

THE CASE FOR
Inclusion 2012



The Case for Inclusion 2012

Introduction

Every year since 2006, United Cerebral Palsy (UCP)—an international advocate, educating and providing support services for children and adults with a spectrum of disabilities through an affiliate network—produces *The Case for Inclusion*, an annual ranking of how well state Medicaid programs serve Americans with intellectual and developmental disabilities (ID/DD). Individuals with ID/DD, including the aging, want and deserve the same freedoms and quality of life as all Americans.

Medicaid affects all of us -- children and adults with disabilities, as we are aging, as our family ages, and when the unexpected happens. It is the critical safety net that provides financial and healthcare security, and community supports to Americans with ID/DD, aging, and low-income individuals and families, so that their desired freedom, quality of life and community participation can be fully realized.

Medicaid Facts: Fiscal Year 2010

Total Spending (State and Federal) - \$404.9 billion

- Individuals with ID/DD – \$32.9 billion (8.1%)

Total Enrollment – 52.9 million people

- Individuals with ID/DD – 666,000 (1.3%)

Source: Medicaid 2010 Actuarial Report & the Research and Training Center on Community Living

It is the duty of a civil society such as ours to aid these individuals, who are often the most vulnerable members of society. Yet some states do much better than others in having the needed political will and sound Medicaid policies necessary to achieve this ideal. *The Case for Inclusion* ranks all 50 states and the District of Columbia (DC) – not on their spending – but on their **outcomes** for Americans with ID/DD.

The Case for Inclusion shows how well each individual state is performing overall; how each state matches up against other states regarding key data measures; and, most importantly, the top performing states with policies and practices that should be replicated.

Disability and Aging

Over the past decade, there has been increasing attention on the combined community living challenges related to both aging and disability populations. Needed resources to serve these populations are becoming harder to secure at the same time that the population in need is increasing.

While shared budget and workforce challenges will require the aging and disability communities to collaborate in finding solutions to meet the exploding demand for community based programs—including implementing shared supports that maintain family units—there needs to be more planning, outreach and education for families with aging caregivers.

The Case for Inclusion 2012

America is aging. In 2010, the number of Americans 65 or older was 40 million. By 2020, the number of elderly will climb to 55 million. By the time today's infants graduate from high school in 2030, the number of elderly will skyrocket to 72 million.¹

For Americans with intellectual and developmental disabilities, the impact of America's aging population has huge implications. First, it will spark a tremendous increase in demand for community-based services. Second, as family caregivers age, Americans with disabilities, who are also aging, must look to alternative supports and, possibly new and dramatically different living arrangements to remain an active part of their community.

To ensure that families with aging caregivers can maintain their dignity and independence in community settings, the first step is to understand which states face the biggest, most immediate challenge to aging in place. Some states have a very large share of individuals with disabilities with aging caregivers. This report (p. 6) includes a list of all 50 states and DC, in alphabetical and rank order, with the share of aging caregivers shown.² Future *The Case for Inclusion* reports will track this demographic data and state responses to this impending need.

Four Key Aspects of a High Functioning Medicaid Program

The University of Minnesota's Research and Training Center on Community Living concisely states the four key aspects of a high functioning and effective Medicaid program, which have been articulated in a number of legislative, administrative and judicial statements describing national policy.³ *The Case for Inclusion's* five major outcome areas align, as indicated, with the following four-part holistic approach:

"The promise of access to and support for integrated community lives and roles for persons with [intellectual and developmental disabilities] is clearly expressed in national legislative, judicial, administrative and other sources that make four basic commitments:

- People with disabilities will live in and participate in their communities; [*Promoting Independence*]
- People with disabilities will have satisfying lives and valued social roles; [*Promoting Productivity*]
- People with disabilities will have sufficient access to needed support, and control over that support so that the assistance they receive contributes to lifestyles they desire; and [*Keeping Families Together and Reaching Those in Need*]
- People will be safe and healthy in the environments in which they live. [*Tracking Quality and Safety*]:

2012 Ranking Enhancements

The 2012 report includes several enhancements designed to aid individuals in using its findings as an advocacy tool.

First and foremost, the 2012 report, in addition to data from all previous reports, is published on UCP's website, using a robust new web module and design at ucp.org/public-policy/the-case-

The Case for Inclusion 2012

[for-inclusion](#). This web-based tool enables policymakers, families, advocates, voters and the media to easily track each state's performance over time on key data measures; compare states among one another and to the US average; and export the data, tables and graphs as needed for personal and professional use. The online resources also allow visitors to track how states have improved or declined in *The Case for Inclusion* rankings since the 2006 report.

Second, the 2012 report has increased focus on quality assurance measures by rewarding states that participate in the [National Core Indicators](#) (NCI) of the Human Services Research Institute. NCI is a voluntary effort by public developmental disabilities agencies to measure and track their own performance. The [core indicators](#) are standard measures used across states to assess the outcomes of services provided to individuals and families. With more than 100 data measures, NCI covers five broad categories including: Individual Outcomes; Health, Welfare and Rights; System Performance; Staff Stability; and Family Indicators.⁴

In January 2012, the federal Administration on Developmental Disabilities awarded \$1.5 million over five years to the [National Association of State Directors of Developmental Disabilities Services \(NASDDDS\)](#) to promote more states using NCI as the uniform data set.⁵ It is critical for states to participate in a comprehensive quality assurance effort that can be benchmarked against the national average and to track individual state's progress for critical person-level outcomes.

While many states moved to mandatory managed care for people with ID/DD, participation in NCI and disclosure of patient encounter data (actual services received by individuals) is critical for managed care and provider accountability. Beyond the high-level assessment part of this year's *The Case for Inclusion*, NCI give states a deeper, more personal look at their Medicaid programs and supports to these individuals.

Finally, this year *The Case for Inclusion* provides sub-rankings for each of the five major categories so that readers have a deeper understanding of each state's performance within each area.

As always, the rankings in this report are a snapshot in time. Most data is from 2010, which is the most recent data available from credible, national sources. All data is sourced directly from the states to the federal government, and in response to public surveys.

The Case for Inclusion 2012

Significant Takeaways from the 2012 Ranking

Promoting Independence

1. **All states still have room for improvement, but some states have consistently remained at the bottom since 2007**, including Arkansas (#49), Illinois (#48), Mississippi (#51) and Texas (#50). Given Illinois Governor Pat Quinn's recent proposal to close four state institutions, Illinois *could* be the breakaway low performer in 2013, should the Illinois legislature agree. Specifically, Governor Quinn proposed closing four state institutions as part of his latest budget⁶. This includes the Jacksonville Developmental Center, which began operating in 1851. Despite the poor quality of life, institutions are extremely expensive, costing more than \$200,000 per person per year, compared to \$84,000 per person per year in community settings.⁷ If successful in what has become a contentious budget debate, Governor Quinn would close half of Illinois state institutions in one year and become a leader in dramatically advancing the quality of life and community inclusion for Illinois residents.
2. **36 states now meet the 80/80 Community standard**, which means that at least 80% of all individuals with ID/DD are served in the community, and 80% of all resources spent on those with ID/DD are for community support. Those that do NOT meet the 80/80 standard are Arkansas, DC (very close), Illinois, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Nebraska, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma (very close), Tennessee (very close), Texas, Utah and Virginia (very close).
3. **As of 2010, 11 states have no state institutions to seclude those with ID/DD**, including Alaska, Hawaii, Maine, Michigan, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oregon (new this year), Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia and DC. In addition, Minnesota closed its last remaining institution in June 2011, and another 12 states have only one institution each. Since 1960, 205 of 354 state institutions have been closed, according to the University of Minnesota's Research and Training Center on Community Living.
4. **22 states now meet the 80% Home-like Setting Standard**, which means that at least 80% of all individuals with ID/DD are served in settings such as their own home, a family home, family foster care or small group settings like shared apartments with fewer than three residents. The US average for this standard is 79%. Just seven states meet a 90% Home-like Setting Standard, and these top performers include Arizona, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Nevada, New Hampshire and Vermont.

Tracking Quality

5. **29 states participate in the National Core Indicators (NCI) model, a comprehensive quality assurance program that includes standard measures to assess outcomes of services (nationalcoreindicators.org)**. In January 2012, the Obama Administration made available grant funding so that even more states could

The Case for Inclusion 2012

participate and ensure that their quality assurance efforts were benchmarked and comprehensive (NCI has more than 100 measures; see Endnote #3 for more details).

Keeping Families Together

- 6. Only 15 states were supporting a large share of families through family support** (at least 200 families per 100,000 of population). This is important, because those support services provide assistance to families that are caring for children with disabilities at home, which helps keep families together and people with disabilities living in a community setting. These family-focused state programs were in Alaska, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont and Wisconsin. New Jersey and Pennsylvania were very close to meeting this standard.

Promoting Productivity

- 7. Just nine states have at least one-third (33%) of individuals with ID/DD working in competitive employment, which best recognize and support work as key to a meaningful life.** These states include Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Michigan, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Vermont, and Washington.

