



www.npcresearch.com

Service Integration: The Clients' Perspective

Final Report

Submitted to

Department of Human Services
State of Oregon

Submitted by

Michael Finigan, Ph.D.
Judy Weller, B.S.
NPC Research, Inc.
5200 SW Macadam Ave., Suite 420
Portland, Oregon 97201
(503) 243-2436
fax (503) 243-2454
e-mail: weller@npcresearch.com

August 14, 2000

Acknowledgements

NPC Research would like to thank Chuck Diamond of the Department of Human Services for overseeing this project, Ron Taylor of Adult and Family Services (AFS) for managing this project and coordinating the logistics, and Roma Vasquez, also of AFS, for seeing to the details. We would also like to thank the AFS point people at each site who coordinated the arrangements and client contacts: Joyce Fletcher, Portland; Carole Cole, Woodburn; Eileen Harrington, Coos Bay; Dan Kinsey, White City; and Gary Chamberlin, Pendleton. Thanks also to those employees who made phone calls to the clients, facilitating arrangements for their participation in the focus groups.

We would also like to thank the clients who shared their experiences, gave us a look at service integration from their perspective, and made suggestions.

A special thank you to Angelina Marchand for her valuable contributions as a co-facilitator in Portland, Coos Bay, White City, and Pendleton. We also are grateful to Bernardino De La Torre for his expertise in co-facilitating a Woodburn focus group in Spanish and translating the responses to English, and to Charley Korn and Chip Edie at NPC Research for report formatting.

Executive Summary

The state of Oregon, Department of Human Services (DHS), has proposed integrating social services at the state and county levels as a means of coordinating efforts and reducing redundancy, thereby producing a smooth, efficient service delivery system.

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of an integrated system, test sites were established which brought together social services provided by DHS divisions [e.g., Adult & Family Services (AFS), Services to Children & Families (SCF)] and services provided by other agencies (e.g., job training, local food bank).

As part of the evaluation process, DHS recognized the importance of looking at service integration from the client perspective. DHS then contracted with NPC Research, Inc., to conduct a series of focus groups with clients to look at service integration from their perspective. For comparison purposes, focus groups were conducted at both integrated and non-integrated sites within the state.

This report presents the information generated by the clients for use in evaluating the effectiveness of service integration in the state of Oregon.

Key Findings

- There is a substantial difference in the experiences of clients utilizing integrated sites vs. non-integrated sites. Feedback from clients at integrated sites was more positive than feedback from clients at non-integrated sites.
- The positive tone at integrated sites may not be solely attributable to physical site integration, but other aspects of that integration which produced greater client satisfaction, such as improved communication and/or increased employee knowledge/helpfulness.
- The positive view at integrated sites is also based on their experience of having one person, the caseworker, and one place, their integrated site center, to go to with problems and concerns.
- Neither participants at integrated sites nor non-integrated sites seemed to be confused about where to go for services. The source of their confusion had to do with the internal processes at each site.
- Most of the anticipated disadvantages of having an integrated site (from the client perspective at non-integrated sites) did not, in fact, occur at integrated sites.

- To maximize effectiveness of site integration from the clients' perspective, additional concerns need to be addressed.
- Even if every possible service is available, transportation may still be a barrier.
- Clients who reported that they were not told about services available to them in addition to those for which they initially applied, were from non-integrated sites only.
- Clients who said they had unmet needs were from non-integrated sites only.
- There are clients who think that other people needing services will need to be helped through the process by clients currently in the system.
- The clients networked, providing each other with information.

Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Research Objective	1
Purpose of this Report.....	1
II. METHODOLOGY	2
Design	2
Site Selection	2
Participant Selection	2
Focus Group Procedure.....	3
Focus Group Questions	3
Sample.....	4
Qualitative Analysis.....	4
Focus Groups	4
III. SERVICES and DIVISIONS ACCESSED BY CLIENTS.....	5
Services Accessed by Clients - Client Reports	5
Divisions Accessed by Clients – DHS Records	9
IV. CLIENT RESPONSE: By Topic	13
Question 1. What services have you been getting during the past 12 months?	14
Question 2. How did you first hear about the services that were available to you?.....	16
Question 3. Did you come in for just one service?.....	17
Question 3a. Did the person you talked to tell you about other services available to you?	18
Question 4. Did you find out later [after the initial contact] that you were eligible for something that you weren't told about? How?	20
Question 5. How quickly did you get what you needed?	21
Question 5a. Could it have been done more quickly? How?.....	23
Question 6. If you have problems or questions, whom do you call?	24
Question 6a. Is there one office where you can go with all your questions or problems? What office is that?	25
Question 7. Was the system confusing?	28
Question 7a. What made it [the system] confusing?	29
Question 8. If you had an opportunity to get all services at one place, would you think it is a good thing?	31
Question 8a. Why [is it a good thing to have all services in one place]?.....	32
Question 9. Are there reasons why that [having all services in one place] might NOT be a good thing?	34
Question 10. Area there any concerns about confidentiality?	36
Question 11. What sorts of things were barriers to your getting services? [also see questions 13a-13c]	37
Question 11a. What could be done to improve or change this [barriers]?	40
Question 12. What advice would you give to someone who needs services?	42

Question 13. Knowing what we are looking for, could you tell us what improvements could be made so that you would be satisfied with the services you receive?	45
13a. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/areas needing improvement – MISCELLANEOUS	50
13b. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/areas needing improvement – PAPERWORK	55
13c. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/areas needing improvement – CASEWORKERS (negative).....	56
13d. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/areas needing improvement – SERVICES/CASEWORKERS/MANAGERS (Positive)	57
14. Suggestions for participants by participants (a category created to capture the spontaneous suggestions participants made to each other).....	59
15. Commendations not included elsewhere in the report and requests for copies of the report	62
 IV. CLIENT REPOSSES – By Site	 63
Portland, Oregon	64
Woodburn, Oregon.....	66
Coos Bay, Oregon	69
White City, Oregon.....	72
Pendleton, Oregon	75
 V. CONCLUSION	 78
Recommendations	78

