

# Staff Stability Survey Report 2014



A COLLABORATION OF

The National Association of State Directors  
of Developmental Disabilities Services and  
Human Services Research Institute

[www.nationalcoreindicators.org](http://www.nationalcoreindicators.org)

---

## CONTACT INFORMATION

---

For information on the NCI Staff Stability Survey or the Survey Report, please contact:

Dorothy Hiersteiner  
Human Services Research Institute  
[dhiersteiner@hsri.org](mailto:dhiersteiner@hsri.org)

## Contents

<b>Summary of Aggregated Results</b> .....	2
<b>Results of the National Core Indicators Staff Stability Survey 2014</b> .....	5
How many provider agencies responded to our survey? .....	5
What size are these provider agencies, and how many DSPs do they represent?.....	5
What types of services do they provide?.....	6
Residential Supports .....	6
In-Home Supports .....	7
Non-Residential Supports .....	8
How many adults with ID/DD do they serve?.....	10
Residential Supports .....	10
In-Home Supports .....	10
Non-Residential Supports .....	11
What are the characteristics of the provider agencies that responded to our survey?.....	12
Tenure of DSP Employees .....	13
Turnover Rates .....	14
Vacancy Rates .....	15
Wages .....	16
What types of benefits do responding agencies offer to DSPs?.....	23
What types of recruitment and retention strategies do respondents use?.....	27
<b>Why Do We Conduct the Staff Stability Survey?</b> .....	28
The need for DSP workforce data .....	28
<b>Contact Information</b> .....	29

## Summary of Aggregated Results

Nine states and the District of Columbia participated in the National Core Indicators (NCI) Staff Stability Survey 2014:

Arizona (AZ)	Ohio (OH)
Washington, D.C. (DC)	South Carolina (SC)
Georgia (GA)	Texas (TX)
Kentucky (KY)	Utah (UT)
Maine (ME)	Vermont (VT)

A total of 673 provider agencies completed the survey from these states, and data gathered in this survey cycle refer to the period between January 1, 2014 and December 31, 2014.

### Types of services provided

Among the provider agencies who responded to our survey:

- **77%** reported providing **residential supports** such as ICF/ID facilities, group homes, and supported living services. A total of 28,284 adults were supported by responding residential supports providers.
- **59%** reported providing **in-home supports** such as homemaker/personal care services, in-home habilitation, and in-home respite. A total of 13,348 adults were supported by responding in-home supports providers.
- **76%** reported providing **non-residential supports** such as supported employment supports, facility-based employment supports, and out-of-home habilitation and/or respite. A total of 38,618 adults were supported by responding non-residential supports providers.

In terms of the agencies' organization types, 12% were public or government; 37% were private, for-profit; and 51% were private, nonprofit.

A full 99% of responding provider agencies said they require criminal background checks before hiring employees.

### Tenure

Of the Direct Support Professionals (DSPs) employed at responding agencies as of December 31, 2014:

- 19% had been employed for less than 6 months.
- 17% had been employed between 6 and 12 months.
- 63% had been employed for more than 12 months.

Of the DSPs who left employment at responding agencies between January 1, 2014 and December 31, 2014:

- 37% had been employed for less than 6 months.
- 22% had been employed between 6 and 12 months.
- 41% had been employed for more than 12 months.

Across responding agencies, the turnover rate for DSPs in 2014 was 45%.

## Vacancy Rates

Of the provider agencies that responded to our survey, 90% distinguish between full- and part-time DSP positions; among those who do, vacancy rates were 7% for full-time positions and 13% for part-time positions.

## Wages

Across all participating states and service types, DSPs received an average hourly wage of \$11.11. Broken out by service type, average hourly wages were:

- \$10.55 for DSPs providing residential supports.
- \$10.93 for DSPs providing in-home supports.
- \$11.10 for DSPs providing non-residential supports.

Broken out by organization type, average hourly wages were:

- \$11.39 for DSPs working at public or government-funded provider agencies.
- \$11.08 for DSPs working at private, for-profit provider agencies.
- \$11.19 for DSPs working for private, nonprofit provider agencies.

## Benefits

In terms of benefits that responding agencies offer to all DSPs (both full-time and part-time DSPs):

- 43% offer paid sick time:
  - 24% offer it as paid time off (defined as a bank of hours in which the employer pools sick, vacation, and personal days together).
  - 19% offer it as paid sick time.
- 43% offer paid vacation time:
  - 24% offer it as paid time off.
  - 19% offer it as paid vacation time.
- 30% offer paid personal time off:
  - 24% offer it as paid time off.
  - 6% offer it as paid personal time.

Across all participating states, 63% of responding agencies provided health insurance to only full-time DSPs; 55% provided dental coverage to only full-time DSPs; and 43% provided vision coverage to only full-time DSPs.

Across all participating states, a large proportion of agencies (66%) offered employer-paid job-related training and 62% offered life insurance.

## Recruitment and Retention

Three-quarters (76%) of responding agencies reported offering a realistic job preview to candidates, and 43% reported using a direct support professional ladder to retain highly skilled workers in DSP roles. DSPs at 87% of responding agencies are trained on and required to sign a Code of Ethics.

## Notes on Interpreting the Data in This Report

- **Only three states—Kentucky, Ohio, and Vermont—achieved the number of responses necessary to be considered representative of their state’s workforce and provider community (95% confidence interval and 5% margin of error). The data from the other states cannot be considered representative, so we recommend caution in making comparisons or inferences.**
- In the text and tables within this report, “average” refers to the average of the state averages.
- Please consider the Ns (numbers of responding providers) for each survey question as you examine the data.

## Results of the National Core Indicators Staff Stability Survey 2014

### How many provider agencies responded to our survey?

A total of 673 surveys were included in this report. However, not every respondent answered every question, so we provide a **Number of Responses (N)** figure for each state on each question.

Surveys were excluded from our analysis if:

- The provider agency reported that it did not provide any of the targeted service types; or
- The provider agency reported that it did not employ DSPs.