Serving Those in Need

- 8. Waiting lists for residential and community services continue to climb and show the unmet need.** More than a quarter of a million people (268,000) are on a waiting list for Home and Community Based Services. This would require a daunting 46% increase in states' HCBS programs. However, 14 states report no waiting list or a small waiting list (requiring less than 10% program growth).

The Case for Inclusion 2012

2012 The Case for Inclusion Rankings

	Alphabetical			By Rank in 2012	
	2012 Ranking	2011 Ranking		2012 Ranking	2011 Ranking
Alabama	33	32	Arizona	1	2
Alaska	30	30	Michigan	2	3
Arizona	1	2	California	3	5
Arkansas	49	50	New Hampshire	4	4
California	3	5	Vermont	5	1
Colorado	28	12	Massachusetts	6	9
Connecticut	7	10	Connecticut	7	10
Delaware	16	7	Washington	8	6
Dist. of Columbia	40	47	New York	9	17
Florida	20	27	Pennsylvania	10	15
Georgia	21	22	Maryland	11	31
Hawaii	19	13	Idaho	12	18
Idaho	12	18	South Carolina	13	16
Illinois	48	48	New Mexico	14	11
Indiana	46	42	South Dakota	15	23
Iowa	43	35	Delaware	16	7
Kansas	36	25	Nevada	17	8
Kentucky	31	33	Montana	18	24
Louisiana	25	37	Hawaii	19	13
Maine	24	29	Florida	20	27
Maryland	11	31	Georgia	21	22
Massachusetts	6	9	Oregon	22	26
Michigan	2	3	Missouri	23	28
Minnesota	26	14	Maine	24	29
Mississippi	51	51	Louisiana	25	37
Missouri	23	28	Minnesota	26	14
Montana	18	24	Wisconsin	27	20
Nebraska	41	46	Colorado	28	12
Nevada	17	8	West Virginia	29	19
New Hampshire	4	4	Alaska	30	30
New Jersey	37	40	Kentucky	31	33
New Mexico	14	11	Rhode Island	32	34
New York	9	17	Alabama	33	32
North Carolina	44	43	Ohio	34	39
North Dakota	39	36	Wyoming	35	21
Ohio	34	39	Kansas	36	25
Oklahoma	38	45	New Jersey	37	40
Oregon	22	26	Oklahoma	38	45
Pennsylvania	10	15	North Dakota	39	36
Rhode Island	32	34	Dist. of Columbia	40	47
South Carolina	13	16	Nebraska	41	46
South Dakota	15	23	Tennessee	42	41
Tennessee	42	41	Iowa	43	35
Texas	50	49	North Carolina	44	43
Utah	45	44	Utah	45	44
Vermont	5	1	Indiana	46	42
Virginia	47	38	Virginia	47	38
Washington	8	6	Illinois	48	48
West Virginia	29	19	Arkansas	49	50
Wisconsin	27	20	Texas	50	49
Wyoming	35	21	Mississippi	51	51

The Case for Inclusion 2012

Sub-ranking by Major Category

Although the overall ranking presents a comprehensive view of each state and the District of Columbia, it is also important to consider the top-performing states in each of the five major categories in addition to how improvement in any category would have the biggest impact on better state performance and subsequent ranking. For example, Arizona ranks #1 overall, but ranks among the worst states (sub-ranking #44) for promoting productivity. Arizona could potentially learn from Connecticut (sub-ranking #2) or Michigan (sub-ranking #1) regarding how to improve in this area.

	Promoting Independence		Tracking Quality and Safety		Keeping Families Together		Promoting Productivity		Reaching Those in Need		Overall	
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank
Alabama	43.1	19	11.8	13	4.0	39	1.2	50	8.1	41	68.2	33
Alaska	48.3	4	1.3	51	5.1	30	5.8	9	8.3	40	68.8	30
Arizona	48.6	3	11.9	2	12.0	1	2.7	44	12.3	8	87.6	1
Arkansas	26.6	50	6.0	29	2.7	48	2.6	45	9.2	36	47.2	49
California	45.2	11	11.6	16	9.8	2	3.4	38	13.0	3	83.0	3
Colorado	46.7	8	5.8	34	5.5	29	1.8	48	9.9	30	69.8	28
Connecticut	40.4	33	11.9	6	7.9	13	7.3	2	11.7	11	79.2	7
Delaware	42.2	22	5.6	38	8.8	7	6.2	5	11.1	14	74.0	16
Dist. of Columbia	41.4	29	4.0	48	3.2	47	3.1	41	11.1	16	62.7	40
Florida	41.8	24	11.8	8	6.6	19	1.8	49	9.7	32	71.8	20
Georgia	43.1	18	11.6	14	4.2	36	4.0	29	8.4	39	71.5	21
Hawaii	47.7	5	8.3	28	5.9	26	0.8	51	10.4	23	73.2	19
Idaho	43.3	17	5.8	33	6.1	25	5.4	10	16.0	1	76.6	12
Illinois	27.1	49	11.8	7	3.3	46	4.0	31	7.4	43	53.6	48
Indiana	38.2	39	5.7	35	3.8	40	4.6	23	4.7	47	57.0	46
Iowa	35.7	45	5.6	36	3.7	42	4.6	26	12.5	5	62.1	43
Kansas	41.7	27	5.8	32	4.8	35	3.6	34	10.3	26	66.2	36
Kentucky	39.4	37	11.4	19	3.4	45	4.8	17	9.6	33	68.6	31
Louisiana	35.7	44	11.8	12	9.1	5	4.0	30	10.2	28	70.7	25
Maine	44.8	13	9.4	26	1.6	51	4.7	19	10.1	29	70.7	24
Maryland	45.6	10	11.6	15	4.2	37	5.9	8	9.5	34	76.8	11
Massachusetts	41.9	23	11.8	10	8.5	8	4.9	16	12.4	6	79.5	6
Michigan	45.1	12	11.9	3	6.2	24	8.9	1	11.3	13	83.4	2
Minnesota	43.0	20	5.4	40	6.3	23	2.9	42	12.4	7	70.0	26
Mississippi	13.1	51	4.4	47	5.0	34	4.9	14	0.9	50	28.2	51
Missouri	40.6	31	11.5	18	5.9	27	2.8	43	10.2	27	70.9	23
Montana	44.1	15	5.6	37	9.2	4	3.6	33	11.0	18	73.5	18
Nebraska	40.8	30	5.0	43	2.1	49	5.3	11	9.4	35	62.7	41
Nevada	46.9	6	4.9	45	6.7	18	4.7	18	10.4	24	73.6	17
New Hampshire	48.7	2	11.1	22	6.9	16	4.9	15	10.3	25	82.0	4
New Jersey	36.5	43	11.9	5	8.4	10	3.3	40	4.2	48	64.2	37
New Mexico	46.9	7	8.6	27	8.5	9	5.3	12	6.5	46	75.8	14
New York	39.6	36	12.0	1	9.5	3	3.6	35	13.9	2	78.5	9
North Carolina	37.1	42	11.8	9	5.9	28	4.9	13	1.5	49	61.2	44
North Dakota	37.3	41	5.4	41	3.8	41	3.7	32	12.7	4	62.8	39
Ohio	38.9	38	11.3	20	6.4	21	4.6	25	6.6	45	67.8	34
Oklahoma	35.6	46	9.7	25	5.0	33	6.1	6	6.8	44	63.1	38
Oregon	46.5	9	5.8	30	5.1	31	3.3	39	10.7	22	71.4	22
Pennsylvania	41.8	25	11.0	23	7.9	14	6.0	7	10.7	21	77.4	10
Rhode Island	43.8	16	5.3	42	4.1	38	4.4	27	10.8	20	68.5	32
South Carolina	39.6	35	11.8	11	9.0	6	4.7	20	11.0	17	76.1	13
South Dakota	39.9	34	11.1	21	7.1	15	4.6	22	11.9	10	74.7	15
Tennessee	40.5	32	5.6	39	5.0	32	1.9	47	9.1	37	62.1	42
Texas	29.2	48	10.9	24	3.5	44	2.6	46	0.7	51	46.8	50
Utah	37.5	40	3.5	50	3.5	43	4.6	24	9.1	38	58.3	45
Vermont	49.6	1	5.0	44	8.2	11	6.8	3	12.0	9	81.7	5
Virginia	29.8	47	11.5	17	1.7	50	4.7	21	8.0	42	55.7	47
Washington	42.6	21	11.9	4	6.6	20	6.5	4	10.9	19	78.5	8
West Virginia	44.3	14	4.4	46	6.9	17	3.5	36	9.9	31	68.9	29
Wisconsin	41.6	28	5.8	31	8.0	12	3.4	37	11.1	15	70.0	27
Wyoming	41.7	26	3.6	49	6.3	22	4.1	28	11.5	12	67.3	35

The Case for Inclusion 2012

Most Improved and Biggest Drops

In the past six years, 17 states have moved at least 10 places in the rankings from 2007 to 2012. Nine states improved dramatically, while eight states dropped significantly. The table below shows these moves.