List of Tables

Table 1. Client Focus Groups	4
Table 2. Groups of Services Accessed by Focus Group Participants – Client Reports	6
Table 3. Number of Services Accessed by Focus Group Participants by Site–Client Reports.....	8
Table 4. Groups of DHS Divisions Accessed by Focus Group Participants – DHS Records	10
Table 5. Number of DHS Divisions Accessed by Focus Group Participants by Site – DHS Records	12
Table 6. What services have you been getting during the past 12 months?	15
Table 7. How did you first hear about the services that were available to you?	16
Table 8. Did you come in for just one service?.....	17
Table 9. Did the person you talked to tell you about other services available to you?	18
Table 10. Did you find out later you were eligible for something that you weren’t told about? How?	20
Table 11. How quickly did you get what you needed?	21
Table 12. Could it have been more quickly? How?.....	23
Table 13. If you have problems or questions, who do you call?.....	24
Table 14. Is there one office where you can go with all your questions or problems? What office is that?	26
Table 15. Was the system confusing?	28
Table 16. What made it confusing?	29
Table 17. If you had an opportunity to get all services at one place, would you think it is a good thing?	31
Table 18. Why [is it a good thing to have all services in one place]?.....	32
Table 19. Are there reasons why that might NOT be a good thing?	35
Table 20. Are there any concerns about confidentiality?	36
Table 21. What sorts of things were barriers to your getting services? [also see question 13a-13c]	37
Table 22. What could be done to improve or change this [barriers]?.....	40
Table 23. What advice would you give someone who needs services?	43
Table 24. Knowing what we are looking for, could you tell us what improvements could be made so that you would be satisfied with the services you receive?	46
Table 25. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/areas needing improvement – MISCELLANEOUS	51
Table 26. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/areas needing improvement – PAPERWORK.....	55
Table 27. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/ areas needing improvement – CASEWORKERS (Negative).....	56
Table 28. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/areas needing improvement – SERVICES/CASEWORKERS/MANAGERS (Positive)	57
Table 29. Suggestions for Participants by Participants [a category created to capture the spontaneous suggestions participants made to each other].....	60
Table 30. Commendations not included elsewhere in report and requests for copies of report	62

I. INTRODUCTION

Increased collaboration has been identified as one of the ways to increase efficiency and decrease redundancy at the state and county levels in the state of Oregon. With this in mind, the Department of Human Services (DHS) proposed some major service integration initiatives with the goal of integrating all the services within the departments as well as within the county governments.

Before establishing a fully integrated state-county social service system, integration was implemented in test sites within the state. This provided information about the effectiveness of the new model from the perspective of DHS and its divisions, local agencies, and those individuals providing services. However, an important piece was still missing: the client perspective. In order to understand the impact that service integration—or lack of integration—has on the client, DHS proposed a research study looking at integrated services from the client perspective. The information generated from this study will be used in conjunction with state- and county-level contributions to better understand the implications of integrated services.

Research Objective

To explore the value of service integration from the client perspective.

Purpose of this Report

The purpose of this report is to present information about the impact of integrated service sites and non-integrated service sites on the client, *from the client perspective*, and to offer comparisons of the two. Among other things, this information includes the number and type of services¹ being accessed by the clients, barriers to getting services, an examination of pros and cons regarding service integration, and suggestions for improvement.

¹ Although DHS distinguishes between “services” and “benefits,” the clients do not necessarily make that distinction. Therefore, for purposes of this report, “services” includes both services *and* benefits accessed by clients.

II. METHODOLOGY

Design

In the spring of 2000, Oregon's Department of Human Services (DHS) contracted with NPC Research, Inc., to conduct focus groups in five locations around the state. The purpose of the focus groups was to explore the idea of integrated services and what that would mean to the client, from the client's perspective.

The focus group was selected as the most appropriate means for gathering information and generating ideas from clients relating to integration of social services. By relying on focus groups to generate interactions within the group, researchers find a rich source of data and insights that may not be accessible by other means of data collection.

Site Selection

The sites were selected purposefully: two were considered integrated, three were not fully integrated. Integrated in this case means that multiple services from more than one division were accessible at one location. The sites selected were Portland, Woodburn, and Pendleton (not integrated); and Coos Bay and White City (integrated). These sites are located in different regions of the state, as follows: Portland and Woodburn, the Northwest region; Coos Bay, South Coast area; White City, Southern region; and Pendleton, Eastern region.

One reason for selecting Woodburn as a focus group site was the city's large Hispanic population. As Oregon's Hispanic population continues to grow, it is ever more important to be sure that issues pertinent to this group are not overlooked.

Participant Selection

To select participants for the focus groups, DHS compiled a random list of clients from all divisions within DHS receiving services at the selected sites. Those divisions are: Adult & Family Services (AFS), Services to Children & Families (SCF), Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs (OADAP), Mental Health Division, Vocational Rehabilitation Division (VRD), Oregon Youth Authority (OYA), Office of Medical Assistance Programs (OMAP), Senior and Disabled Services Division (SDSD), Corrections, and the Health Division. The random lists were given to site personnel who examined them for clients with the potential to create safety issues for the group facilitators. (A client with safety issues was defined as someone with a known violent or confrontational background.) Such people were then eliminated from the list. Telephone calls were made to clients remaining on the list until a total of twelve clients agreed to participate in each focus group at each site.

Clients agreeing to participate were then provided with information about the group and offered transportation and childcare reimbursement, if necessary. They were also offered a \$15 incentive for attending. It was anticipated that of the twelve agreeing to attend, approximately eight to nine would actually attend, an ideal group size. Both male and female clients were invited to participate.

In Woodburn, to ensure that the Hispanic population was well represented, participant lists were sorted by language. Thus, one of the two groups in Woodburn was made up of participants

whose primary language was Spanish. For the second Woodburn group, most participants were non-Hispanic; all spoke English. The Spanish-speaking group was facilitated with the help of an interpreter.

Focus Group Procedure

Two focus groups were held at each site, one in the morning and one in the evening, each lasting 1 1/2 to 2 hours. The groups were audio taped; however, clients were assured that state employees would not hear the tapes, nor would their names be associated with anything they had to say. Two facilitators from NPC Research facilitated each group, including the group in Woodburn, which was conducted in both English and Spanish. Snacks were provided for each group.

