

Golden Gate Regional Center

Eric Zigman, Executive Director
1355 Market St., Suite 220, San Francisco, CA 94103
415-832-5516 Fax 415-546-9203
ezigman@ggrc.org
www.ggrc.org



Performance Report for Golden Gate Regional Center – Spring 2019

Every year, the Department of Developmental Services (DDS) contracts with regional centers in California to serve consumers and families. And, every year DDS looks at how well the regional centers are doing. This report will give you information about your regional center.

Last year, at Golden Gate Regional Center (GGRC) we served about 9,710 consumers. The charts on page two tell you about the consumers we serve. You'll also see how well we are doing in meeting our goals and in fulfilling our contract with DDS.

At GGRC, we want to improve every year, do better than the state average, and meet or exceed the DDS standard. As you can see in this report, we continued to make progress in the five "Regional Center Goals" displayed in the chart on page two – nearly all of the individuals we served in Developmental Centers have transitioned to new lives and homes in community settings; nearly all children are living with families and, as with the past several years, no children served by GGRC are living in large facilities.

But, we still need to improve in meeting statewide averages in some of these categories. In particular we have five percent fewer individuals in home settings as compared with statewide averages. The GGRC three-county catchment area (San Francisco, San Mateo and Marin Counties) has unquestionably the highest cost of living and occupancy costs in the state. Our challenges in finding and supporting home settings which could utilize independent and supported living services are directly tied to the lack of affordable housing availability for the individuals we serve in our region. In addition, inadequate rates for home support services intensify our challenges in this area. We are redoubling our efforts to create and discover affordable housing opportunities for those we serve, as well as continuing to advocate to the state for provider rate reform, in order to make an impact in this area.

We hope this report helps you learn more about GGRC. If you have any questions or comments, please contact us!

This report is a summary. To see the complete report, go to: www.ggrc.org.





Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Eric Zigman". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Eric" and last name "Zigman" clearly distinguishable.

Executive Director, Golden Gate Regional Center

Who uses GGRC?

These charts tell you about who GGRC consumers are and where they live.



How well is GGRC performing?

This chart tells you about five areas where DDS wants each regional center to keep improving.

The first column tells you how GGRC was doing at the end of 2017, and the second column shows how GGRC was doing at the end of 2018.

To see how GGRC compares to the other regional centers in the state, compare the numbers to the state averages (in the shaded columns).

Regional Center Goals (based on Lanterman Act)	December 2017		December 2018	
	State Average	GGRC	State Average	GGRC
Fewer consumers live in developmental centers	0.21%	0.55%	0.12%	0.12%
More children live with families	99.32%	99.14%	99.38%	99.20%
More adults live in home settings*	79.61%	74.19%	80.20%	74.44%
Fewer children live in large facilities (more than 6 people)	0.04%	0.00%	0.04%	0.00%
Fewer adults live in large facilities (more than 6 people)	2.47%	3.00%	2.31%	2.94%

Notes: 1) Consumers can be included in more than one diagnosis category. 2) Residence Types: CCF/ICF is Community Care Facility/Intermediate Care Facility; ILS/SLS is Independent Living Services/Supported Living Services. 3) Home settings include independent living, supported living, Adult Family Home Agency homes, and consumers' family homes. 4) Green text indicates the RC remained the same or improved from the previous year, red indicates the RC did not improve.

Did GGRC meet DDS standards?

Read below to see how well GGRC did in meeting DDS compliance standards:

Areas Measured	Last Period	Current Period
Passes independent audit	Yes	Yes
Passes DDS audit	Yes	Yes
Audits vendors as required	Partially Met	Met
Didn't overspend operations budget	Yes	Yes
Participates in the federal waiver	Yes	Yes
CDERs and ESRs are updated as required (CDER is the Client Development Evaluation Report and ESR is the Early Start Report. Both contain information about consumers, including diagnosis.)	98.82%	96.45%
Intake/Assessment timelines for consumers age 3 or older met	93.75%	97.78%
IPP (<i>Individual Program Plan</i>) requirements met	99.90%	100%
IFSP (<i>Individualized Family Service Plan</i>) requirements met	82.0%	80.8%

Notes: 1) The federal waiver refers to the Medicaid Home and Community-Based Services Waiver program that allows California to offer services not otherwise available through the Medi-Cal program to serve people (including individuals with developmental disabilities) in their own homes and communities. 2) The CDER and ESR currency percentages were weighted based on the RC's Status 1 and Status 2 caseloads to arrive at a composite score. 3) The IFSP calculation methodology was changed from composite to average in order to more accurately reflect the RC's performance by only including children reviewed during monitoring and not all Early Start consumers. 4) N/A indicates that the regional center was not reviewed for the measure during the current period.

On the following page (page four), you will see that GGRC continues to be a leader in supporting the competitive, integrated employment of those we serve. In particular, average wages remain significantly higher than the state average among those we support as they have for several years. Additionally, GGRC's performance on the "Percentage of adults who were placed in competitive, integrated employment following participation in a Paid Internship Program" was well above state average in Fiscal Year 2017-2018, as was the number of employment development incentives paid to service providers to place and support individuals in their jobs.

How well is GGRC doing at getting consumers working?