	Case for Inclusion Ranking						Difference 2007 to 2012	
	Most Improved and Biggest Drops							
	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007		
Maryland	11	31	18	32	33	33	+22	I m p r o v e d
Louisiana	25	37	40	46	45	44	+19	
Pennsylvania	10	15	15	16	15	29	+19	
Missouri	23	28	25	29	28	41	+18	
Ohio	34	39	43	45	44	48	+14	
Idaho	12	18	16	15	18	25	+13	
Washington	8	6	4	25	20	20	+12	
South Dakota	15	23	26	26	29	26	+11	
Nevada	17	8	13	34	34	27	+10	
North Carolina	44	43	34	36	35	34	-10	D r o p p e d
West Virginia	29	19	22	23	24	16	-13	
Kansas	36	25	23	24	22	22	-14	
New Jersey	37	40	24	20	21	23	-14	
Wyoming	35	21	29	28	25	17	-18	
Minnesota	26	14	12	12	12	7	-19	
Colorado	28	12	9	9	7	8	-20	
Alaska	30	30	27	3	3	2	-28	

Alaska – dropped 28 places since 2007 – fell so dramatically because the number of people being served in a family home was previously estimated (by the state) at 3,700 for the 2007 ranking. Beginning with the 2010 ranking, it was reported accurately at around 200 people served. It is also important to note that Alaska does not participate in NCI.

Colorado – dropped 20 places since 2007 – fell so dramatically because of a significant decline in competitive employment participation (from 53% to 17%), and the state does not participate in NCI.

Idaho – improved 13 places since 2007 – significantly increased the share of individuals (from 75% to 85%) and resources (from 51% to 91%) dedicated to the community. It also more than doubled the number of people with ID/DD in competitive employment (from 14% to 30%).

Kansas – dropped 14 places since 2007 – does not participate in the NCI.

Louisiana – improved 19 places since 2007 – had huge improvement in the portion of individuals (from 49% to 63%) and resources (from 41% to 77%) dedicated to community services over institutions, and it had large drop in the portion of individuals served in large institutions (from 18% to 8%).

The Case for Inclusion 2012

Maryland – improved 22 places since 2007 – closed a state institution and reduced the population at state institutions by 60%. The state also began participating in NCI and added a Medicaid Buy-in Program to support individuals as they go to work, increase their productivity and raise their incomes.

Missouri – improved 18 places since 2007 – dramatically increased the portion of resources dedicated to people in the community (from 59% to 81%) and started participating in NCI.

Nevada – improved 10 places since 2007 - dramatically increased the portion of resources dedicated to people in the community (from 68% to 93%), closed a state institution and reduced the number of people at state institutions by 47%.

New Jersey – dropped 14 places since 2007 – primarily did poorly because the state did not report whether it has a waiting list and how many people are on it.

North Carolina – dropped 10 places since 2007 - primarily did poorly because the state did not report whether it has a waiting list and how many people are on it.

Ohio – improved 14 places since 2007 – dramatically increased the share of individuals (to 82% from 63%) and resources (from 50% to 82%) dedicated to the community, closed a state institution, reduced by half the portion of individuals served in large institutions (from 18% to 9%), started participating in NCI and reported on its waiting list which was of average size.

Pennsylvania – improved 19 places since 2007 – substantially increased the portion of resources dedicated to people in the community (from 70% to 82%), dramatically increased the portion of people served in home-like settings (from 58% to 83%), reduced by almost half the portion of people served in large institutions (from 11% to 6%) and closed a state institution.

South Dakota – improved 11 places since 2007 – steadily improved in the share of individuals served in the community and added a Medicaid Buy-in Program.

Washington – improved 12 places since 2007 – mostly a result of the state accurately reporting on its waiting list, which is relatively small.

West Virginia – dropped 13 places since 2007 –dramatically increased the share of resources going to the community (from 77% to 99%) but does not participate in NCI.

Wyoming – dropped 18 places since 2007 – primarily due to the fact that it does not participate in NCI and resulting from a large drop in competitive employment (from 25% to 14%).

The Case for Inclusion 2012

The Best, the Worst and Facts about the Top 10 Performing States

The Best Performing States

1. Arizona
2. Michigan
3. California
4. New Hampshire
5. Vermont
6. Massachusetts
7. Connecticut
8. Washington
9. New York
10. Pennsylvania

The Worst Performing States

42. Tennessee
43. Iowa
44. North Carolina
45. Utah
46. Indiana
47. Virginia
48. Illinois
49. Arkansas
50. Texas
51. Mississippi

Facts about the Best Performing States

1. Top Performers are both big and small states in population – “big” population states include California (#1 biggest), New York (#3) and Pennsylvania (#6), and “small” population states include New Hampshire (#42) and Vermont (#49).
2. Top Performers are both rich and poorer states in terms of median family income – “rich” states include New Hampshire (#1 richest), Connecticut (#2) and Massachusetts (#7), and “poorer” states include Arizona (#34) and Michigan (#30).
3. Top Performers are high tax and low tax burden states – “high tax burden” states include California (#6) and Pennsylvania (#7), and “low tax burden” states include New Hampshire (#50), Michigan (#45) and Washington (#30).
4. Top Performers are big and low spending per person, served through the Home and Community Based Services – “big spender” states are Connecticut (#5) and New York (#7), and “low spender” states are California (#50), Arizona (#47) and Washington (#36).

The Case for Inclusion 2012

How to Use this *The Case for Inclusion* & How the Rankings Were Developed

Using *The Case for Inclusion* Report:

This report is intended to help advocates and policymakers understand:

- How their state performs overall in serving individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities;
- What services and outcomes need attention and improvement in their state; and
- Which states are top performers in key areas, so advocates and officials in those top-performing states can act as a resource for those states desiring to improve in key areas.

This report puts each state's progress in serving individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities into a national context. **Advocates** should use this information to educate other advocates, providers, families and individuals, policymakers and state administrations on key achievements and areas needing improvement within each state. The facts and figures can support policy reforms and frame debates about resource allocation for the ID/DD population. Advocates can also use the information to prioritize those areas that need the most immediate attention. Lastly, advocates can use the facts to support adequate and ongoing funding to maintain high quality outcomes, eliminate waiting lists and close large institutions.

Elected officials should use this report as a guiding document on which issues and states need time and attention and, possibly, additional resources or more inclusive state policies to improve outcomes for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

Those within federal and state administrations should use this report to put their work and accomplishments in context and to chart a course for the next focus area in the quest for continuous improvement and improved quality of life. The states should replicate this data reporting in more detail at the state and county level to identify areas of excellence and to target critical issues needing attention.

How the Rankings Were Developed:

The Case for Inclusion rankings were developed through a broad, data-driven effort. Demographic, cost, utilization, key data elements and outcomes statistics were assembled for all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Ninety-nine individual data elements from numerous governmental non-profit and advocacy organizations were reviewed. Dozens of Medicaid, disability and ID/DD policy experts, were consulted as well as members of national advocacy and research organizations. They were asked to consider the attributes of top performing Medicaid programs and offer opinions and recommendations on key data measures and outcomes.

To comprehensively determine the top-performing states, a weighted scoring methodology was developed. Twenty key outcome measures and data elements were selected and individually scored in five major categories on a total 100-point scale. If a person is living in the community,

The Case for Inclusion 2012

it is a key indicator of inclusion; therefore the “Promoting Independence” category received a majority of the points.

Weighting of Case for Inclusion Scores – 100 Total Possible Points

Promoting Independence	Community-based	% of Recipients with ID/DD on HCBS	24
		% of ID/DD Expenditures on HCBS	
		% of ID/DD Expenditures on non-ICF-MR	
	Residential Services in the Community (includes all types)	1-3 - %	24
		1-6 -%	
		16+ % (smaller %, higher rank)	
		% in Large State Facilities	
Waivers Promoting Self-Determination		2	
Tracking Community Involvement and Safety		Quality Assurance	12
		Abuse	
Keeping Families Together		Family Support per 100k	12
		% in a Family Home	
Promoting Productivity	Medicaid Buy-In		10
	Supported or Competitive Employment		
	Voc Rehab		
Reaching Those in Need	Waiting List	Average % Growth for Residential and HCBS	16
	Individuals with ID/DD served per 100k of		
	Ratio of Prevalence to Individuals served		
	Uses Federal Functional Definition for Eligibility		

In general, the top-performing state for each measure was assigned the highest possible score in that category. The worst-performing state was assigned a zero score in that category. All other states were apportioned accordingly based on their outcome between the top- and worst-performing.

As noted, most data is from 2010, but all data is the most recent available from credible national sources. Therefore, these state rankings are a snapshot in time. In addition, changes and reforms enacted or beginning in 2011 or later have not been considered.

When reviewing an individual states ranking, it is important to consider action taken since 2010, if any, to accurately understand both where that state was and where it is presently. Also, it is important to note that not all individuals with disabilities were considered, only those with intellectual and developmental disabilities. This limited the scope of the effort, allowing focus on subsequent initiatives of meaningful, achievable improvement.

A note of caution: Although nearly 60 points separate the top performing state from the poorest performing state, eight points separate the top 10 states, 17 points separate the top 25 states, and only 13 points separate the middle 25 states. Therefore, minor changes in state policy

The Case for Inclusion 2012

or outcomes could significantly affect how a state ranks on future or past *The Case for Inclusion* reports.