Focus Group Questions

Focus group questions, which were anticipated to generate discussion about integration of services, were then developed (See Appendix A). The questions led to discussions about the following:

- Which services clients have been receiving
- How clients first found out about services
- Whether the first person they talked to also told them about additional services
- Whether they found out later that they had been eligible for services they weren't told about initially
- The speed with which services were received and how it could have happened more quickly
- The one person they can call with problems or questions
- The one office they can go to with problems or questions
- Whether or not the system is confusing and, if so, what made it confusing
- Whether having the opportunity to get all services in one place would be a good thing
- Whether having the opportunity to get all services in one place would NOT be a good thing
- Whether there are concerns about confidentiality
- What sorts of things were barriers to getting services
- What advice they would give to someone who needs services
- What improvements they would suggest so that they would be satisfied with the services they receive

Sample

A total of 77 clients participated in the ten focus groups. The majority (66) were women. Ages ranged from 19 to 80.

Qualitative Analysis

Focus groups are a method for gathering qualitative data. In order to analyze data from the focus groups, transcripts were made of all audiotapes, supplemented by notes provided by one of the facilitators. These data were then analyzed for content and categorized by theme, differentiated according to site.

Focus Groups

Information about the focus groups, including location, type of services, date, and gender of participants is presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Client Focus Groups

Focus Group #	Location	Integrated		Date	Time	Participants		
		Yes	No			Female	Male	Total
1	Portland		x	4/4/00	2 p.m.	4	0	4
2	Portland		x	4/4/00	7 p.m.	6	2	8
3	Woodburn		x	4/7/00	7 p.m.	8	0	8
4	Woodburn		x	4/10/00	2 p.m.	10	0	10
5	Coos Bay	x		4/17/00	2 p.m.	8	1	9
6	Coos Bay	x		4/17/00	7 p.m.	6	2	8
7	White City	x		4/19/00	2 p.m.	5	2	7
8	White City	x		4/19/00	7 p.m.	9	0	9
9	Pendleton		x	4/21/00	2 p.m.	6	3	9
10	Pendleton		x	4/21/00	7 p.m.	4	1	5
Total Number of Participants						66	11	77

III. SERVICES and DIVISIONS ACCESSED BY CLIENTS

Services Accessed by Clients - Client Reports

The first question asked of focus group participants was, “What services have you been getting during the past 12 months?” Clients were deliberately *not* asked to talk only about DHS services, so that they would provide information about all benefits and services they receive. The reason for this is that for services to be truly integrated from the client perspective, this must include ALL services they are receiving, regardless of the source.

Twenty-one different services were named in response. Clients’ responses included services received from DHS divisions as well those received from other agencies. In all, the 77 focus group participants said they are receiving 200 services. Their definition of “services” included assistance from DHS divisions, such as SCF and AFS; other agencies, such as Eastern Oregon Alcohol Foundation; and specific services and benefits, such as food stamps and childcare.

It was of particular interest to know the number of services each client was receiving in order to understand their frame of reference for judging integration of current and/or future services. For each client, then, services were looked at as a group. For example, one person may have been receiving food stamps, medical, and childcare (a group of three services). See Table 2 for details about the composition of the groups of services.

A compilation of these groups of services showed that of the 77 participants, the largest number of clients, 31, said that they are receiving two services (40.26%). The number of services being received ranged from one client who claimed to be receiving none, to two people who said that they are receiving seven or more services (2.6%).

Table 2. Groups of Services Accessed by Focus Group Participants – Client Reports

Services	Sites					Total	% of Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton		
<i>No Services</i>							
Nothing		1				1	
Total receiving no services	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.30%
<i>One Service</i>							
Food stamps	1	2				3	
Medical	1	1				2	
Total receiving one service	2	3	0	0	0	5	6.49%
<i>Two Services</i>							
Cash, food stamps	1					1	
Cash, medical		1				1	
Cash (IMPACT), SDSD	1					1	
Childcare, food stamps				1		1	
Childcare, medical	2	2				4	
Childcare, WIC				1		1	
Food stamps, housing				1		1	
Food stamps, med	3	5	2	7	1	18	
Food stamps, SS Dis.				1		1	
Medical, non-need caregiver grant				2		2	
Total receiving two services	7	8	2	13	1	31	40.26 %
<i>Three Services</i>							
Adult ed, food stamps, Voc. Rehab			1			1	
AFS (stamps, medical), SSI					1	1	
CAPECO, food stamps, medical					2	2	
Cash, childcare, medical			1			1	
Cash, food stamps, medical	1	1	2	1		5	
Cash, food stamps, MH			1			1	
Childcare, food stamps, medical		1	1			2	
Childcare, medical, WIC		1				1	
Food stamps, housing, medical		1				1	
Food stamps, medical, Disability					1	1	
Food stamps, medical, SS (child)	1			1		2	
Food Stamps, medical, SSI			1			1	
Food stamps, medical, WIC		1				1	
Food stamps, mental health, SCF			1			1	
Total receiving three services	2	5	8	2	4	21	27.27%

Services	Sites					Total	% of Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton		
<i>Four Services</i>							
Adult ed, food stamps, medical, SDSD			1			1	
AFS, SCF, food stamps, medical					1	1	
CAPECO, computer training, GED, Voc Rehab					1	1	
Cash, childcare, food stamps, medical				1		1	
Cash, food stamps, medical, work exp.					1	1	
Cash, food stamps, MH, SCF			1			1	
Childcare, food stamps, housing, medical		1				1	
SCF, food stamps, MH, SSI			1			1	
E. OR Alcohol Foundation (EOAF), food stamps, SDSD, Voc Rehab					1	1	
Food stamps, medical, SS, Voc Rehab					1	1	
Total receiving four services	0	1	3	1	5	10	12.99%
<i>Five Services</i>							
AFS, Jobs Plus, medical, Vocational Rehab, WIC			1			1	
CAPECO, computer training, food stamps, medical, Voc Rehab					1	1	
Corrections, HR, MH, SDSD, Voc Rehab					1	1	
Food stamps, medical, MH, SDSD, SS Dis.			1			1	
Food stamps, medical, SDSD, SSI, Voc. Rehab			1			1	
Food stamps, medical, MH, SCF, Voc. Rehab					1	1	
Total receiving five services	0	0	3	0	3	6	7.79%
<i>Six Services</i>							
Cash (AFS), food stamps, medical, SCF, SDSD, WIC			1			1	
Total receiving six services	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.30%
<i>Seven or More Services</i>							
Disability, Women's Resource Center, NW Pilot, LEEP, SDSD (for food stamps, med), SS	1					1	
CAPECO, Corrections, Cash, EOAF, food stamps, housing, JOBS, medical, MH, SCF, SSI, Voc Rehab, WIC					1	1	
Total receiving seven or more services	1	0	0	0	1	2	2.60%
Total clients receiving services	12	18	17	16	14	77	100%