A total of **120 surveys were excluded.**

### Sample Sizes

	Number of responses*	Valid responses**	Total number of providers	Response rate	Meets 95% confidence interval and 5% margin of error	# Responses needed to reach 95% confidence interval and 5% margin of error^
AZ	49	42	363	13%		187
DC	31	25	94	33%		76
GA	51	44	368	14%		189
KY	163	147	204	80%	YES	134
ME	18	16	84	21%		70
OH	365	292	1766	21%	YES	316
SC	16	15	57	28%		50
TX	53	49	535***	10%		N/A
UT	31	28	97	32%		78
VT	16	15	16	100%	YES	16

\*Please note that the following cases were deleted and not included in this column: Those that had logged in to the data entry system but had answered no questions

\*\*Please note that the following cases were considered invalid: Those that reported providing no services and those that reported employing no DSPs

\*\*\*TX provided NCI with a list of provider email addresses that represented about 40% of all providers in the state.

^ calculated using <http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html>

### What size are these provider agencies, and how many DSPs do they represent?

The provider agencies that responded represent a mix of agency sizes. A large proportion (43%) employ 61 or more DSPs. Small agencies represented the second-largest proportion: 32.5% employ 20 or fewer DSPs.

Size of Provider (based on number of DSPs)

	Small (1-20 DSPs)	Medium (21-40 DSPs)	Large (41-60 DSPs)	Extra Large (61+ DSPs)	Number of Responses (N=673)
AZ	31.0%	11.9%	14.3%	42.9%	42
DC	32.0%	16.0%	4.0%	48.0%	25
GA	40.9%	20.5%	13.6%	25.0%	44
KY	40.1%	25.2%	11.6%	23.1%	147
ME	18.8%	6.3%	18.8%	56.3%	16
OH	54.8%	14.7%	5.1%	25.3%	292
SC	20.0%			80.0%	15
TX	34.7%	14.3%	18.4%	32.7%	49
UT	46.4%	14.3%	10.7%	28.6%	28
VT	6.7%	20.0%	6.7%	66.7%	15
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>32.5%</b>	<b>14.3%</b>	<b>10.3%</b>	<b>42.9%</b>	


What types of services do they provide?

Of the respondents to our survey, 77% reported providing residential supports—living accommodations, services and supports provided to a person outside of the family home. The service categories listed below are not mutually exclusive; that is, we asked provider agencies to identify all services they provide.

Residential Supports

	% of Respondents That Provide Residential Supports	Number of Responses
AZ	66.7%	42
DC	88.0%	25
GA	63.6%	44
KY	68.7%	147
ME	87.5%	16
OH	71.1%	291
SC	86.7%	15
TX	81.6%	49
UT	57.1%	28
VT	100.0%	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>77.1%</b>	<b>672</b>

Types of Residential Supports Provided





Proportion of Responding Agencies Providing Residential Services: Breakout by State and Type

	ICF/IID, 4-6 Residents	ICF/IID, 7-15 Residents	ICF/IID, 16+ Residents	Other Specialized Institutional Facility	Group Home 1-3* or agency- operated apartment	Group Home 4-6*	Group Home 7-15*	Supported Living Services	Other	Number of Responses (N=484)
AZ		3.6%	3.6%	3.6%	46.4%	32.1%	7.1%	32.1%	17.9%	28
DC	31.8%				22.7%	22.7%		81.8%	36.4%	22
GA					46.4%	35.7%	10.7%	32.1%	39.3%	28
KY		1.0%	5.0%		52.5%	4.0%	5.9%	37.6%	27.7%	101
ME	14.3%	7.1%	7.1%	7.1%	85.7%	64.3%	7.1%	57.1%	14.3%	14
OH	6.8%	12.6%	11.6%	1.4%	29.5%	22.7%	8.2%	62.8%	13.5%	207
SC	23.1%	38.5%		15.4%	23.1%	84.6%	46.2%	76.9%	15.4%	13
TX	27.5%	20.0%	2.5%	2.5%	50.0%	52.5%	7.5%	62.5%	22.5%	40
UT					62.5%	37.5%	6.3%	75.0%	25.0%	16
VT	6.7%				33.3%	33.3%		86.7%	33.3%	15
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>11.0%</b>	<b>8.3%</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>45.2%</b>	<b>38.9%</b>	<b>9.9%</b>	<b>60.5%</b>	<b>24.5%</b>	

\*Number of people with disabilities living in the home.


The survey also asked about "Out of home respite." "Other" responses include: Host homes, shared living and foster care.

Of all responding agencies, 59% provide In-Home Supports—supports provided to a person in his or her own independent home or in the home of a family member, including respite.

**In-Home Supports**

	<b>% of Respondents That Provide In-Home Supports</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>
<b>AZ</b>	59.5%	42
<b>DC</b>	36.0%	25
<b>GA</b>	50.0%	44
<b>KY</b>	51.0%	145
<b>ME</b>	50.0%	16
<b>OH</b>	69.3%	287
<b>SC</b>	50.0%	14
<b>TX</b>	83.7%	49
<b>UT</b>	46.4%	28
<b>VT</b>	93.3%	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>58.9%</b>	<b>665</b>

**Types of In-Home Supports Provided**



Of those providing in-home supports, the following table presents the proportions of responding agencies that provide each type. These categories are not mutually exclusive.

**Proportion of Responding Agencies Providing In-Home Supports: Breakout by State and Type**

	<b>Homemaker/Personal Care Services</b>	<b>Personal Care Aide</b>	<b>In-Home Habilitation</b>	<b>In-Home Respite</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Number of Responses (N=412)</b>
<b>AZ</b>	44.0%	44.0%	96.0%	92.0%	24.0%	25
<b>DC</b>	11.1%	33.3%	66.7%	66.7%	11.1%	9
<b>GA</b>	68.2%	63.6%	4.5%	22.7%	18.2%	22
<b>KY</b>	54.1%	31.1%	6.8%	45.9%	23.0%	74
<b>ME</b>	62.5%	37.5%	25.0%	12.5%	25.0%	8
<b>OH</b>	91.0%	24.6%	3.5%	13.6%	6.0%	199
<b>SC</b>	14.3%	28.6%	42.9%	85.7%	14.3%	7
<b>TX</b>	46.3%	43.9%	58.5%	70.7%	17.1%	41
<b>UT</b>	46.2%	30.8%	23.1%	30.8%	15.4%	13
<b>VT</b>	35.7%	35.7%	57.1%	57.1%	21.4%	14
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>47.3%</b>	<b>37.3%</b>	<b>38.4%</b>	<b>49.8%</b>	<b>17.6%</b>	


“Other” responses include: medication monitoring and behavior supports.