Acknowledgements

A special thank you goes to Sheryl A. Larson, Senior Research Associate at the University of Minnesota's Research and Training Center on Community Living, who provided an advance copy of data tables for *The Case for Inclusion 2012* ranking to successfully release in a timely manner.

About the Author

Tarren Bragdon has been involved in healthcare policy research and analysis for over a decade. His work has been featured in newspapers and media outlets nationwide including *The Wall Street Journal*, *New York Post*, *New York Sun* and *PBS*. He served two terms in the Maine House of Representatives on the Health and Human Services Committee and served as chair of the board of directors of Spurwink Services, one of the largest social service providers in Maine.

¹ "Older Population by Age Group: 1900 to 2050 with Chart of the 65+ Population." U.S. Agency on Aging. August 14, 2008. Available at: http://www.aoa.gov/aoaroot/aging_statistics/future_growth/docs/By_Age_65_and_over.xls (March 16, 2012)

² Braddock, David. "Aging I/DD Caregivers as Percent of Total Persons with I/DD." 2011. Caregiving families aged 60 years or more, expressed as a percentage of total persons with I/DD. Estimates for total persons with I/DD and total number of aging I/DD caregiving families with children or adult family members with I/DD were from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). Available at: <http://www.stateofthestates.org/index.php/interactive-charts#chartControls> (March 12, 2012)

³ The University of Minnesota Research and Training Center on Community Living. "Medicaid Home and Community Based Services for Persons with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities - Interim Report." September 26, 2005. Page 3.

⁴ For more details of these 100 data measures, visit <http://www.nationalcoreindicators.org/indicators/> or to ask about how your state can participate contact the Human Services Research Institute at 617.876.0426 or contact Joshua Engler, Project Coordinator for the National Core Indicators, at jengler@hsri.org. To view the latest National Core Indicators report (FY2010) go to: http://www.nationalcoreindicators.org/upload/core-indicators/NCI_Annual_Summary_Report_2009-10_FINAL.pdf

⁵ "Administration on Developmental Disabilities Awards Funding for NCI Expansion." Human Services Research Institute. January 2, 2012. Available at: <http://www.nationalcoreindicators.org/news/#new-states-join-nci-with-help-of-add-funding> (February 22, 2012)

⁶ Long, Ray and Monique Garcia. "Quinn to unveil bad-news budget." Chicago Tribune. February 22, 2012. Available at: http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-02-22/news/ct-met-quinn-budget-20120222_1_super-max-tamms-bad-news-budget (February 24, 2012)

⁷ Brino, Anthony. "Lawmakers still skeptical of Quinn facilities-closure plan." Illinois Statehouse News. February 7, 2012. Available at: <http://illinois.statehousenewsline.com/7603/lawmakers-still-skeptical-of-quinn-facilities-closure-plan/> (February 24, 2012)

Data

State		Promoting Independence															
		Community-based			Residential												
		% of Recipients with ID/DD on HCBS	% of ID/DD Expenditures on HCBS	% of ID/DD Expenditures on non-ICF-MR	Own Home		Family Home					Family Foster Care			Congregate Care (includes ICF-MR)		
1	1				1-3	4-6	7-15	Total	1-3	4-6	1-6	7-15	16+	Total			
AL	Alabama	96%	89%	89%	213	3,659	212	8	0	220	1,715	488	2,203	907	173	5,283	
AK	Alaska	100%	98%	100%	399	231	209	0	0	209	234	106	340	5	11	356	
AZ	Arizona	99%	96%	96%	454	26,185	1,166	0	0	1166	1,422	1,117	2,539	32	153	2,724	
AR	Arkansas	72%	47%	71%	641	2,023	566	8	0	574	113	53	166	865	1,604	2,635	
CA	California	90%	78%	88%	21,627	133,809	3,359	0	0	3,359	19,004	6,325	25,329	1,229	3,993	30,551	
CO	Colorado	97%	92%	96%	729	7,017	2,492	0	0	2,492	0	1,370	1,370	203	67	1,640	
CT	Connecticut	89%	69%	82%	1,388	7,896	464	13	20	497	1,293	2,696	4,000	354	686	5,040	
DE	Delaware	88%	74%	82%	27	2,149	145	0	0	145	259	467	726	0	118	844	
DC	Dist. of Columbia	78%	67%	98%	28	510	72	0	0	72	687	487	1,193	52	0	1,245	
FL	Florida	91%	74%	82%	5,326	36,218	0	0	0	0	359	5,704	6,063	1,233	2,925	10,221	
GA	Georgia	95%	79%	87%	3,316	5,344	1,135	165	0	1,240	1,155	1,225	2,380	0	751	3,131	
HI	Hawaii	97%	92%	99%	48	1,584	489	65	0	554	3	163	166	8	0	174	
ID	Idaho	85%	60%	91%	1,437	12,791	1,729	0	0	1,729	23	196	219	515	461	1,195	
IL	Illinois	66%	45%	65%	3,999	11,996	239	15	0	254	155	3,844	3,999	7,703	5,545	17,247	
IN	Indiana	74%	62%	96%	4,404	5,881	238	10	0	248	479	1,672	2,151	2,525	510	5,186	
IA	Iowa	87%	55%	68%	5,863	5,411	3	0	0	3	0	380	380	798	2,405	3,583	
KS	Kansas	94%	82%	89%	2,561	2,591	227	0	0	227	650	1,493	2,143	477	347	2,967	
KY	Kentucky	90%	65%	62%	297	1,506	644	0	0	644	2,275	0	2,275	24	591	2,890	
LA	Louisiana	63%	46%	72%	2,340	13,894	54	0	0	54	0	2,861	2,861	346	1,631	4,838	
ME	Maine	98%	84%	99%	303	387	401	17	0	418	1,201	657	1,838	65	32	1,955	
MD	Maryland	99%	100%	90%	1,747	2,228	216	0	0	216	3,544	1,629	5,173	256	144	5,573	
MA	Massachusetts	94%	62%	90%	2,114	19,916	1,569	0	0	1,569	1,447	5,024	6,471	1,188	786	8,445	
MI	Michigan	100%	100%	96%	6,319	19,431	148	317	99	564	1,110	7,439	8,549	1,904	737	11,092	
MN	Minnesota	90%	86%	98%	2,418	14,678	922	0	0	922	1,067	8,800	9,867	589	372	11,689	
MS	Mississippi	42%	12%	39%	60	1,693	0	0	0	0	309	80	388	682	2,036	3,106	
MO	Missouri	93%	78%	81%	3,230	6,199	19	0	0	19	422	1,276	1,698	976	766	3,440	
MT	Montana	98%	89%	90%	650	2,400	220	20	0	240	200	380	600	400	64	1,064	
NE	Nebraska	91%	86%	76%	1,132	904	404	0	0	404	1,025	520	1,545	89	402	2,036	
NV	Nevada	94%	80%	93%	1,348	3,621	70	0	0	70	0	36	36	0	65	101	
NH	New Hampshire	99%	98%	99%	434	506	1,125	7	7	1,139	310	75	385	22	25	432	
NJ	New Jersey	77%	47%	66%	728	30,134	0	1126	0	1,126	3,598	4,329	7,927	931	2,962	11,820	
NM	New Mexico	95%	92%	100%	451	1,565	410	12	0	422	752	363	1,115	120	0	1,235	
NY	New York	90%	59%	91%	7,911	76,814	1,700	771	0	2,471	3,313	11,420	14,703	18,788	2,941	36,432	
NC	North Carolina	74%	55%	74%	1,486	13,389	1,128	0	0	1,128	2,049	1,526	3,575	346	2,170	6,091	
ND	North Dakota	87%	52%	83%	1,267	907	27	0	0	27	0	251	251	487	145	883	
OH	Ohio	82%	59%	82%	11,032	19,939	892	0	0	892	3,191	432	3,623	2,817	3,861	10,301	
OK	Oklahoma	77%	69%	82%	1,636	2,516	429	0	0	429	0	740	743	461	1,091	2,295	
OR	Oregon	100%	100%	98%	764	8,589	2,655	0	0	2,655	300	1,720	2,020	216	626	2,862	
PA	Pennsylvania	90%	73%	82%	5,168	32,417	1,434	0	0	1,434	4,715	3,838	9,553	2,014	2,993	14,560	
RI	Rhode Island	99%	95%	97%	680	879	162	4	0	166	254	923	1,177	147	42	1,566	
SC	South Carolina	85%	62%	81%	668	12,238	139	0	0	139	368	1,998	2,366	897	767	4,030	
SD	South Dakota	95%	80%	83%	527	1,033	5	0	0	5	725	514	1,239	416	144	1,799	
TN	Tennessee	87%	72%	78%	3,347	3,590	317	0	0	317	233	357	610	649	528	1,787	
TX	Texas	69%	48%	67%	3,605	5,080	5,665	0	0	5,665	0	4,420	4,420	567	5,057	17,940	
UT	Utah	85%	72%	73%	885	1,843	263	0	0	263	893	341	1,233	172	739	2,144	
VT	Vermont	100%	99%	100%	236	1,634	1,237	0	0	1,237	56	75	131	0	0	131	
VA	Virginia	85%	67%	77%	1,656	1,071	578	0	0	578	1,093	1,240	2,333	411	2,646	5,390	
WA	Washington	94%	75%	80%	3,727	14,442	129	0	0	129	89	2,015	2,104	169	1,061	3,334	
WV	West Virginia	90%	80%	99%	753	2,846	165	0	0	165	218	171	389	500	47	936	
WI	Wisconsin	96%	83%	85%	5,823	7,663	1,280	0	0	1,280	0	2,858	2,858	2,040	722	5,620	
WY	Wyoming	96%	85%	85%	253	933	84	0	0	84	276	495	771	87	83	941	
	United States	87%	67%	77%	127,455	592,180	28,024	2,498	126	40,060	38,340	96,589	160,214	55,682	55,961	279,516	
	United States - Est.				127,455	592,180	34,140	3,043	126	40,060	62,584	105,290	167,874	55,682	56,028	279,584	