Table 3. Number of Services Accessed by Focus Group Participants by Site–Client Reports

	Number of Services and/or Benefits Accessed								Total
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7+	
Portland	0	2	7	2	0	0	0	1	12
Woodburn	1	3	8	5	1	0	0	0	18
Coos Bay	0	0	2	8	3	3	1	0	17
White City	0	0	13	2	1	0	0	0	16
Pendleton	0	0	1	4	5	2	1	1	14
Total	1	5	31	21	10	5	2	2	77
% of Total	1.30%	6.49%	40.26%	27.27%	12.99%	6.50%	2.60%	2.60%	100%

▪ **Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Sites**

There were no substantial differences in the number of services accessed by clients at integrated sites compared to those at non-integrated sites.

For the integrated sites, at White City by far the majority of participants said that they are receiving two services (13 of 16). In Coos Bay, the greatest number of participants are receiving three services (8), though the range was from two to six services.

At the non-integrated sites, the greatest number of clients at Portland and Woodburn are receiving two services. Woodburn and Portland are the only sites where clients reported receiving none or one service.

Divisions Accessed by Clients – DHS Records

The Department of Human Services (DHS) provided information about DHS divisions being accessed by the focus group participants, according to DHS records. This list includes divisions only, not specific services received from those divisions. This is different from the information provided by the focus group participants. Participants tended to name the individual services they are receiving (such as food stamps), and not the DHS division from which they receive those services (such as AFS). Clients also named services they receive from agencies outside of DHS.

The DHS record is important because it is an indicator of which divisions within DHS are being accessed by the focus group participants. In addition, from the DHS list it is possible to see the various *groupings* of DHS divisions that are being accessed by participants. For example, Table 4 shows that 31 clients are receiving services from both AFS and OMAP. This is by far the largest grouping of divisions. Next is a group of three divisions: AFS, OMAP, and SCF. This group of divisions is received by five people. Five people are also receiving help from another group of three divisions: AFS, OMAP and VRD.

Table 5 reveals, as was also indicated in the client reports, that groups of two, three, or four divisions are accessed most often by focus group participants. Thirty-three people are receiving help from two divisions, 17 from three divisions, and 10 from four divisions. Seven clients receive aid from one division. DHS records show that two of the 77 focus group participants are receiving services from seven or more divisions.

Table 4. Groups of DHS Divisions Accessed by Focus Group Participants – DHS Records

	Sites					Total	% of Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton		
<i>One Division</i>							
AFS	1	2		4		7	
Total accessing one division	1	2	0	4	0	7	9.09%
<i>Two Divisions</i>							
AFS, OMAP	7	11		9	4	31	
OMAP, SDSD	2					2	
Total accessing two divisions	9	11	0	9	4	33	42.86%
<i>Three Divisions</i>							
AFS, HD, OMAP			1			1	
AFS, MH, OMAP		1	1			2	
AFS, OMAP, OYA		1				1	
AFS, OMAP, SCF	1	1		1	2	5	
AFS, OMAP, SDSD	1					1	
AFS, OMAP, VRD			1		4	5	
OMAP, SCF, SDSD					1	1	
OMAP, SDSD, VRD					1	1	
Total accessing three divisions	2	3	3	1	8	17	22.08%
<i>Four Divisions</i>							
AFS, Corrections, OADAP, VRD			1			1	
AFS, HD, OMAP, OYA,		1				1	
AFS, HD, OMAP, SCF		1				1	
AFS, HD, OMAP, SDSD				2		2	
AFS, HD, OMAP, VRD			2			2	
AFS, MH, OMAP, VRD			1			1	
AFS, OMAP, SDSD, SCF					1	1	
AFS, OMAP, SDSD, VRD					1	1	
Total accessing four divisions	0	2	4	2	2	10	12.99%
<i>Five Divisions</i>							
AFS, Corrections, HD, OYA, VRD			1			1	
AFS, HD, MH, OADAP, OMAP			2			2	
AFS, HD, MH, OMAP, VRD			2			2	

Total accessing five divisions	0	0	5	0	0	5	6.49%
<i>Six Divisions</i>							
AFS, Corrections, HD, OADAP, OMAP, SCF			1			1	
AFS, Corrections, HD, MH, OMAP, SCF			1			1	
AFS, HD, MH, OADAP, OMAP, SCF			1			1	
Total accessing six divisions	0	0	3	0	0	3	3.90%
<i>Seven Divisions</i>							
AFS, Corrections, HD, MH, OADAP, OMAP, SCF			2			2	
Total accessing seven divisions	0	0	3	0	0	2	2.60%
Total clients accessing divisions	12	18	17	16	14	77	100%

Table 5. Number of DHS Divisions Accessed by Focus Group Participants by Site – DHS Records

	Number of DHS Divisions Accessed								Total
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7+	
Portland	0	1	9	2	0	0	0	0	12
Woodburn	0	2	11	3	2	0	0	0	18
Coos Bay	0	0	0	3	4	5	3	2	17
White City	0	4	9	1	2	0	0	0	16
Pendleton	0	0	4	8	2	0	0	0	14
Total	0	7	33	17	10	5	3	2	77
% of Total	0%	9.09%	42.86%	22.08%	12.99%	6.49%	3.90%	2.60%	100%

- **Differences Between Integrated Sites and Non-Integrated Sites**

There were no substantial differences in the number of client-accessed DHS divisions, nor the *groups* of client-accessed DHS divisions, when comparing integrated vs. non-integrated sites.