The chart below shows how well GGRC is performing on increasing consumer employment performance compared to their prior performance and statewide average:

Areas Measured	Time Period			
	CA	GGRC	CA	GGRC
Consumer Earned Income (Age 16+): Data Source: Employment Development Department	Jan through Dec 2016		Jan through Dec 2017	
Quarterly number of consumers with earned income	25,236	988	27,182	1,057
Percentage of consumers with earned income	16%	19%	17%	20%
Average annual wages	\$8,327	\$12,056	\$9,033	\$12,785
Annual earnings of consumers compared to people with all disabilities in California Data Source: Cornell University Disability Status Report	2016		2017	
	\$45,300		\$47,500	
National Core Indicator Adult Consumer Survey	July 2011-June 2012		July 2014-June 2015	
Percentage of adults who reported having integrated employment as a goal in their IPP	27%	26%	27%	28%
Paid Internship Program Data Source: Paid Internship Program Survey	2017-18			
	CA Average		GGRC	
Number of adults who were placed in competitive, integrated employment following participation in a Paid Internship Program	6		6	
Percentage of adults who were placed in competitive, integrated employment following participation in a Paid Internship Program	18%		27%	
Average hourly or salaried wages for adults who participated in a Paid Internship Program	\$11.64		\$14.18	
Average hours worked per week for adults who participated in a Paid Internship Program	18		17	
Incentive Payments Data Source: Competitive Integrated Employment Incentive Program Survey				
Average wages for adults engaged in competitive, integrated employment, on behalf of whom incentive payments have been made	\$11.93		\$13.84	
Average hours worked for adults engages in competitive, integrated employment, on behalf of whom incentive payments have been made	22		21	
Total number of Incentive payments made for the fiscal year for the following amounts:	\$1,500	13	25	
	\$1,250	21	46	
	\$1,000	29	50	

The 2019 employment data was compiled differently from previous years. To obtain these statistics, DDS provided the EDD with the names and social security numbers of individuals ages 16 and older that are Status 2. The EDD matched that information to their database and returned individual-specific wage data including employment locations, business name and type. DDS then analyzed the data for accuracy and only reported to regional centers the information deemed most accurate. Approximately 87% of the EDD data were deemed accurate enough to report with confidence.

How well is GGRC doing at reducing disparities and improving equity?

These tables show you how well the regional center is doing at providing services equally for all consumers.

Indicator showing the relationship between annual authorized services and expenditures by individual's residence type and ethnicity

Residence Type	American Indian or Alaska Native		Asian		Black/African American		Hispanic		Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander		White		Other	
	2017	2018	2017	2018	2017	2018	2017	2018	2017	2018	2017	2018	2017	2018
Home	🟡 0.52	🔴 0.49	🟢 0.77	🟡 0.74	🟢 0.82	🟢 0.81	🟡 0.71	🟡 0.72	🟢 0.79	🟡 0.67	🟢 0.75	🟡 0.74	🟡 0.70	🟡 0.71
ILS/SLS	🟢 1.00	🟢 1.00	🟢 0.84	🟢 0.86	🟢 0.83	🟢 0.82	🟢 0.87	🟢 0.85	N/A	N/A	🟢 0.89	🟢 0.87	🟢 0.88	🟢 0.88
Institutions	N/A	N/A	🟡 0.66	🟢 0.82	🟡 0.52	🔴 0.32	🔴 0.47	🟡 0.58	N/A	N/A	🔴 0.26	🟡 0.52	N/A	🟢 0.80
Residential Care	🟢 0.99	🟢 0.99	🟢 0.96	🟢 0.96	🟢 0.97	🟢 0.97	🟢 0.97	🟢 0.97	🟢 0.97	🟢 0.96	🟢 0.97	🟢 0.96	🟢 0.97	🟢 0.96
Medical	🟢 0.89	N/A	🟢 0.92	🟢 0.85	🟢 0.95	🟢 0.99	🟢 0.95	🟢 0.95	N/A	N/A	🟢 0.88	🟢 0.89	🟢 0.93	🟢 0.93
other	🟢 0.76	N/A	🟡 0.70	🟡 0.52	🟢 0.78	🟢 0.94	N/A	🟢 0.78	N/A	N/A	🟢 0.89	🟡 0.74	🔴 0.47	🟡 0.53

Note: 1) Institutions include developmental centers, state hospitals, and correctional facilities. 2) Residential includes care facilities intermediate care facilities, and continuous nursing facilities. 3) Med/Rehab/Psych include skilled nursing facilities, psychiatric treatment and rehabilitation centers, acute general hospitals, sub-acute care services, and community treatment facilities. 4) Other includes consumers who are out-of-state, in hospice, transient/homeless, or not listed elsewhere.

Per capita purchase of service expenditures by individual's primary language (for primary languages chosen by 30 or more consumers only)

Language	Count of UCI		Per Capita Purchase of Service Expenditures	
	2017	2018	2017	2018
English	6,888	7,049	\$27,969	\$29,176
Spanish	1,655	1,725	\$9,690	\$9,881
Cantonese Chinese	601	643	\$17,583	\$17,895
Tagalog	181	179	\$18,822	\$19,878
Mandarin Chinese	65	83	\$15,511	\$12,444
Vietnamese	77	82	\$12,704	\$12,200
Arabic	64	66	\$14,368	\$15,400
Russian	51	51	\$21,577	\$22,132
Other Asian	30	33	\$16,549	\$18,180

Want more information?

To see the complete report, go to: www.ggrc.org

Or contact GGRC at 415-546-9222