Source: Research and Training Center on Community Living; Coleman Institute; Research and Training Center on Community Living

Table/Page: T. 3.9; Community Spend; T. 2.8; T. 2.9; T. 2.7; T. 2.6

Year of Data: 2010; 2009; 2010; 2010; 2010; 2010

Data

State	Promoting Independence														
	All Individuals by Size of Residence									Large State Facilities					
	Totals (includes own home, family home, family foster care and congregate care)									% in Large State Facilities	Residents in Large State Facilities per 100,000 population	Number of Large State Facilities	Residents at Large State Facilities	FY2009 Aver per diem	Persons with ID/DD in Non-specialized Nursing Facilities
	1-3	%	4-6	1-6	%	7-15	16+	%	Total						
Alabama	5,799	77%	496	6,295	85%	907	173	2%	7,575	2.3%	3.6	1	173	\$ 577	777
Alaska	1,073	90%	106	1,179	99%	3	11	1%	1,195	0.0%	0.0	0	0	N/A	20
Arizona	29,227	96%	1,117	30,344	99%	32	153	1%	30,529	0.4%	1.8	1	115	\$ 350	49
Arkansas	3,343	57%	61	3,404	58%	865	1,604	27%	5,873	17.9%	36.1	6	1,052	\$ 317	0
California	177,799	94%	6,325	184,124	97%	1,229	3,993	2%	189,346	1.1%	5.6	5	2,070	\$ 710	1,217
Colorado	10,238	86%	1,370	11,608	98%	203	67	1%	11,878	0.6%	1.3	2	67	\$ 628	97
Connecticut	11,041	75%	2,709	13,750	93%	374	686	5%	14,810	4.6%	19.2	6	686	\$ 934	382
Delaware	2,580	82%	467	3,047	96%	0	118	4%	3,165	2.2%	8.6	1	70	\$ 909	43
Dist. of Columbia	1,297	71%	487	1,784	97%	52	0	0%	1,836	0.0%	0.0	0	0	N/A	15
Florida	41,903	81%	5,704	47,607	92%	1,233	2,925	6%	51,765	1.8%	4.9	5	916	\$ 501	309
Georgia	10,950	84%	1,350	12,280	94%	0	751	6%	13,031	5.8%	7.8	5	751	\$ 440	754
Hawaii	2,124	90%	228	2,352	100%	8	0	0%	2,360	0.0%	0.0	0	0	N/A	87
Idaho	15,980	93%	196	16,176	94%	515	461	3%	17,152	0.4%	4.0	1	62	\$ 638	233
Illinois	16,389	49%	3,859	20,248	60%	7,703	5,545	17%	33,496	6.3%	16.5	8	2,111	\$ 337	DNF
Indiana	11,002	70%	1,682	12,684	81%	2,525	510	3%	15,719	1.2%	3.1	4	192	\$ 602	1,581
Iowa	11,277	76%	380	11,657	78%	798	2,405	16%	14,860	3.4%	16.5	2	503	\$ 758	645
Kansas	6,029	72%	1,493	7,522	90%	477	347	4%	8,346	4.2%	12.2	2	347	\$ 416	0
Kentucky	4,722	88%	0	4,722	88%	24	591	11%	5,337	3.2%	3.9	2	169	\$ 727	935
Louisiana	16,288	77%	2,861	19,149	91%	346	1,631	8%	21,126	5.3%	25.1	7	1,124	\$ 498	416
Maine	2,292	75%	674	2,966	97%	65	32	1%	3,063	0.0%	0.0	0	0	N/A	72
Maryland	7,735	79%	1,629	9,364	96%	256	144	1%	9,764	1.5%	2.5	3	144	\$ 496	DNF
Massachusetts	25,046	78%	5,024	30,070	94%	1,188	786	2%	32,044	2.5%	12.0	6	786	\$ 585	712
Michigan	27,008	72%	7,756	34,764	93%	2,003	737	2%	37,504	0.0%	0.0	0	0	N/A	509
Minnesota	19,085	66%	8,800	27,885	97%	589	372	1%	28,846	0.1%	0.5	1	29	\$ 851	218
Mississippi	2,062	42%	80	2,142	44%	682	2,036	42%	4,860	27.2%	44.6	5	1,324	\$ 254	140
Missouri	9,870	77%	1,276	11,146	86%	976	766	6%	12,888	5.0%	17.9	9	647	\$ 469	DNF
Montana	3,470	80%	400	3,870	89%	400	64	1%	4,334	1.3%	DNF	1	55	DNF	DNF
Nebraska	3,465	77%	520	3,985	89%	89	402	9%	4,476	3.9%	9.5	1	173	\$ 1,373	379
Nevada	5,039	98%	36	5,075	99%	0	65	1%	5,140	0.9%	1.7	1	47	\$ 501	88
New Hampshire	2,375	95%	82	2,457	98%	29	25	1%	2,511	0.0%	0.0	0	0	N/A	61
New Jersey	34,460	79%	5,455	39,915	91%	931	2,962	7%	43,808	6.2%	30.7	7	2,703	\$ 669	DNF
New Mexico	3,178	87%	375	3,553	97%	120	0	0%	3,673	0.0%	0.0	0	0	N/A	103
New York	89,738	73%	12,191	101,929	82%	18,788	2,941	2%	123,658	1.6%	10.2	10	1,981	\$ 987	DNF
North Carolina	18,052	82%	1,526	19,578	89%	346	2,170	10%	22,094	7.2%	16.8	5	1,598	\$ 458	4258
North Dakota	2,201	71%	251	2,452	80%	487	145	5%	3,084	3.7%	17.1	1	115	\$ 570	193
Ohio	35,054	83%	432	35,486	84%	2,817	3,861	9%	42,164	3.2%	11.5	10	1,329	\$ 432	DNF
Oklahoma	4,581	67%	740	5,321	77%	461	1,091	16%	6,873	3.7%	6.7	2	252	\$ 664	406
Oregon	12,308	83%	1,720	14,028	94%	216	626	4%	14,870	0.0%	0.0	0	0	\$ 985	9
Pennsylvania	43,734	83%	3,838	47,572	90%	2,014	2,993	6%	52,579	2.3%	9.4	5	1,189	\$ 636	DNF
Rhode Island	1,975	64%	927	2,902	94%	147	42	1%	3,091	0.5%	1.6	0	17	N/A	92
South Carolina	15,413	79%	1,998	15,411	90%	897	767	4%	17,075	4.5%	16.6	5	767	\$ 535	181
South Dakota	2,290	68%	514	2,804	83%	416	144	4%	3,364	4.3%	21.5	1	144	\$ 491	144
Tennessee	7,487	83%	357	7,844	87%	649	528	6%	9,021	4.3%	6.6	2	384	\$ 990	369
Texas	14,350	59%	4,420	18,770	77%	567	5,057	21%	24,394	17.2%	16.7	13	4,207	\$ 456	DNF
Utah	3,884	76%	341	4,225	82%	172	739	14%	5,136	4.2%	7.8	1	216	\$ 459	95
Vermont	3,163	98%	75	3,238	100%	0	0	0%	3,238	0.0%	0.0	0	0	N/A	28
Virginia	4,398	51%	1,240	5,638	65%	411	2,646	30%	8,695	13.3%	18.7	5	1,153	\$ 535	864
Washington	18,387	85%	2,015	20,402	94%	169	1,061	5%	21,632	4.2%	13.4	5	901	\$ 548	329
West Virginia	3,982	85%	171	4,153	88%	500	47	1%	4,700	0.0%	0.0	0	0	N/A	DNF
Wisconsin	14,766	72%	2,858	17,624	86%	2,040	722	4%	20,386	2.2%	7.9	2	449	\$ 790	153
Wyoming	1,546	70%	495	2,041	92%	87	85	4%	2,211	3.8%	14.7	1	83	\$ 718	45
United States	785,999	79%	99,087	885,086	89%	55,808	55,061	6%	996,855	3.1%	10.3	160	31,101	\$ 535	31,832
United States - Est.	816,359	79%	108,333	924,692	89%	55,808	56,028	5%	1,036,528						