Clients in integrated sites accessed a range of services from three to seven in Coos Bay and from one to four in White City. Clients in the non-integrated sites accessed a numbers of services ranging from one to three in Portland, one to four in Woodburn, and two to four in Pendleton.

Note: The intent of looking at both client reports of services received and the DHS report of divisions being accessed by focus group participants was to give an overall understanding of the context in which clients discuss integration of services. Their understanding of what comprises services will need to be kept in mind when interpreting comments that clients made during the focus groups.

IV. CLIENT RESPONSE: By Topic

Two focus groups were conducted at each of five sites (Portland, Woodburn, Coos Bay, White City, and Pendleton), one in the afternoon and one in the evening at each location. During the focus groups participants were asked 12 questions designed to elicit discussions around the topic of integrated services. Those questions are listed below. A response summary and a table showing categorized responses by site follow each question. Differences between integrated and non-integrated sites, as well as differences between the Hispanic group and non-Hispanic groups, are noted, when found.

It is important to remember that this was a qualitative study. For this reason, although the numbers shown in the tables indicate the number of comments recorded, **they do not represent one response from each client for each question.** For example, during the discussion following question 1 for the two focus groups conducted in Portland, five responses were recorded. Knowing that there were 12 participants in Portland, we can see that not everyone responded to question 1. Also, it is possible that more than one comment was made by one person.

The reason for including numbers is to give a better indication of the *strength* of the comment. In other words, if a comment was made more than once, it is an indication that the concern/experience being related may be a common one; at the least we know that it is not the experience of one person only. Occasionally in a table a 3+ will be noted. This means that agreement was expressed in the group among *more than* three people.

Question 1. What services have you been getting during the past 12 months?

The focus group participants did not distinguish between services received from the Department of Human Services and those received from other social service agencies, therefore the responses include DHS divisions, such as AFS and SCF, as well as CAPECO, the Eastern Oregon Alcohol Foundation, and other non-profit agencies.

Some participants were not aware of which divisions were providing their services. For example, one client said that he “...did not know where the medical card comes from.” Therefore responses to this question included not only DHS divisions and other agencies, but also the services themselves (e.g., food stamps, computer training).

An important outcome of leaving the definition of services open to interpretation by the clients is that this tells us what constitutes the “services” they are referring to when we ask questions about integration of those services. As discussed previously, we found that the clients’ definition of services is broader than the list of DHS divisions. It also includes items others may name as “benefits,” such as food stamps.

For every site, food stamps and medical (AFS and OMAP) were the services accessed by the greatest number of participants. Sixty-one participants reported receiving food stamps and 40 reported receiving medical (not including 10 receiving medical through SSI or SS Disability). This is followed by cash (13), childcare (11), and vocational rehabilitation (11). As for other specific DHS divisions, Senior and Disabled Services was named by 8 participants, Mental Health by 7, SCF by 7, and the Health Department by 2. Please see Table 6 for this and other information about which services are being accessed by focus group participants.

Table 6. What services have you been getting during the past 12 months?

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
Adult Ed			2			2
CAPECO					5	5
Cash	3	2	5	2	1	13
Childcare	2	4	2	3		11
Computer Training					2	2
Corrections					2	2
E. OR Alcohol Foundation					2	2
Food Stamps (AFS)	8	13	17	12	11	61
GED					1	1
Health Dept.			1		1	2
Housing		3			1	4
Job with City					1	1
Jobs Plus			1		1	2
Medical (OMAP)	7	8	4	12	9	40
Mental Health			5		2	7
SCF			5		2	7
SDSD	1		5		2	8
SSI or SS Dis.	2		4	2	2	10
Voc Rehab			4		7	11
WIC		2	2	2	2	8
Work Experience					1	1
Total	23	32	57	33	55	200

▪ **Differences Between Integrated and Non-integrated Sites in Response to Question 1**

There were no substantial differences between integrated and non-integrated sites as far as the variety of services received. Clients in Pendleton (non-integrated) and Coos Bay (integrated) reported receiving the widest variety of services, 20 and 14 respectively. Clients at the remaining sites reported receiving either 6 or 7 services.

Question 2. How did you first hear about the services that were available to you?

For the greatest number of people, word of mouth was the initial means of finding out about services. Agencies such as the Women’s Resource Center also were a source of information, as were other professional individuals such as a doctor and a high school family advocate. See Table 7, below.

Table 7. How did you first hear about the services that were available to you?

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
<i>Agencies</i>						
Women’s Resource Center	1					1
IMPACT	1					1
Women’s Crisis Center			1			1
Mental Health			1			1
Free clinic					1	1
Alcohol treatment center					1	1
“I was former case manager”	1					1
Total Agencies	3	0	2	0	2	7
<i>People (nonprofessional)</i>						
Word of mouth	1		3+	1	1	6+
People in lobby	1					1
Family member		2				2
Friend/neighbor		3				3
Total People (non-professional)	2	5	3+	1	1	12+
<i>Previously received in other state/town</i>						
		1		2		3
Total Previously Received	0	1	0	2	0	3
<i>Other</i>						
Asked AFS				4		4
Doctor				1		1
Phone book			1			1
Heard on news (OHP)				1		1
High school family advocate				1		1
Don’t remember					1	1
Total Other	0	0	1	7	1	9

▪ Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Sites in Response to Question 2

There were no substantial differences in how clients in integrated and non-integrated sites first heard about services.

Question 3. Did you come in for just one service?

Nine clients replied that they came in for just one service; the majority had multiple needs. Twenty-three mentioned being told about other services that were available to them; none of these were at the Woodburn site. No clients in Coos Bay or White City commented that they were *not* told about other services, however that was not the case in the other three sites. See Table 8 for the number of clients at each location who came in for just one service.

An important point about this question is that it seemed to open up the floodgate for comments, complaints, etc., about a variety of areas. It may be that the initial questions served as a warm-up and they saw this as their first opportunity to speak about the issues foremost in their minds. For whatever reason, this question provided a rich source of information about concerns clients would like to see addressed. Therefore comments that did not respond directly to this, and other questions were compiled, categorized, and addressed following responses to question 13, “Knowing what we are looking for, could you tell us what improvements could be made so that you would be satisfied with the services you receive?” These miscellaneous comments are numbered 13a through 13d.