Of the provider agencies that responded to our survey, 76% provide non-residential supports and services (supports provided outside an individual’s home—such as adult day program services and community supports; supports to help individuals who are looking for work or on the job for which they are paid—for example, work supports).

**Non-Residential Supports**

	<b>% of Respondents That Provide Non- Residential Supports</b>	<b>Number of Responses</b>
<b>AZ</b>	70.7%	41
<b>DC</b>	36.0%	25
<b>GA</b>	76.7%	43
<b>KY</b>	83.0%	147
<b>ME</b>	75.0%	16
<b>OH</b>	53.0%	285
<b>SC</b>	100.0%	15
<b>TX</b>	77.6%	49
<b>UT</b>	89.3%	28
<b>VT</b>	100.0%	15
<b>Total</b>	<b>76.1%</b>	<b>664</b>

**Types of Non-Residential Supports Provided**



Of those providing non-residential supports, the following table presents the percentages that provide each type. These categories are not mutually exclusive.

Proportion of Responding Agencies Providing Non-Residential Supports: Breakout by State and Type

	Community-based Supported Employment	Community-based Group Employment	Community-based Non-Work, Individual	Community-based Non-Work, Group	Facility-based Employment	Facility-based Non-Work	Out-of-home Habilitation	Out-of-home Respite	Other	Number of Responses (N=449)
<b>AZ</b>	37.9%	37.9%	13.8%	6.9%	24.1%	41.4%	37.9%	55.2%	13.8%	29
<b>DC</b>	44.4%	11.1%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	44.4%	33.3%	11.1%	11.1%	9
<b>GA</b>	69.7%	39.4%	72.7%	63.6%	42.4%	51.5%	9.1%	12.1%	12.1%	33
<b>KY</b>	35.2%	2.5%	36.1%	9.0%	16.4%	43.4%	13.1%	31.1%	10.7%	122
<b>ME</b>	41.7%	25.0%	41.7%	41.7%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	8.3%	16.7%	12
<b>OH</b>	47.0%	18.5%	22.5%	23.8%	44.4%	53.6%	15.9%	16.6%	8.6%	151
<b>SC</b>	53.3%	46.7%	6.7%	13.3%	86.7%	66.7%	13.3%	13.3%	6.7%	15
<b>TX</b>	55.3%	10.5%	18.4%	13.2%	34.2%	47.4%	57.9%	42.1%	13.2%	38
<b>UT</b>	84.0%	24.0%	28.0%	12.0%	32.0%	44.0%	8.0%	12.0%	0.0%	25
<b>VT</b>	100.0%	6.7%	100.0%	20.0%	0.0%	13.3%	6.7%	53.3%	0.0%	15
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>56.9%</b>	<b>22.2%</b>	<b>37.3%</b>	<b>23.7%</b>	<b>37.6%</b>	<b>45.6%</b>	<b>21.7%</b>	<b>25.5%</b>	<b>9.3%</b>	

“Other” responses include: Volunteer opportunities for adults with ID/DD; field trips.

## How many adults with ID/DD do they serve?

All told, responding agencies provide **residential supports** to a total of 28,284 adults with ID/DD.

### Numbers Served: Size and Total of Populations Served With Residential Supports

	<b>1-10 Adults</b>	<b>11-20 Adults</b>	<b>21-50 Adults</b>	<b>51-99 Adults</b>	<b>100+ Adults</b>	<b>Total Adults Served</b>	<b>Number of Responses (N=455)</b>
<b>AZ</b>	41.7%	12.5%	8.3%	8.3%	29.2%	1568	24
<b>DC</b>	38.1%	19.0%	19.0%	19.0%	4.8%	659	21
<b>GA</b>	39.3%	17.9%	10.7%	25.0%	7.1%	1071	28
<b>KY</b>	23.4%	22.3%	33.0%	14.9%	6.4%	3486	94
<b>ME</b>	7.1%	28.6%	28.6%	35.7%	0.0%	547	14
<b>OH</b>	47.2%	7.7%	17.4%	10.8%	16.9%	10687	195
<b>SC</b>	7.7%	0.0%	15.4%	46.2%	30.8%	1423	13
<b>TX</b>	11.1%	8.3%	36.1%	22.2%	22.2%	5530	36
<b>UT</b>	13.3%	13.3%	33.3%	6.7%	33.3%	1738	15
<b>VT</b>	6.7%	13.3%	26.7%	13.3%	40.0%	1575	15
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>23.6%</b>	<b>14.3%</b>	<b>22.9%</b>	<b>20.2%</b>	<b>19.1%</b>		
<b>TOTAL SERVED</b>						<b>28,284</b>	

Responding agencies provide **in-home supports** to a total of 13,348 adults with ID/DD.

### Numbers Served: Size and Total of Populations Served With In-Home Supports

	<b>1-10 Adults</b>	<b>11-20 Adults</b>	<b>21-50 Adults</b>	<b>51-99 Adults</b>	<b>100+ Adults</b>	<b>Total Adults Served</b>	<b>Number of Responses (N=366)</b>
<b>AZ</b>	29.2%	16.7%	25.0%	12.5%	16.7%	2652	24
<b>DC</b>	66.7%	22.2%	11.1%		0.0%	87	9
<b>GA</b>	35.0%	30.0%	30.0%	5.0%	0.0%	367	20
<b>KY</b>	64.1%	12.5%	17.2%	4.7%	1.6%	1133	64
<b>ME</b>	62.5%	37.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	59	8
<b>OH</b>	60.5%	12.4%	10.7%	7.3%	9.0%	5204	177
<b>SC</b>	14.3%	14.3%	57.1%	14.3%	0.0%	190	7
<b>TX</b>	24.2%	15.2%	15.2%	12.1%	33.3%	2622	33
<b>UT</b>	45.5%	9.1%	36.4%	0.0%	9.1%	342	11
<b>VT</b>	23.1%	23.1%	30.8%	7.7%	15.4%	692	13
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>42.5%</b>	<b>19.3%</b>	<b>23.3%</b>	<b>6.4%</b>	<b>8.5%</b>		
<b>TOTAL SERVED</b>						<b>13,348</b>	

Responding agencies provide **non-residential supports** to a total of 38,618 adults with ID/DD.