Source

Research and Training Center on Community Living

Table/Page
Year of Data

T. 1.5
2010

T. 1.11
2010

T. 1.7
2010

T. 1.9
2010

T. 3.13
2010

Data

State	Promoting Independence			Ensuring Community Involvement and Safety				
	Waivers that Can Promote Self-Determination			Quality Assurance			Abuse	
	Independence Plus Waivers	Other Self-Directed - 1115 or 1915(c) Waiver for ID/DD	Money Follows the Person - Award or Apply	Council on Quality and Leadership	National Core Indicators (HSRI)	Noteworthy State QA Initiatives	Protection and Advocacy Clients	% of all those served
Alabama	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		38	1%
Alaska		Yes					117	10%
Arizona		Yes			Yes	Yes	34	0%
Arkansas	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		734	12%
California	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	1,517	1%
Colorado	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	60	1%
Connecticut	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	45	0%
Delaware	Yes	Yes	Yes				26	1%
Dist. of Columbia		Yes	Yes				78	4%
Florida	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		180	0%
Georgia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		96	1%
Hawaii		Yes	Yes		Yes		183	8%
Idaho	Yes	Yes	Yes				85	0%
Illinois		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		105	0%
Indiana		Yes	Yes	Yes			92	1%
Iowa		Yes	Yes	Yes			114	1%
Kansas		Yes	Yes	Yes			40	0%
Kentucky		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		69	1%
Louisiana	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		105	0%
Maine	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		166	5%
Maryland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		75	1%
Massachusetts	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		136	0%
Michigan	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	55	0%
Minnesota		Yes	Yes	Yes			349	1%
Mississippi		Yes	Yes				162	3%
Missouri	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		143	1%
Montana	Yes	Yes					35	1%
Nebraska		Yes	Yes				91	2%
Nevada		Yes	Yes	Yes			117	2%
New Hampshire	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	48	2%
New Jersey	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		130	0%
New Mexico		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	259	7%
New York		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	35	0%
North Carolina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		84	0%
North Dakota		Yes	Yes	Yes			40	1%
Ohio	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		610	1%
Oklahoma		Yes	Yes		Yes		333	5%
Oregon	Yes	Yes	Yes				51	0%
Pennsylvania		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1,137	2%
Rhode Island	Yes	Yes	Yes				43	1%
South Carolina	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes		74	0%
South Dakota		Yes		Yes	Yes		63	2%
Tennessee		Yes	Yes				76	1%
Texas		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		579	2%
Utah		Yes	Yes				270	5%
Vermont	Yes					Yes	68	2%
Virginia		Yes	Yes		Yes		86	1%
Washington		Yes	Yes		Yes		46	0%
West Virginia		Yes	Yes				156	3%
Wisconsin		Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	88	0%
Wyoming		Yes				Yes	111	5%
United States	25	50	44	24	29	13	10,386	1%
United States - Est.								

Source	CMS & NHPF	PAS Center	CMS & Mathematica	Council on Quality and Leadership	Human Services Research Institute	QualityMall.org	Administration on Developmental Disabilities
Table/Page			MRDD	Orgs in ST		QA & QI	Outcomes
Year of Data	2008	Nov 2006	2012	2010	Jan-12	2010	2008

Data

State	Keeping Families Together				
	Family Support				% Individuals Living in Family Home
	Families	Spending	Spending per Family	Families Supported per 100k of Population	
Alabama	1,377	\$ 700,000	\$ 508	29	50%
Alaska	1,468	\$ 6,180,000	\$ 4,210	206	19%
Arizona	20,899	\$ 352,500,000	\$ 16,867	326	86%
Arkansas	521	\$ 500,000	\$ 960	18	34%
California	99,244	\$ 738,400,000	\$ 7,440	266	71%
Colorado	3,736	\$ 6,800,000	\$ 1,820	74	59%
Connecticut	8,178	\$ 47,700,000	\$ 5,833	229	53%
Delaware	1,987	\$ 1,410,000	\$ 710	221	68%
Dist. of Columbia	422	\$ 11,000,000	\$ 26,066	70	28%
Florida	17,537	\$ 336,400,000	\$ 19,182	93	70%
Georgia	7,276	\$ 24,000,000	\$ 3,299	75	41%
Hawaii	921	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,429	68	67%
Idaho	751	\$ 300,000	\$ 399	48	75%
Illinois	5,609	\$ 35,200,000	\$ 6,276	44	36%
Indiana	4,207	\$ 24,000,000	\$ 5,705	65	37%
Iowa	1,977	\$ 29,000,000	\$ 14,669	65	36%
Kansas	4,074	\$ 54,400,000	\$ 13,353	142	31%
Kentucky	3,370	\$ 23,200,000	\$ 6,884	78	28%
Louisiana	10,985	\$ 366,900,000	\$ 33,400	242	66%
Maine	545	\$ 1,100,000	\$ 2,018	41	13%
Maryland	8,194	\$ 40,200,000	\$ 4,906	142	23%
Massachusetts	14,817	\$ 46,100,000	\$ 3,111	226	62%
Michigan	13,588	\$ 55,100,000	\$ 4,055	138	52%
Minnesota	8,008	\$ 231,200,000	\$ 28,871	151	51%
Mississippi	4,100	\$ 21,900,000	\$ 5,341	138	35%
Missouri	8,332	\$ 23,600,000	\$ 2,832	139	48%
Montana	2,851	\$ 11,000,000	\$ 3,858	288	55%
Nebraska	712	\$ 7,500,000	\$ 10,534	39	20%
Nevada	2,603	\$ 6,900,000	\$ 2,651	96	70%
New Hampshire	3,960	\$ 7,650,000	\$ 1,942	301	20%
New Jersey	17,086	\$ 64,400,000	\$ 3,769	194	69%
New Mexico	6,199	\$ 29,200,000	\$ 4,710	300	43%
New York	53,908	\$ 559,700,000	\$ 10,383	278	62%
North Carolina	8,471	\$ 35,500,000	\$ 4,191	89	61%
North Dakota	629	\$ 8,000,000	\$ 12,719	93	29%
Ohio	19,603	\$ 76,800,000	\$ 3,918	170	47%
Oklahoma	4,948	\$ 84,500,000	\$ 17,078	132	37%
Oregon	2,142	\$ 3,100,000	\$ 1,447	56	58%
Pennsylvania	25,001	\$ 78,300,000	\$ 3,132	197	62%
Rhode Island	1,235	\$ 11,700,000	\$ 9,474	117	28%
South Carolina	10,161	\$ 57,100,000	\$ 5,620	219	72%
South Dakota	2,191	\$ 6,600,000	\$ 3,012	268	31%
Tennessee	7,727	\$ 11,400,000	\$ 1,475	122	40%
Texas	27,567	\$ 75,900,000	\$ 2,753	109	21%
Utah	1,564	\$ 10,100,000	\$ 6,458	56	36%
Vermont	1,602	\$ 13,900,000	\$ 8,677	256	50%
Virginia	3,573	\$ 2,900,000	\$ 812	45	12%
Washington	7,076	\$ 58,300,000	\$ 8,239	105	67%
West Virginia	2,650	\$ 30,200,000	\$ 11,396	143	61%
Wisconsin	16,695	\$ 41,100,000	\$ 2,462	293	38%
Wyoming	1,038	\$ 8,100,000	\$ 7,803	184	42%
United States	487,028	\$ 3,780,000,000	\$ 7,761	157	59%
United States - Est.			Calculated		