Table 8. Did you come in for just one service?

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
Came in for one service	3	1	2	2	1	9

- **Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Sites In Response to Question 3**

As Table 8 shows, there are no notable differences in the number of clients at integrated sites who came in for just one service compared to the number of clients at non-integrated sites who came in for just one service.

Question 3a. Did the person you talked to tell you about other services available to you?

The broad area of responses to question 3a should be kept in mind when considering areas of response and non-response to this question. For example, although clients in Woodburn did not say that the person they talked to told them about other services available to them, part of the reason may be that the group discussion following this question tended to address other issues of concern. Table 9, below, shows that there are differences between integrated and non-integrated sites in response to this question. A discussion of those differences follows the table.

Table 9. Did the person you talked to tell you about other services available to you?

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
<i>Yes</i>	5		8	6	4	23
Total Yes	5	0	8	6	4	23
<i>No</i>						
You have to know what you want	2	1			1	4
Told later-had to come back	1	1				2
Transferred to several	1	1				2
Told later-through mail		1				1
Total No	4	4	0	0	1	9
<i>Unclear</i>	1					1
Total Unclear	1					1
<i>Needs Unmet</i>						
General	4	3				7
How do I qualify?	4					4
Depends on worker					1	1
Total Needs Unmet	8	3	0	0	1	12
<i>Didn't want services</i>						
Too much trouble	1					1
Have to re-certify too often for stamps	1					1
Not worth \$10 stamps given		1				1
Total Didn't Want Services	2	1	0	0	0	3

- **Differences between Integrated and Non-Integrated Sites in Response to Question 3a**

There was a substantial difference between integrated and non-integrated sites when clients responded to this question, which asked whether or not the person they talked when they first came in to inquire about services told them about benefits or services that were available to them, in addition to those about which they were inquiring. At both of the integrated sites, Coos Bay and White City, all replies were, "Yes." In addition, no one at these sites said that they had unmet needs. At all of the non-integrated sites, there were client(s) who reported that they were not told about other services on their initial visit, and that they had unmet needs.

Question 4. Did you find out later [after the initial contact] that you were eligible for something that you weren't told about? How?

Twenty replies to this question were “yes.” Services clients found out about later included food stamps, dental and medical care, car repair, clothes, and help with the power bill. Clients found out about their eligibility through agency personnel, school personnel, and other people (such as those in the lobby). See Table 10 for additional details

Table 10. Did you find out later [after the initial contact] that you were eligible for something that you weren't told about? How?

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
<i>Yes</i>						
Did not specify	1	1	1	5	3	11
Dental	1					1
Food stamps	2					2
Denied by caseworker		1				1
Clothes			1			1
Car repair			1			1
Medical supplies			1			1
SSI for son (12 yrs. later)			1			1
Power bill					1	1
Total Yes	4	2	5	5	4	20
<i>How?</i>						
Agency Personnel						
OHP	1					1
Different caseworker	1			1		2
Friends in office	1					1
“WIC lady”				1		1
Total Agency Personnel	3	0	0	2	0	5
Other People						
School Personnel				1	1	2
“Other people”			1	1		2
Someone in lobby				1		1
“Just now!”					1	1
Total Other People	0	0	1	3	2	6

▪ **Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Sites in Response to Question 4**

Clients at both integrated and non-integrated sites found out later that they were eligible for services they weren't told about when applying for services.

Question 5. How quickly did you get what you needed?

Responses to this question varied depending upon the services and the clients' interpretation of the question. Several participants mentioned that food stamps were available right away or within three to four days; some talked about the steps taken before initial services were received. Others commented on the time spent waiting in the lobby to be seen by a caseworker (hours), and still others talked about the length of time before a caseworker responded to their calls. Table 11 categorizes and lists the variety of responses to this question.

Table 11. How quickly did you get what you needed?

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
<i>General</i>						
30 days	1		1			2
Depends		1	3			4
Had to wait till baby born		1				1
2 weeks			3		1	4
Longer than other places			1			1
1 year wait list (re-apply)			1			1
If no help here, go elsewhere			1			1
2 days				1		1
10 days to process report				1		1
2 mos. 'cause paperwork was lost/reapply		1				1
After paperwork		1				1
Interviews w/child dev. specialist, child support enforcement agency, then letter re. caseworker				1		1
<i>Cash</i>						
Right away	1					1
2 days				1		1
45 days	1					1
<i>Food stamps</i>						
Right away/quickly	3	1		2		6
3-4 days					1	1
<i>Appointment</i>						
Waited all day from 7 a.m.	1					1
Have to be 15 min. early, then wait			1			1
4 hrs. 'til they knew I was there				1		1

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
<i>Medical</i>						
Long time		1				1
HMO: Apply, wait, then Reapply every 6 mos.		1				1
6 mos. for psychiatrist			1			1
For daughter, same day				1		1
<i>Childcare</i>						
Long time		1				1
2 weeks for paperwork				1		1
<i>Caseworker</i>						
Same day I call				4		4
4-6 days				1		1
Months to get different one					1	1
<i>SS/SSI</i>						
So slow you don't need it when you get it					1	1
60 days				1		1
Slow				1		1
<i>Section 8</i>						
2 yrs					1	1

▪ **Differences Between Integrated Sites and Non-Integrated Sites in Response to Question 5**

We wondered if differences between integrated sites and non-integrated sites would appear in response to this question, i.e., do clients receive service more quickly from integrated sites than from non-integrated sites? We could not answer this question based on the responses we received, in part due to the fact that length of time waiting for a service may depend on general guidelines in force at all sites, according to the clients.

One difference was indicated by the several positive comments that were made about the speed with which caseworkers return calls in White City. None were made about the other sites.

Question 5a. Could it have been done more quickly? How?