Numbers Served: Size and Total of Populations Served With Non-Residential Supports

	<b>1-10 Adults</b>	<b>11-20 Adults</b>	<b>21-50 Adults</b>	<b>51-99 Adults</b>	<b>100+ Adults</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Number of Responses (N=400)</b>
<b>AZ</b>	18.5%	29.6%	18.5%	11.1%	22.2%	2032	27
<b>DC</b>	14.3%	14.3%	42.9%	28.6%	0.0%	243	7
<b>GA</b>	15.6%	12.5%	15.6%	15.6%	40.6%	2841	32
<b>KY</b>	28.0%	15.9%	25.2%	17.8%	13.1%	7566	107
<b>ME</b>	25.0%	8.3%	16.7%	25.0%	25.0%	652	12
<b>OH</b>	32.6%	6.8%	22.7%	13.6%	24.2%	13113	132
<b>SC</b>	7.1%	0.0%	7.1%	28.6%	57.1%	2401	14
<b>TX</b>	9.7%	12.9%	12.9%	25.8%	38.7%	5640	31
<b>UT</b>	16.7%	16.7%	12.5%	12.5%	41.7%	2329	24
<b>VT</b>	7.1%	0.0%	21.4%	28.6%	42.9%	1801	14
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>17.5%</b>	<b>11.7%</b>	<b>19.6%</b>	<b>20.7%</b>	<b>30.6%</b>		
<b>TOTAL SERVED</b>						<b>38,618</b>	

## What are the characteristics of the provider agencies that responded to our survey?

### Agency Type

	Public or Government	Private For-profit	Private Nonprofit	Number of Responses (N=657)
AZ	7.1%	35.7%	57.1%	42
DC	4.2%	58.3%	37.5%	24
GA	27.9%	27.9%	44.2%	43
KY	3.5%	68.1%	28.5%	144
ME	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	16
OH	13.1%	53.2%	33.7%	282
SC	26.7%	0.0%	73.3%	15
TX	31.3%	52.1%	16.7%	48
UT	3.6%	53.6%	42.9%	28
VT	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	15
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>11.7%</b>	<b>37.4%</b>	<b>50.9%</b>	

Nearly all (98%) reported that they conduct background checks on DSPs.

### Conduct Criminal Background Checks

	Requires Criminal Background Check Before Hiring	Number of Responses (N=664)
AZ	95.2%	42
DC	100.0%	24
GA	100.0%	43
KY	100.0%	144
ME	100.0%	16
OH	99.7%	288
SC	100.0%	15
TX	100.0%	49
UT	92.9%	28
VT	100.0%	15
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>98.8%</b>	

Tenure—Current DSP Employees (as of December 31, 2014)

	# of DSPs Employed	Less Than 6 Months of Tenure	6-12 Months of Tenure	More than 12 Months of Tenure
<b>AZ</b>	6419	19.1%	16.4%	63.4%
N*	42	32	31	34
<b>DC</b>	2165	12.6%	24.7%	62.0%
N*	25	19	18	21
<b>GA</b>	2167	14.3%	17.7%	68.6%
N*	44	34	39	36
<b>KY</b>	7280	20.0%	15.9%	61.5%
N*	147	122	125	134
<b>ME</b>	1550	12.0%	11.1%	76.5%
N*	16	14	14	14
<b>OH</b>	24276	21.6%	13.9%	64.8%
N*	292	193	185	243
<b>SC</b>	2412	13.7%	14.4%	63.8%
N*	15	14	15	15
<b>TX</b>	3674	22.5%	18.3%	59.4%
N*	49	36	39	41
<b>UT</b>	3160	33.5%	20.3%	46.3%
N*	28	22	22	26
<b>VT</b>	1505	19.3%	13.1%	66.2%
N*	15	14	14	14
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>54608</b>	<b>AVERAGE: 18.9%</b>	<b>16.6%</b>	<b>63.3%</b>
N*	<b>673</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>578</b>

\*N = Number of responses



Tenure—Separated DSP Employees (Left Between Jan. 1, 2014 and Dec. 31, 2014)

	# of DSPs Separated	Less than 6 Months of Tenure	6-12 Months of Tenure	More Than 12 Months of Tenure
<b>AZ</b>	2836	43.9%	30.0%	25.4%
N*	37	28	27	24
<b>DC</b>	465	31.0%	29.3%	43.2%
N*	25	16	17	17
<b>GA</b>	943	38.8%	20.3%	42.8%
N*	41	27	27	29
<b>KY</b>	2773	42.0%	22.9%	38.4%
N*	146	103	99	99
<b>ME</b>	524	29.5%	14.8%	55.9%
N*	15	13	12	13
<b>OH</b>	9706	32.6%	20.3%	42.8%
N*	281	166	144	170
<b>SC</b>	778	26.3%	25.2%	49.2%
N*	15	13	11	11
<b>TX</b>	1940	49.8%	19.0%	33.5%
N*	47	31	29	30
<b>UT</b>	2533	48.5%	24.3%	27.7%
N*	28	18	18	20
<b>VT</b>	500	29.5%	15.6%	55.5%
N*	15	14	14	13
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>22998</b>	<b>AVERAGE: 37.2%</b>	<b>22.2%</b>	<b>41.4%</b>
N*	<b>650</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>426</b>

\*N = Number of responses

Turnover Rates for DSPs

State	# of DSPs on Payroll	# of DSPs Separated in Last 12 Months	Turnover Rate	Number of Responses
<b>AZ</b>	4752	2836	59.7%	37
<b>DC</b>	2165	465	21.5%	25
<b>GA</b>	2084	943	45.2%	41
<b>KY</b>	7171	2773	38.7%	146
<b>ME</b>	1290	524	40.6%	15
<b>OH</b>	23752	9706	40.9%	281
<b>SC</b>	2412	778	32.3%	15
<b>TX</b>	3597	1940	53.9%	47
<b>UT</b>	3160	2533	80.2%	28
<b>VT</b>	1505	500	33.2%	15
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>51888</b>	<b>22998</b>	<b>AVERAGE: 44.6%</b>	<b>650</b>