Source

Coleman Institute

Table/Page
Year of Data

Family Support - from State Profiles
2009

Calculated

Data

State	Promoting Productivity								
	Medicaid Buy-In		Supported or Competitive Employment				Voc Rehab		
	Has?	Enrollment - 12/09	Participants	Spending	Spending per Participant	%	Total Number in Competitive Employment	per 100k of population	% VR Wages to State Average
Alabama			250	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 11,200	5%	5,969	125	50%
Alaska	Yes	239	494	\$ 5,790,000	\$ 11,721	38%	524	73	69%
Arizona	Yes	1,024	1,365	\$ 7,400,000	\$ 5,421	6%	1,372	21	55%
Arkansas	Yes	131	59	\$ 500,000	\$ 8,475	2%	2,361	81	64%
California	Yes	4,774	10,917	\$ 83,400,000	\$ 7,639	13%	11,605	31	49%
Colorado			1,401	DNF	DNF	17%	2,216	44	54%
Connecticut	Yes	4,942	4,915	\$ 65,300,000	\$ 13,286	57%	1,420	40	66%
Delaware	Yes		339	\$ 4,410,000	\$ 13,009	41%	902	100	43%
Dist. of Columbia			421	\$ 6,050,000	\$ 14,371	30%	410	68	35%
Florida			5,404	\$ 12,800,000	\$ 2,369	18%	6,411	34	58%
Georgia	Yes		2,282	\$ 14,100,000	\$ 6,179	20%	4,302	44	46%
Hawaii			180	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 8,333	7%	479	35	67%
Idaho	Yes	606	812	\$ 3,200,000	\$ 3,941	30%	1,857	118	62%
Illinois	Yes	687	3,085	\$ 19,000,000	\$ 6,159	19%	5,285	41	44%
Indiana	Yes	4,182	2,798	\$ 11,000,000	\$ 3,931	25%	4,020	62	62%
Iowa	Yes	13,324	3,325	\$ 8,200,000	\$ 2,466	24%	2,264	74	64%
Kansas	Yes	1,094	1,111	\$ 4,900,000	\$ 4,410	14%	1,426	50	53%
Kentucky	Yes		1,303	\$ 3,400,000	\$ 2,609	25%	4,564	105	64%
Louisiana	Yes	1,648	1,472	\$ 12,300,000	\$ 8,356	19%	2,353	52	71%
Maine	Yes	800	1,150	\$ 5,500,000	\$ 4,783	27%	649	49	64%
Maryland	Yes	507	4,633	\$ 64,800,000	\$ 13,987	41%	2,309	40	44%
Massachusetts	Yes	11,474	3,469	\$ 38,200,000	\$ 11,012	29%	3,035	46	47%
Michigan	Yes	3,374	6,303	\$ 21,000,000	\$ 3,332	74%	6,933	70	64%
Minnesota	Yes	7,351	1,111	\$ 7,500,000	\$ 6,751	7%	2,389	45	49%
Mississippi	Yes		419	\$ 2,100,000	\$ 5,012	22%	4,555	153	72%
Missouri	Yes		345	\$ 1,900,000	\$ 5,507	4%	3,903	65	51%
Montana	Yes		281	\$ 2,100,000	\$ 7,473	12%	799	81	66%
Nebraska	Yes	92	1,216	\$ 9,400,000	\$ 7,730	31%	1,568	86	57%
Nevada	Yes	13	451	\$ 3,300,000	\$ 7,317	28%	901	33	55%
New Hampshire	Yes	1,772	1,086	\$ 5,420,000	\$ 4,991	27%	1,101	84	54%
New Jersey	Yes	3,706	1,111	\$ 10,300,000	\$ 9,271	11%	4,022	46	45%
New Mexico	Yes	833	1,251	\$ 10,100,000	\$ 8,074	32%	1,545	75	66%
New York	Yes	7,711	8,377	\$ 42,700,000	\$ 5,097	13%	12,151	63	38%
North Carolina	Yes	1,200	3,059	\$ 13,700,000	\$ 4,479	29%	6,290	66	49%
North Dakota	Yes	534	406	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 6,158	11%	793	118	67%
Ohio	Yes	3,603	6,227	\$ 85,400,000	\$ 13,714	24%	7,520	65	69%
Oklahoma			3,413	\$ 24,100,000	\$ 7,061	66%	1,689	45	62%
Oregon	Yes	1,234	1,335	\$ 19,500,000	\$ 14,607	11%	1,924	50	59%
Pennsylvania	Yes	17,538	12,399	\$ 31,500,000	\$ 2,541	40%	9,305	73	54%
Rhode Island	Yes	19	733	\$ 4,600,000	\$ 6,276	22%	756	72	51%
South Carolina	Yes		1,195	\$ 5,900,000	\$ 4,937	18%	8,257	178	59%
South Dakota	Yes	126	725	\$ 5,600,000	\$ 7,724	24%	598	73	57%
Tennessee			1,484	\$ 11,500,000	\$ 7,749	20%	1,906	30	54%
Texas	Yes	96	748	\$ 19,900,000	\$ 26,604	4%	11,861	47	51%
Utah	Yes	564	906	\$ 5,500,000	\$ 6,071	21%	3,116	112	62%
Vermont	Yes	669	909	\$ 10,500,000	\$ 11,551	38%	1,480	236	59%
Virginia	Yes	22	2,421	\$ 25,900,000	\$ 10,698	28%	3,214	40	42%
Washington	Yes	1,517	5,379	\$ 28,500,000	\$ 5,298	49%	2,404	36	51%
West Virginia	Yes	1,104	447	\$ 1,700,000	\$ 3,803	10%	1,867	101	69%
Wisconsin	Yes	15,677	2,410	\$ 12,900,000	\$ 5,353	13%	2,683	47	60%
Wyoming	Yes	154	305	\$ 2,200,000	\$ 7,213	14%	705	125	59%
United States	44	114,341	117,658	\$ 800,000,000	\$ 6,801	20%	171,968	56	56%
United States - Est.		152,939							

Source: National Consortium for Health Systems Development; Coleman Institute; US Dept of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services

Table/Page: Supported Employment - from State Profiles

Year of Data: 2010 2009 2009

Data

State	Reaching Those in Need								
	Waiting Lists					Prevalence		Individuals with ID/DD served per 100k of population	Ratio of Prevalence to Individuals Served
	Waiting List for Residential Services	% Growth in Residential Services Required to Meet Waiting List	Waiting List ID/DD HCBS - Kaiser	% Growth in HCBS Services Required to Meet Waiting List	Waiting List Average	% Children with Cognitive Disability	% Adults with Cognitive Disability		
Alabama	2,372	64%	NA	NA	64%	6.0%	6.0%	154	3%
Alaska	662	69%	982	76%	72%	3.8%	3.8%	167	4%
Arizona	29	1%	NA	NA	1%	3.9%	3.9%	476	12%
Arkansas	1,522	40%	991	26%	33%	6.1%	6.1%	201	3%
California	0	0%	-	0%	0%	3.3%	3.3%	507	15%
Colorado	1,562	26%	3,232	40%	33%	3.3%	3.3%	235	7%
Connecticut	531	8%	1,846	22%	15%	3.5%	3.5%	414	12%
Delaware	174	17%	-	0%	9%	4.2%	4.2%	352	8%
Dist. of Columbia	0	0%	-	0%	0%	4.2%	4.2%	304	7%
Florida	3,835	25%	18,960	63%	44%	4.0%	4.0%	275	7%
Georgia	1,640	21%	10,364	90%	56%	3.9%	3.9%	154	3%
Hawaii	0	0%	-	0%	0%	3.0%	3.0%	173	6%
Idaho	0	0%	-	0%	0%	4.6%	4.6%	1,092	24%
Illinois	15,042	70%	33,114	205%	138%	3.2%	3.2%	261	8%
Indiana	17,142	174%	29,303	264%	219%	4.5%	4.5%	242	5%
Iowa	94	0%	108	1%	1%	3.8%	3.8%	487	13%
Kansas	1,287	22%	2,414	31%	27%	4.1%	4.1%	292	7%
Kentucky	295	8%	-	0%	4%	6.5%	6.5%	123	2%
Louisiana	DNF	DNF	4,572	58%	58%	5.4%	5.4%	465	9%
Maine	337	13%	98	2%	7%	5.9%	5.9%	231	4%
Maryland	2,770	37%	3,210	29%	33%	3.2%	3.2%	169	5%
Massachusetts	0	0%	-	0%	0%	4.1%	4.1%	489	12%
Michigan	DNF	DNF	-	0%	0%	5.0%	5.0%	380	8%
Minnesota	3,243	23%	NA	NA	23%	3.7%	3.7%	543	15%
Mississippi	DNF	DNF	-	0%	DNF	6.2%	6.2%	164	3%
Missouri	206	3%	NA	NA	3%	5.2%	5.2%	215	4%
Montana	691	36%	810	35%	36%	4.3%	4.3%	437	10%
Nebraska	1,639	46%	2,390	62%	54%	3.4%	3.4%	245	7%
Nevada	109	7%	126	8%	7%	3.0%	3.0%	190	6%
New Hampshire	19	1%	NA	NA	1%	3.8%	3.8%	191	5%
New Jersey	DNF	DNF	-	0%	DNF	3.0%	3.0%	498	17%
New Mexico	4,998	237%	1,141	29%	133%	4.9%	4.9%	178	4%
New York	3,864	8%	-	0%	4%	3.3%	3.3%	638	19%
North Carolina	397	DNF	NA	NA	DNF	4.4%	4.4%	231	5%
North Dakota	0	0%	-	0%	0%	3.2%	3.2%	457	14%
Ohio	DNF	DNF	43,793	172%	172%	4.9%	4.9%	365	7%
Oklahoma	5,737	132%	5,754	111%	121%	5.8%	5.8%	183	3%
Oregon	3,219	51%	-	0%	26%	5.0%	5.0%	387	8%
Pennsylvania	1,613	7%	20,460	65%	36%	4.5%	4.5%	413	9%
Rhode Island	0	0%	-	0%	0%	5.1%	5.1%	294	6%
South Carolina	335	7%	1,296	19%	13%	4.8%	4.8%	368	8%
South Dakota	2	0%	23	1%	0%	3.8%	3.8%	412	11%
Tennessee	1,158	21%	2,316	31%	26%	5.6%	5.6%	142	3%
Texas	DNF	DNF	70,113	334%	334%	3.8%	3.8%	97	3%
Utah	1,822	55%	1,847	43%	49%	3.4%	3.4%	185	5%
Vermont	0	0%	NA	NA	0%	5.4%	5.4%	517	10%
Virginia	4,395	58%	6,798	78%	68%	3.6%	3.6%	108	3%
Washington	DNF	DNF	829	7%	7%	4.4%	4.4%	321	7%
West Virginia	409	22%	409	9%	16%	7.1%	7.1%	253	4%
Wisconsin	4,783	38%	675	4%	21%	3.6%	3.6%	358	10%
Wyoming	120	9%	246	12%	11%	3.8%	3.8%	392	10%
United States	88,053	25%	268,220	46%	36%	4.1%	4.1%	322	8%
United States - Est.	115,059	25%							