There was general agreement in White City (4+ comments) that the process of accessing services could have been done more quickly. One participant in White City suggested that calls should have to be returned within 72 hours, an interesting response considering the positive comments mentioned in response to question 5. As Table 12 shows, there were suggestions from all sites, including: provide housing immediately, don't have paperwork over and over, have one-on-one service, tell us the rules (3+), don't tell us to come back and then they don't know anything about it, and don't wait so long for cash. No one mentioned that having services available in one location would speed up the process. One person in Portland said that things could *not* have been done more quickly because the workers already have too much to do. This concern for and understanding of the work load and other pressures faced by caseworkers came up several times over the course of the focus groups.

Table 12. Could it have been done more quickly? How?

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
<i>Yes</i>						
Did not specify				4+		4+
Housing should be immediate	1					1
Should have to return calls within 72 hours				1		1
Don't have paperwork over & over		1				1
Have one-on-one service		1				1
Tell us the rules			3+			3+
If didn't have to come back then they don't know anything about it			1			1
Don't wait so long for cash				1		1
Total Yes	1	2	4+	6+	0	13+
<i>No</i>						
They have too much to do	1					1
Total No	1	0	0	0	0	1

▪ **Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Sites in Response to Question 5a**

There was a noticeable difference between client responses from integrated sites versus non-integrated sites when asked about how quickly they received services. Ten of the 13 clients who said that they could have received services more quickly were from the integrated sites. Few people at the non-integrated sites had much to say in response to this question, with three saying they could have received services more quickly, and one saying that they could not have received them more quickly.

Question 6. If you have problems or questions, whom do you call?

As shown in Table 13, twelve clients in White City said that they call their caseworker when they have a problem or question. An additional four clients at that site said that they call the receptionist/operator/front desk person. Two or three people in each of the other locations mentioned that they call their caseworkers, with three in Portland calling the receptionist/operator/front desk person, as do two in Pendleton. One person in each of the three non-integrated locations (Portland, Woodburn, and Pendleton) said that they did not know whom to call. An additional client in Pendleton and two clients in White City said that there isn't any one person to call.

The need for integration of services was indicated by responses from several clients in Woodburn who said that they have to call one person in *each* agency. Several also mentioned having to go to Salem for food stamps and/or housing.

Table 13. If you have problems or questions, whom do you call?

Content Category	Sites					Total ²
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
Caseworker	2	3	2	12	3	22
Someone in <i>each</i> agency (1 for food stamps, 1 for med., etc)	3+				1	4+
Receptionist/operator/front desk	3			4	2	9
Salem for housing	3+					3+
Don't know	1	1			1	3
There isn't one person				2	1	3
I never call					1	1

▪ **Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Sites in Response to Question 6**

The majority of clients at integrated sites said that the caseworker is the person to call with a problem or question, in contrast to clients at two of the non-integrated sites, Portland and Pendleton, who gave the widest variety of responses to this question. Woodburn is an exception here; the three clients at this non-integrated site who knew whom to call named the caseworker as that person.

² Reminder: All clients did not respond to each question. Also, one client may have provided more than one response.

**Question 6a. Is there one office where you can go with all your questions or problems?
What office is that?**

At White City, all 6 “yes” replies to this question indicated that they go to Rogue Valley/White City. In Coos Bay 9 of the 10 responses named the Newmark Center as the place to go. At Pendleton clients also said that there is one place where they can go. However, the 18 responses in Pendleton named 9 different locations/agencies.

In Woodburn one client said that Salem is the place to go and another said that where you go depends on where you live. As for Portland, one person suggested going to social service agencies, while another said that there isn’t one place to go. Three from Woodburn and five from Pendleton also said there isn’t one place. No one from either Coos Bay or White City said that there is *not* one place where they can go with all their questions or problems. Please see Table 14, next page.

Table 14. Is there one office where you can go with all your questions or problems? What office is that?

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
<i>Yes</i>						
Social service agencies	1					1
If you qualify, can do it in 1 place		1				1
Salem (have to)		1				1
Depends on where you live		1				1
Different ones here at Newmark			9			9
Governor's office			1		2	3
Rogue Valley/White City				6		6
Vocational Rehab					3	3
CAPECO					2	2
Umatilla Co. Detox					2	2
AFS					2	2
SDSD					2	2
OHP, but you don't find out anything, anyway					1	1
Disability					1	1
Umatilla Mental Health					3	3
Total Yes	1	3	10	6	18	38
<i>No</i>						
I called 6 branches/3-4 people ea.	1					1
Didn't get promised help w/paperwork		1				1
They don't switch your info, so you have to apply all over the place		1				1
They should be able to tell you when you are in the office		1				1
Even with all the services, you have to ask for what you want			1			1
Total No	1	3	1	0	0	5

- **Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Sites in Response to Question 6a**

As shown in Table 14, previous page, there were differences between integrated and non-integrated groups in their responses to the question asking if there is one office where clients can go with all their questions or problems. There were also differences in responses to the question asking what office that would be. Clients at integrated sites named the center of the integrated site (Newmark Center or Rogue Valley/White City) as the office to go to with problems and/or questions.

For the non-integrated sites, the one office to go to with problems and/or questions was not as easy to name. There were very few places named by either Portland or Woodburn, while Pendleton named nine different places.

Question 7. Was the system confusing?

More than 17 clients said that the system is confusing, with “yes” responses spread across the various sites. One person in Coos Bay said, “Sometimes,” and two in White City said, “No.”

Table 15. Was the system confusing?

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
<i>Yes</i>	2	4+	3+	4	4+	17+
<i>Sometimes</i>			1			1
<i>No</i>				2		2

- **Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Services in Response to Question 7**

Participants at all sites found the system confusing. The only sites where participants said that it was confusing sometimes or not at all were integrated sites. See Table 15, above.

Question 7a. What made it [the system] confusing?

Rules/qualifications were mentioned 22 times as being the cause of confusion. Documentation (e.g., paperwork, application wording) was mentioned 18 times and Other (miscellaneous) sources of confusion were mentioned 8+ times. Only one person mentioned “where to go” as the reason for the system being confusing.

Table 16. What made it confusing?