### Distinguish Between Full-Time and Part-Time DSP Positions

	% That Distinguish Between Full- and Part-Time Positions	Number of Responses
AZ	75.6%	41
DC	95.8%	24
GA	88.6%	44
KY	83.0%	147
ME	100.0%	15
OH	84.7%	287
SC	93.3%	15
TX	91.1%	45
UT	89.3%	28
VT	100.0%	15
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>90.1%</b>	<b>661</b>

### Full-time DSP Positions and Vacancy Rates

	# Full-Time DSPs Employed	# Full-Time Position Vacancies	Total # Full-Time DSP Positions	Full-Time Vacancy Rate*	Number of Responses
AZ	2340	253	2593	9.8%	30
DC	1255	38	1293	2.9%	23
GA	1159	93	1252	7.4%	38
KY	4746	322	5068	6.4%	122
ME	956	72	1028	7.0%	15
OH	12699	931	13630	6.8%	231
SC	1234	72	1306	5.5%	13
TX	2277	309	2586	11.9%	41
UT	1614	131	1745	7.5%	25
VT	637	41	678	6.0%	13
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>28917</b>	<b>2262</b>	<b>31179</b>	<b>AVERAGE: 7.1%</b>	<b>551</b>

\*Vacant positions/total number of full-time direct support positions

### Part-Time DSP Positions and Vacancy Rates

	# Part-Time DSPs Employed	# Part-Time Position Vacancies	Total # Part-Time DSP Positions	Part-Time Vacancy Rate*	Number of Responses
AZ	1377	89	1466	6.1%	29
DC	521	44	565	7.8%	22
GA	709	110	819	13.4%	38
KY	888	231	1119	20.6%	121
ME	220	50	270	18.5%	15
OH	8310	1200	9510	12.6%	231
SC	533	65	598	10.9%	13
TX	1000	219	1219	18.0%	41
UT	1538	227	1765	12.9%	25
VT	430	39	469	8.3%	13
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15526</b>	<b>2274</b>	<b>17800</b>	<b>AVERAGE: 12.9%</b>	<b>548</b>

\*Vacant positions/total number of part-time direct support positions

Wages

		Average Starting Hourly Wage	Average Hourly Wage	State Minimum Hourly Wage
<b>AZ</b>	Mean	\$9.05	\$9.62	\$7.90
	N*	17	19	
<b>DC</b>	Mean	\$13.68	\$13.70	\$9.50
	N*	10	10	
<b>GA</b>	Mean	\$11.32	\$12.31	\$7.25
	N*	21	23	
<b>KY</b>	Mean	\$10.16	\$10.88	\$7.25
	N*	66	63	
<b>ME</b>	Mean	\$9.45	\$10.51	\$7.50
	N*	8	8	
<b>OH</b>	Mean	\$9.78	\$10.96	\$7.95
	N*	132	150	
<b>SC</b>	Mean	\$9.98	\$10.27	\$7.25
	N*	9	8	
<b>TX</b>	Mean	\$9.18	\$9.90	\$7.25
	N*	34	35	
<b>UT</b>	Mean	\$9.09	\$10.18	\$7.25
	N*	16	17	
<b>VT</b>	Mean	\$11.84	\$12.73	\$8.73
	N*	13	13	
<b>AVERAGE</b>		<b>\$10.35</b>	<b>\$11.11</b>	<b>Federal Minimum Hourly Wage: \$7.25</b>
	<b>TOTAL N*</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>346</b>	

\*N = Number of responses

Wages—Residential Services

		Average Starting Hourly Wage	Average Hourly Wage
<b>AZ</b>	Mean	\$9.02	\$9.73
	N*	20	22
<b>DC</b>	Mean	\$13.71	\$13.94
	N*	16	17
<b>GA</b>	Mean	\$9.06	\$9.72
	N*	25	23
<b>KY</b>	Mean	\$8.95	\$9.67
	N*	75	79
<b>ME</b>	Mean	\$9.42	\$10.61
	N*	12	12
<b>OH</b>	Mean	\$9.28	\$10.18
	N*	139	153
<b>SC</b>	Mean	\$9.90	\$10.24
	N*	12	11
<b>TX</b>	Mean	\$8.97	\$9.61
	N*	31	31
<b>UT</b>	Mean	\$8.41	\$9.23
	N*	11	12
<b>VT</b>	Mean	\$11.85	\$12.60
	N*	11	10
<b>AVERAGE</b>		<b>\$9.86</b>	<b>\$10.55</b>
	<b>TOTAL N*</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>370</b>

\*N = Number of responses

Wages—In-Home Supports

State		Average Starting Hourly Wage	Average Hourly Wage
AZ	Mean	\$9.49	\$9.79
	N*	18	20
DC	Mean	\$13.73	\$13.79
	N*	8	9
GA	Mean	\$10.15	\$10.82
	N*	20	20
KY	Mean	\$11.46	\$12.50
	N*	48	50
ME	Mean	\$9.36	\$10.57
	N*	7	7
OH	Mean	\$9.13	\$9.80
	N*	105	111
SC	Mean	\$9.55	\$9.65
	N*	7	7
TX	Mean	\$9.71	\$10.30
	N*	31	31
UT	Mean	\$8.83	\$9.64
	N*	9	9
VT	Mean	\$11.64	\$12.40
	N*	10	9
<b>AVERAGE</b>		<b>\$10.31</b>	<b>\$10.93</b>
	<b>TOTAL N*</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>274</b>

\*N = Number of responses

Wages—Non-residential Supports and Services Outside the Home

State		Average Starting Hourly Wage	Average Hourly Wage
AZ	Mean	\$9.44	\$10.10
	N*	21	23
DC	Mean	\$12.99	\$13.18
	N*	7	7
GA	Mean	\$9.35	\$10.36
	N*	28	25
KY	Mean	\$10.18	\$10.99
	N*	94	94
ME	Mean	\$9.56	\$11.08
	N*	7	7
OH	Mean	\$10.30	\$11.56
	N*	90	95
SC	Mean	\$9.66	\$10.35
	N*	8	7
TX	Mean	\$9.32	\$10.01
	N*	30	29
UT	Mean	\$9.49	\$10.73
	N*	19	21
VT	Mean	\$11.65	\$12.63
	N*	13	13
<b>AVERAGE</b>		<b>\$10.19</b>	<b>\$11.10</b>
	<b>TOTAL N*</b>	<b>317</b>	<b>321</b>

