (n=249)
Yes ^a	39%	41%	32%	34%	31%
If yes, how easy was it to find?	n=118	n=150	n=120	n=129	n=149
Very difficult	1%	2%	--	5%	2%
A little difficult	8%	11%	9%	9%	4%
Somewhat easy	20%	16%	12%	12%	15%
Very easy	72%	71%	78%	74%	79%

Note: Standard is 90% will report the ADRC is somewhat or very easy to find.

Table 2.7 How convenient was it for you to go to the ADRC?

	2011-2012 (n=120)	2012 (n=155)	2013 (n=123)	2014 (n=129)	2015 (n=147)
Not at all convenient	7%	4%	3%	5%	6%
Not that convenient	14%	8%	9%	7%	5%
Somewhat convenient	24%	27%	31%	30%	26%
Very convenient	55%	61%	57%	58%	63%

Note: Standard is 85% report that it was somewhat or very convenient to go to the ADRC.

Table 2.8 When you first went to the ADRC, how long did you have to wait to see someone?

	2011-2012 (n=121)	2012 (n=152)	2013 (n=120)	2014 (n=129)	2015 (n=145)
Less than 5 minutes	34%	42%	38%	43%	50%
Between 5 and 20 minutes	46%	43%	49%	41%	40%
Longer than 20 minutes	11%	7%	10%	11%	6%
I had to arrange another time to come back	3%	3%	2%	1%	1%
I did not see anyone	2%	5%	2%	4%	3%

Note: Standards are that 40% report that they waited less than 5 minutes to see someone and no more than 10% report waiting more than 20 minutes to see someone.

Table 2.9. Do you think that your wait time to see someone was...

	2011-2012 (n=114)	2012 (n=142)	2013 (n=117)	2014 (n=124)	2015 (n=139)
Short and timely	43%	50%	50%	40%	55%
Some wait, but was reasonable	53%	46%	45%	52%	41%
Much too long	4%	4%	5%	8%	4%

Note: Standard is fewer than 10% report it took "much too long" to see someone.

Table 2.10 ADRC website

	2011-2012 (n=243)	2012 (n=296)	2013 (n=280)	2014 (n=301)	2015 (n=322)
Participants using the website	n=31; 13%	n=31; 10%	n=44; 16%	n=41; 14%	n=64; 20%
Number of times participants used the website	(n=31)	(n=30)	(n=51)	(n=43)	(n=66)
1 time	29%	20%	33%	33%	23%
2 to 3 times	55%	43%	37%	35%	48%
More than 3 times	16%	37%	29%	33%	29%
Ease of using the website	(n=28)	(n=27)	(n=51)	(n=40)	(n=63)
Very difficult			10%	5%	-3%
A little difficult	14%	7%	12%	15%	14%
Somewhat easy	32%	48%	35%	42%	41%
Very easy	54%	44%	43%	38%	41%

Table 2.11 If you needed to contact ADRC, how easy would that be?

	2011-2012 (n=241)	2012 (n=291)	2013 (n=291)	2014 (n=300)	2015 (n=316)
Very difficult	12%	6%	5%	3%	3%
Somewhat difficult	17%	12%	8%	9%	8%
Somewhat easy	22%	15%	19%	17%	19%
Very easy	49%	67%	68%	71%	71%

Note: Standard is that 75% of consumers report that it would be easy or very easy to contact the ADRC again.