Source: Research and Training Center on Community Living; Kaiser Family Foundation; US Census Bureau, ACS

Table/Page: T, 2.5
Year of Data: 2010

Waiting List: 2010

T 1810
2010

Calculated

Data

State	Serving at a Reasonable Cost								
	ICF-MR			HCBS			Overall Spending		
	Total Expenditures-2010	Aver. Residents	Aver. Cost per Resident	Total Expenditures-2010	Aver. Residents	Aver. Cost per Resident	ID/DD Spending per 1k personal income	ID/DD Spending per capita	
Alabama	\$ 54,859,100	224	\$ 155,969	\$ 272,842,019	5,543	\$ 49,227	\$ 2.28	\$ 68	
Alaska	\$ 1,644,076	0	\$ -	\$ 100,945,278	1296	\$ 77,920	\$ 3.95	\$ 183	
Arizona	\$ 24,181,959	193	\$ 125,621	\$ 606,010,820	22,283	\$ 27,196	\$ 3.49	\$ 119	
Arkansas	\$ 158,996,003	1,585	\$ 100,345	\$ 139,744,190	3,866	\$ 36,152	\$ 4.75	\$ 169	
California	\$ 560,645,760	9,187	\$ 77,759	\$ 1,939,601,000	83,078	\$ 23,347	\$ 3.82	\$ 141	
Colorado	\$ 28,495,752	164	\$ 174,286	\$ 336,291,937	8,030	\$ 41,879	\$ 2.23	\$ 104	
Connecticut	\$ 292,218,580	1,064	\$ 274,771	\$ 643,614,884	8,580	\$ 75,018	\$ 7.69	\$ 435	
Delaware	\$ 30,733,521	119	\$ 258,265	\$ 89,162,020	836.5	\$ 106,589	\$ 5.00	\$ 187	
Dist. of Columbia	\$ 69,360,377	426	\$ 162,818	\$ 139,208,569	1392	\$ 100,006	\$ 5.91	\$ 645	
Florida	\$ 333,717,786	3,010	\$ 110,888	\$ 933,666,466	29,903	\$ 31,224	\$ 2.09	\$ 89	
Georgia	\$ 91,956,520	716	\$ 128,521	\$ 332,542,420	11,532	\$ 30,571	\$ 2.14	\$ 61	
Hawaii	\$ 9,014,193	85	\$ 106,049	\$ 100,020,238	2,541	\$ 39,370	\$ 3.11	\$ 115	
Idaho	\$ 66,258,392	530	\$ 125,134	\$ 99,214,014	2,709	\$ 36,631	\$ 4.69	\$ 202	
Illinois	\$ 636,142,294	8,546	\$ 74,437	\$ 525,600,000	16,128	\$ 32,589	\$ 3.13	\$ 135	
Indiana	\$ 313,996,626	4,086	\$ 76,856	\$ 509,458,094	11,104	\$ 45,883	\$ 4.13	\$ 186	
Iowa	\$ 286,660,825	2,072	\$ 138,350	\$ 343,542,519	14,079	\$ 24,402	\$ 6.50	\$ 266	
Kansas	\$ 61,911,471	519	\$ 119,405	\$ 280,702,208	7,749	\$ 36,224	\$ 4.41	\$ 166	
Kentucky	\$ 145,522,749	619	\$ 235,093	\$ 266,303,766	5,284	\$ 50,398	\$ 2.87	\$ 103	
Louisiana	\$ 472,346,871	4,913	\$ 96,142	\$ 398,178,839	7,924	\$ 50,250	\$ 7.13	\$ 242	
Maine	\$ 60,512,303	140	\$ 432,231	\$ 307,266,249	4,250	\$ 72,298	\$ 8.32	\$ 356	
Maryland	\$ 1,515	141	\$ 11	\$ 588,226,135	11,182	\$ 52,605	\$ 2.89	\$ 138	
Massachusetts	\$ 417,064,471	813	\$ 513,310	\$ 667,079,913	11,861	\$ 56,241	\$ 4.72	\$ 240	
Michigan	\$ -	0	\$ -	\$ 420,833,872	8,564	\$ 49,140	\$ 3.80	\$ 122	
Minnesota	\$ 169,111,403	1,753	\$ 96,497	\$ 998,020,576	15,093	\$ 66,127	\$ 7.54	\$ 344	
Mississippi	\$ 269,536,058	2,625	\$ 102,700	\$ 35,623,845	1,931	\$ 18,448	\$ 4.26	\$ 131	
Missouri	\$ 133,887,537	758	\$ 176,633	\$ 463,119,959	8,936	\$ 51,829	\$ 3.45	\$ 135	
Montana	\$ 12,659,441	54	\$ 234,434	\$ 98,904,472	2,302	\$ 42,974	\$ 3.77	\$ 149	
Nebraska	\$ 34,312,746	420	\$ 81,794	\$ 205,291,287	3,864	\$ 53,129	\$ 4.16	\$ 164	
Nevada	\$ 18,473,464	101	\$ 183,816	\$ 72,474,267	1,598	\$ 45,367	\$ 1.59	\$ 54	
New Hampshire	\$ 3,106,085	25	\$ 124,243	\$ 174,832,808	4,080	\$ 42,856	\$ 3.79	\$ 176	
New Jersey	\$ 619,411,055	2,898	\$ 213,774	\$ 538,107,000	10,082	\$ 53,357	\$ 3.62	\$ 187	
New Mexico	\$ 24,694,512	230	\$ 107,601	\$ 294,460,077	3,933	\$ 74,869	\$ 5.34	\$ 190	
New York	\$ 3,373,068,946	7,580	\$ 445,025	\$ 4,766,908,958	64,187	\$ 74,266	\$ 10.10	\$ 546	
North Carolina	\$ 491,450,313	3,900	\$ 126,013	\$ 608,294,643	10,714	\$ 56,778	\$ 4.06	\$ 179	
North Dakota	\$ 90,198,338	582	\$ 155,113	\$ 97,696,826	3,831	\$ 25,505	\$ 7.28	\$ 370	
Ohio	\$ 763,029,799	6,060	\$ 125,913	\$ 1,095,712,081	25,524	\$ 42,930	\$ 6.84	\$ 274	
Oklahoma	\$ 123,591,517	1,576	\$ 78,446	\$ 280,201,976	5,203	\$ 53,859	\$ 3.39	\$ 139	
Oregon	\$ 2,192,905	22	\$ 99,678	\$ 515,170,446	11,690	\$ 44,071	\$ 5.18	\$ 178	
Pennsylvania	\$ 598,966,448	3,681	\$ 162,718	\$ 1,636,580,454	31,309	\$ 52,273	\$ 5.70	\$ 245	
Rhode Island	\$ 11,462,072	40	\$ 290,179	\$ 243,023,182	3,275	\$ 74,206	\$ 6.31	\$ 284	
South Carolina	\$ 140,569,551	1,421	\$ 98,958	\$ 226,600,000	6,744	\$ 33,605	\$ 3.49	\$ 128	
South Dakota	\$ 24,523,880	145	\$ 169,130	\$ 96,252,693	2,060	\$ 46,723	\$ 4.59	\$ 181	
Tennessee	\$ 225,405,648	1,089	\$ 207,079	\$ 574,381,791	7,564	\$ 75,936	\$ 4.17	\$ 151	
Texas	\$ 974,081,321	10,418	\$ 93,501	\$ 912,609,318	21,021	\$ 43,414	\$ 1.93	\$ 97	
Utah	\$ 57,404,313	780	\$ 73,595	\$ 148,512,550	4,251	\$ 34,940	\$ 2.94	\$ 94	
Vermont	\$ 980,000	6	\$ 163,333	\$ 132,937,535	2,416	\$ 55,024	\$ 6.21	\$ 243	
Virginia	\$ 270,359,227	1,569	\$ 172,368	\$ 539,806,187	8,764	\$ 61,594	\$ 2.73	\$ 125	
Washington	\$ 141,460,725	742	\$ 190,648	\$ 419,822,564	11,086	\$ 37,870	\$ 3.42	\$ 130	
West Virginia	\$ 62,594,827	477	\$ 131,226	\$ 245,100,113	4,373	\$ 56,049	\$ 5.70	\$ 202	
Wisconsin	\$ 145,075,365	808	\$ 179,549	\$ 694,835,980	18,521	\$ 37,517	\$ 5.46	\$ 199	
Wyoming	\$ 18,503,355	83	\$ 224,283	\$ 90,361,421	2,114	\$ 42,754	\$ 4.90	\$ 221	
United States	\$ 12,871,190,036	88,954	\$ 144,693	\$ 26,285,720,458	577,069	\$ 45,550	\$ 4.34	\$ 182	
United States - Est.									

Source: Research and Training Center on Community Living, Coleman Institute
 Table/Page: T. 3.4 2010 T. 3.7 Fiscal Effort Calculated 2009
 Year of Data

THE CASE FOR
Inclusion 2012



Copyright © May 2012

www.ucp.org | 800.872.5827 | info@ucp.org

United Cerebral Palsy | 1825 K Street NW, Suite 600 | Washington, DC 20006