\*N = Number of responses

Wages—On-Site or On-Call Supports

State		Average Starting Hourly Wage	Average Hourly Wage
AZ	Mean	\$8.94	\$9.15
	N*	7	8
DC	Mean	\$13.75	\$13.73
	N*	4	3
GA	Mean	\$10.53	\$12.55
	N*	2	1
KY	Mean	\$9.32	\$9.83
	N*	14	15
ME	Mean	\$9.95	\$10.16
	N*	4	4
OH	Mean	\$8.27	\$8.66
	N*	72	73
SC	Mean	\$9.79	\$9.79
	N*	3	3
TX	Mean	\$8.99	\$13.01
	N*	8	8
UT	Mean	\$8.67	\$9.48
	N*	3	3
VT	Mean	\$13.43	\$13.83
	N*	4	4
<b>AVERAGE</b>		<b>\$10.16</b>	<b>\$11.02</b>
	<b>TOTAL N*</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>122</b>

\*N = Number of responses

Wages—Sleep Rate

State		Average Starting Hourly Wage	Average Hourly Wage
AZ	Mean	\$8.76	\$8.89
	N*	4	5
DC	Mean	\$13.80	\$13.80
	N*	1	1
GA	Mean	\$10.50	\$12.00
	N*	2	2
KY	Mean	\$8.52	\$8.97
	N*	14	16
ME	Mean	\$8.17	\$8.46
	N*	4	4
OH	Mean	\$8.01	\$8.14
	N*	67	69
SC	Mean	\$9.79	\$9.79
	N*	1	1
TX	Mean	\$8.57	\$8.97
	N*	7	7
UT	Mean	\$7.25	\$7.30
	N*	5	5
VT	Mean	\$13.25	\$13.39
	N*	3	3
<b>AVERAGE</b>		<b>\$9.66</b>	<b>\$9.97</b>
	<b>TOTAL N*</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>113</b>

\*N = Number of responses



Wages—By Organization Type

Public or Government (Local)		
		Average Hourly Wage
AZ	Mean	\$9.43
	N*	3
DC	Mean	\$13.60
	N*	1
GA	Mean	\$9.90
	N*	9
KY	Mean	\$10.79
	N*	3
OH	Mean	\$14.44
	N*	15
SC	Mean	\$11.09
	N*	3
TX	Mean	\$10.46
	N*	10
<b>AVERAGE</b>		<b>\$11.39</b>
	<b>TOTAL N*</b>	<b>44</b>

Private For-Profit		
		Average Hourly Wage
AZ	Mean	\$9.32
	N*	6
DC	Mean	\$13.64
	N*	5
GA	Mean	\$13.67
	N*	6
KY	Mean	\$10.69
	N*	43
ME	Mean	\$10.01
	N*	2
OH	Mean	\$10.51
	N*	81
TX	Mean	\$9.75
	N*	16
UT	Mean	\$11.01
	N*	8
<b>AVERAGE</b>		<b>\$11.08</b>
	<b>TOTAL N*</b>	<b>167</b>

Private Nonprofit		
		Average Hourly Wage
AZ	Mean	\$9.85
	N*	10
DC	Mean	\$13.80
	N*	4
GA	Mean	\$13.99
	N*	8
KY	Mean	\$11.36
	N*	17
ME	Mean	\$10.68
	N*	6
OH	Mean	\$10.74
	N*	52
SC	Mean	\$9.78
	N*	5
TX	Mean	\$9.50
	N*	8
UT	Mean	\$9.45
	N*	9
VT	Mean	\$12.73
	N*	13
<b>AVERAGE</b>		<b>\$11.19</b>
	<b>TOTAL N*</b>	<b>132</b>

\*N = Number of responses

## What types of benefits do responding agencies offer to DSPs?

These responses were filtered for only providers that indicated that they differentiated between full-time and part-time employees (N=661). Also, providers that participated in the pilot are not included in these results: Based on findings from the pilot, survey questions were changed for the official rollout.

### Paid Time Off

*“Paid time off” is defined as a bank of hours in which the employer pools sick days, vacation days and personal days together.*

	All DSPs	Only FT DSPs	Only PT DSPs	No DSPs	Don't Know	Number of Responses (N=329)
<b>AZ</b>	33.3%	29.6%	3.7%	33.3%	0.0%	27
<b>DC</b>	38.1%	33.3%	0.0%	28.6%	0.0%	21
<b>GA</b>	10.5%	63.2%	0.0%	23.7%	2.6%	38
<b>KY</b>	25.2%	57.1%	0.8%	15.1%	1.7%	119
<b>ME</b>	46.2%	46.2%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	13
<b>OH</b>	16.3%	55.8%	2.3%	20.9%	4.7%	43
<b>SC</b>	16.7%	83.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12
<b>TX</b>	29.7%	48.6%	0.0%	21.6%	0.0%	37
<b>UT</b>	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	4
<b>VT</b>	20.0%	53.3%	13.3%	13.3%	0.0%	15
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>23.6%</b>	<b>52.0%</b>	<b>2.0%</b>	<b>21.4%</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	

### Paid Sick Time

*Agencies providing ‘paid time off’ were excluded from this calculation.*

	All DSPs	Only FT DSPs	Only PT DSPs	No DSPs	Don't Know	Number of Responses (N=77)
<b>AZ</b>	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	70.0%	0.0%	10
<b>DC</b>	14.3%	28.6%	0.0%	57.1%	0.0%	7
<b>GA</b>	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	70.0%	10.0%	10
<b>KY</b>	25.0%	20.0%	0.0%	50.0%	5.0%	20
<b>ME</b>	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3
<b>OH</b>	15.4%	15.4%	0.0%	53.8%	15.4%	13
<b>SC</b>	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1
<b>TX</b>	11.1%	11.1%	0.0%	77.8%	0.0%	9
<b>UT</b>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	2
<b>VT</b>	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>19.3%</b>	<b>28.8%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>47.9%</b>	<b>3.0%</b>	

### Paid Vacation Time

Agencies providing 'paid time off' were excluded from this calculation.

	All DSPs	Only FT DSPs	Only PT DSPs	No DSPs	Don't Know	Number of Responses (N=76)
AZ	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	70.0%	0.0%	10
DC	0.0%	42.9%	0.0%	57.1%	0.0%	7
GA	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	10
KY	25.0%	15.0%	0.0%	55.0%	5.0%	20
ME	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3
OH	25.0%	16.7%	0.0%	41.7%	16.7%	12
SC	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1
TX	11.1%	22.2%	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	9
UT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	2
VT	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>18.8%</b>	<b>34.0%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>44.1%</b>	<b>2.2%</b>	

### Paid Personal Time

Agencies providing 'paid time off' were excluded from this calculation.

	All DSPs	Only FT DSPs	No DSPs	Don't Know	Number of Responses (N=68)
AZ	0.0%	12.5%	87.5%	0.0%	8
DC	0.0%	14.3%	85.7%	0.0%	7
GA	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	8
KY	5.3%	10.5%	73.7%	10.5%	19
ME	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	2
OH	8.3%	41.7%	33.3%	16.7%	12
SC	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0
TX	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	2
UT	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	2
VT	50.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>6.4%</b>	<b>16.1%</b>	<b>75.6%</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	

### Health Insurance

	All DSPs	Only FT DSPs	Only PT DSPs	No DSPs	Don't know	Number of Responses (N=339)
AZ	6.9%	58.6%	3.4%	31.0%	0.0%	29
DC	18.2%	54.5%	0.0%	27.3%	0.0%	22
GA	10.3%	61.5%	0.0%	28.2%	0.0%	39
KY	15.1%	49.6%	0.0%	33.6%	1.7%	119
ME	6.7%	80.0%	0.0%	13.3%	0.0%	15
OH	6.7%	51.1%	0.0%	40.0%	2.2%	45
SC	15.4%	84.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13
TX	7.9%	71.1%	0.0%	18.4%	2.6%	38
UT	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	75.0%	0.0%	4
VT	0.0%	93.3%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	15
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>8.7%</b>	<b>62.9%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>26.7%</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	

Health Insurance—Dependents Allowed on  
Agency Health Insurance Policies

	Yes	No	Number of Responses (N=426)
AZ	90.0%	10.0%	20
DC	80.0%	20.0%	15
GA	92.9%	7.1%	28
KY	92.6%	7.4%	81
ME	91.7%	8.3%	12
OH	71.2%	28.8%	191
SC	100.0%	0.0%	13
TX	93.5%	6.5%	31
UT	70.0%	30.0%	20
VT	93.3%	6.7%	15
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>87.5%</b>	<b>12.5%</b>	

Dental Insurance

	All DSPs	Only FT DSPs	Only PT DSPs	No DSPs	Don't Know	Number of Responses (N=337)
AZ	14.3%	50.0%	3.6%	32.1%	0.0%	28
DC	18.2%	45.5%	0.0%	36.4%	0.0%	22
GA	7.9%	57.9%	0.0%	34.2%	0.0%	38
KY	20.3%	48.3%	0.0%	28.8%	2.5%	118
ME	13.3%	73.3%	0.0%	13.3%	0.0%	15
OH	10.9%	34.8%	0.0%	52.2%	2.2%	46
SC	23.1%	76.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13
TX	21.1%	55.3%	0.0%	21.1%	2.6%	38
UT	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	75.0%	0.0%	4
VT	6.7%	86.7%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	15
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>13.6%</b>	<b>55.4%</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>29.3%</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	

Vision Insurance

	All DSPs	Only FT DSPs	Only PT DSPs	No DSPs	Don't Know	Number of Responses (N=340)
AZ	10.3%	44.8%	3.4%	41.4%	0.0%	29
DC	18.2%	40.9%	0.0%	40.9%	0.0%	22
GA	7.7%	53.8%	0.0%	38.5%	0.0%	39
KY	18.3%	43.3%	0.0%	36.7%	1.7%	120
ME	20.0%	46.7%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	15
OH	10.9%	26.1%	0.0%	60.9%	2.2%	46
SC	23.1%	69.2%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	13
TX	18.4%	52.6%	0.0%	26.3%	2.6%	38
UT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	4
VT	14.3%	50.0%	0.0%	35.7%	0.0%	14
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>14.1%</b>	<b>42.7%</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>42.1%</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	

## Other Types of Benefits

*These categories are not mutually exclusive.*

	Post-secondary education support*	Unpaid time off	Employer paid job- related training	Employer- sponsored retirement plan	Employer- sponsored disability insurance	Flexible spending account	Health incentive programs	Life Insurance	Other	Number of Responses (N=547)
<b>AZ</b>	10.3%	51.7%	58.6%	44.8%	20.7%	20.7%	13.8%	44.8%	6.9%	29
<b>DC</b>	26.1%	52.2%	56.5%	39.1%	17.4%	8.7%	4.3%	34.8%	17.4%	23
<b>GA</b>	15.4%	53.8%	74.4%	64.1%	41.0%	30.8%	23.1%	61.5%	7.7%	39
<b>KY</b>	26.2%	50.0%	70.5%	53.3%	33.6%	33.6%	19.7%	59.8%	13.1%	122
<b>ME</b>	40.0%	46.7%	73.3%	53.3%	66.7%	20.0%	40.0%	93.3%	20.0%	15
<b>OH</b>	31.9%	51.1%	62.4%	41.9%	25.8%	21.4%	13.1%	56.3%	12.2%	229
<b>SC</b>	30.8%	46.2%	53.8%	92.3%	76.9%	69.2%	23.1%	92.3%	7.7%	13
<b>TX</b>	36.8%	50.0%	63.2%	71.1%	36.8%	34.2%	31.6%	73.7%	18.4%	38
<b>UT</b>	20.8%	58.3%	62.5%	29.2%	12.5%	16.7%	12.5%	20.0%	8.3%	24
<b>VT</b>	33.3%	60.0%	80.0%	86.7%	66.7%	73.3%	66.7%	80.0%	46.7%	15
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>27.2%</b>	<b>52.0%</b>	<b>65.5%</b>	<b>57.6%</b>	<b>39.8%</b>	<b>32.9%</b>	<b>24.8%</b>	<b>61.7%</b>	<b>15.8%</b>	

\*Paid time off, reimbursement or other support

Note: "Other" benefits reported included bonuses and gift cards, cancer insurance, mileage reimbursement, paid bonus days.

What types of recruitment and retention strategies do respondents use?

	Pay incentive or referral bonus program		Realistic job preview		Train on and sign Code of Ethics		DSP ladder to retain highly skilled workers	
		N		N		N		N
AZ	56.8%	37	89.2%	37	83.8%	37	44.4%	36
DC	12.0%	25	76.0%	25	95.8%	24	70.8%	24
GA	6.8%	44	65.1%	43	95.5%	44	38.6%	44
KY	19.7%	147	75.3%	146	79.3%	145	37.7%	146
ME	60.0%	15	64.3%	14	66.7%	15	33.3%	15
OH	29.2%	271	78.8%	269	88.3%	266	41.4%	266
SC	23.1%	13	83.3%	12	85.7%	14	42.9%	14
TX	34.9%	43	79.1%	43	85.7%	42	44.2%	43
UT	50.0%	26	88.5%	26	100.0%	26	42.3%	26
VT	33.3%	15	57.1%	14	85.7%	14	30.8%	13
<b>AVERAGE</b>	<b>32.6%</b>	<b>636</b>	<b>75.7%</b>	<b>629</b>	<b>86.7%</b>	<b>627</b>	<b>42.6%</b>	<b>627</b>

---

## Why Do We Conduct the Staff Stability Survey?

### The need for DSP workforce data

Around the country, states are looking to improve the quality and stability of the workforce of direct support professionals (DSPs) who assist adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Their efforts come at a time of escalating demand for long-term care services and supports and transition from institutional care to home and community-based settings. Importantly, states are also looking to reduce the costs associated with staff turnover at provider agencies<sup>1</sup> and to reduce the impact of turnover on the quality of supports and outcomes for consumers<sup>2,3</sup>.

To develop policies and programs to support the DSP workforce, states require reliable data on turnover, wages, benefits, and recruitment/retention strategies. However, they have been impeded by a lack of ongoing, dependable state-based information.

### The starting point

National Core Indicators (NCI) is a nearly 20-year collaboration between the National Association of State Directors of Developmental Disabilities Services (NASDDDS) and the Human Services Research Institute (HSRI). The purpose of the program, which began in 1997, is to support NASDDDS member agencies to gather a standard set of performance and outcome measures that can be used to track their own performance over time, to compare results across states, and to establish national benchmarks<sup>4</sup>. NCI had worked with a small number of states to collect data on DSP turnover and vacancy rates among providers. In 2013, amid low response rates and waning interest, NCI decided to work with interested states and stakeholders to create a new, more relevant and useful Staff Stability tool.

To begin this process, NCI contacted member states and asked them to complete a survey about the old NCI Staff Turnover Tool, its utility, and whether states would be interested in collecting more comprehensive information on the DSP workforce (such as wages, benefits and recruitment/retention strategies). Twenty-four states responded, and the overall response was positive. States were enthusiastic about the possibility of collecting these data and looked forward to being able to benchmark and compare their state's data to those of other states.

### Drafting and testing a new tool

NCI staff spoke with experts from the University of Minnesota and the National Direct Service Resource Center<sup>5</sup>, who offered insight and recommended resources to use as reference as NCI designed the new tool<sup>6</sup>. Once the tool was drafted, NCI used a focus group composed of providers and provider networks to gather feedback; using an online questionnaire, NCI received responses from several provider agencies on the feasibility, ease, and utility of the survey. When revisions were made based on that feedback, NCI convened a focus group over the phone with providers and DSPs, who provided additional feedback on the survey. The focus group agreed that the New Staff Stability Survey would provide critical and relevant information about DSP workforce stability, wages, benefits and recruitment and retention strategies. The focus group participants provided clarification on terminology and estimated

the amount of time it would take a provider to complete the survey. Participants also suggested possible additional data to collect in the future using the Staff Stability Tool.

### **Two-state pilot**

Two states agreed to pilot the survey. Online data collection (using HSRI's Online Data Entry System Administrator, otherwise known as ODESA) began in December 2014. Participating states provided HSRI a list of all provider email addresses. The states then sent communication to all providers to inform them of the new survey and to explain why they had decided to administer it and how the data would be used. Next, HSRI sent an email to each address. Each email contained a unique access code that allowed the recipient to access the survey instrument in ODESA and to ensure anonymous responses. Follow-up emails were sent to all providers at least twice before data collection was complete.

Overall, response rates were low. In discussions with state staff following data collection, the staff stated that the time of year (holiday season in December) and difficulty accumulating provider email addresses contributed to the low response rates. Overall, providers who completed the survey communicated their satisfaction with the ease and accessibility of the survey, and felt that the state-level aggregate dataset will provide policymakers and lawmakers with valuable data.

### **Official rollout**

Following the pilot, the survey and survey administration process was refined, and the survey tool was opened up to the 10 states you see in this report. Data collection began in January 2015 and continued until June 30, 2015. However, due to delays in accessing email addresses as well as other administrative obstacles, some states began data collection later than others.

### **Contact Information:**

For more information on the NCI Staff Stability Survey, please contact:

Dorothy Hiersteiner  
Human Services Research Institute  
[dhiersteiner@hsri.org](mailto:dhiersteiner@hsri.org)

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2006). The supply of direct support professionals serving individuals with intellectual disabilities and other developmental disabilities: Report to Congress. Retrieved from <http://aspe.hhs.gov/daltcp/reports/2006/DSPsupply.htm>

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Larson, S.A., Hewitt, A. & Lakin, K.C. (2004). A multi-perspective analysis of effects on recruitment and retention challenges on outcomes for persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities and their families. *American Journal on Mental Retardation*.

<sup>4</sup> National Core Indicators ([www.nationalcoreindicators.org/about/](http://www.nationalcoreindicators.org/about/))

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.medicaid.gov/Medicaid-CHIP-Program-Information/By-Topics/Long-Term-Services-and-Supports/Workforce/Workforce-Initiative.html>

<sup>6</sup> Edelstein, S., Seavey, D. (2009). The need for monitoring the long-term care direct service workforce and recommendations for data collection. Retrieved from [http://phinational.org/sites/phinational.org/files/research-report/dsw\\_dcrptfeb09.pdf](http://phinational.org/sites/phinational.org/files/research-report/dsw_dcrptfeb09.pdf)