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
<i>Where to go</i>	1					
Total Where to go	1	0	0	0	0	1
<i>Rules/qualifications</i>						
If I gain here, they cut there	2	1	2			5
Newer car, no services	1	1				2
Wouldn't pay house pmt, but paid more for apt. later	1					1
Can't have over \$100 or no services		1				1
CA gave \$300 stamps, OR \$15		1				1
If I pay childcare, might as well stay home				1		1
Co-pay for childcare is more than previous sitter charged	2			1		3
Boyfriend under 22, no help		1				1
Don't know rights		1				1
Meet exact requirements or no help			1			1
Shouldn't have to report gifts				2		2
If get married, lose medical				1		1
They go by gross				1		1
They said son had to move, but he is the one paying bills					1	1
Total Rules/Qualifications	6	6	3	6	1	22
<i>Workers</i>						
Workers in general		2				2
Only help their own kind		1				1
Need training			1			1
Lack of communication			1			1
Total Workers	0	3	2	0	0	5

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
<i>Documentation/Paperwork</i>						
They needed receipts		1				1
Application wording		1				1
Application/paperwork not appropriate (for grandkids, etc.)		1		3	3	7
Paperwork (general)				7		7
Fill out different forms for med., etc., though they're basically the same				2		2
Total Documentation/Paperwork	0	3	0	12	3	18
<i>Other</i>						
Can't get some services (no babysitters)			1			1
So many gaps/holes in services, we are in cracks			3+			3+
They don't want you to better yourself			1			1
Sent to rehab when didn't need it					3	3
Total Other	0	0	5+	0	3	8+

▪ **Differences Between Integrated and Non-integrated Sites in Response to Question 7a.**

There were no substantial differences between integrated and non-integrated sites regarding why the system is considered confusing by clients. As mentioned above, clients generally do not mention being confused by where to go for services, whether their site is integrated or not.

The overwhelming source of confusion at all sites is internal (within sites), having to do with rules/qualifications, documentation/paperwork, workers, and other internal problems. Fifty-three of the 54 responses to this question named internal factors as a source of confusion.

Question 8. If you had an opportunity to get all services at one place, would you think it is a good thing?

Over 36 people said that getting all services in one place would be a good thing. The only site with clients who did not totally agree was Woodburn. Two clients in Woodburn said that “maybe” it would be good, and two expressly said “no” it would not be good. See Table 17, below, for additional responses by site.

The positive responses to this question were contradicted, however, in the responses to question 9, which asked if there are reasons why having services in one place would NOT be a good thing. Please see question 9 and its accompanying Table 19 for these contradictory responses.

Table 17. If you had an opportunity to get all services at one place, would you think it is a good thing?

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
Yes	1	1	11+	9	14	36+
Maybe	0	2	0	0	0	2
No	0	2	0	0		2

▪ **Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Sites in Response to Question 8**

There were no substantial differences between integrated and non-integrated sites in response to the question asking if it would be a good thing to get all services at one place. One site, Woodburn, had clients with doubts, however.

Question 8a. Why [is it a good thing to have all services in one place]?

Comments in the area of efficiency were those given most often (14 times) as reasons why having all services in one place would be a good thing. Comments included, “We wouldn’t have to shop around,” “It would save time,” and “ If you had a question, they could see everything you are doing, even if they just met you.”

Twelve comments were made citing reasons of convenience, such as: “Then we wouldn’t have to go all over,” “It is nice to have everything in one place,” and “It is much better here (Coos Bay) than in other areas.”

Table 18. Why [is it a good thing to have all services in one place]?

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
<i>Convenience</i>						
Wouldn’t have to go all over	1	2				3
Nice to have all in one place			1			1
Much better than other areas			1			1
Don’t have to go to Medford				1		1
WIC lady comes to Shady Cove				1		1
Voc rehab/AFS/SCF are in one building, and that’s good					2	2
Depends where it is/not Salem		3				3
Total Convenience	1	5	2	2	2	12
<i>Efficiency</i>						
Wouldn’t have to shop around	1					1
Safe time (if quicker)		1				1
Can look in computer & tell you where to go			1		2	3
If you had a question, they could see everything you are doing, even if just met you					2	2
One caseworker					1	1
Test scores could be consistent					1	1
Less gas		1				1
Already share info, but would help <i>them</i> immensely					1	1
Less paperwork		1		1		2
Wouldn’t have to miss work		1				1
Total Efficiency	1	4	1	1	7	14

- **Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Sites in Response to Question 8a**

Clients in integrated and non-integrated sites cited convenience and efficiency as reasons why it would be good to have all services in one place.

Question 9. Are there reasons why that [having all services in one place] might NOT be a good thing?

By far the majority of reasons given why having services available in one place might NOT be a good thing were provided by clients in Portland. They were concerned about services (e.g., they might run out; if one agency denies, others might too), paperwork (papers and files would be “all over” or “shoved around”), caseworkers (prefer to have more than one, more caseworkers could have a smaller load of clients), and they had other concerns as well (the individual “flavor” might be lost, stigma, and the concern that people would be confused). The only reason given in Woodburn for thinking this may not be a good idea was the possibility of being “stuck” with one worker. However, three people in Woodburn said that it *might* be a good idea, depending on where they have to go/not if they have to go to Salem. In Pendleton one person said that now services are portioned out (a reason NOT to change), and another agreed with the person in Woodburn who did not want to be “stuck” with one worker.

The largest number of clients supporting the idea of having services at one place was in Pendleton. One client there said that they already have vocational rehabilitation, AFS, and SCF in one building, and “that’s good.” See Table 19, below, for additional details about why clients think integrating services might *not* be a good thing.

Table 19. Are there reasons why that might NOT be a good thing?

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
Yes						
<i>Services</i>						
Might run out	1					1
If one denies, others might	2					2
Now it is portioned out	1				1	2
Total Services	4	0	0	0	1	5
<i>Paperwork</i>						
Papers would be all over	2					2
Files shoved around	1					1
Total Paperwork	3	0	0	0	0	3
<i>Caseworker</i>						
Prefer more than 1 worker	1					1
If not stuck with 1 worker		1			1	2
Caseworker only works 4 days a week	1					1
If more caseworkers, they could see fewer clients	1					1
More appointments	1					1
Total Caseworker	4	1	0	0	1	6
<i>Other</i>						
Individual flavor would be lost	1					1
Stigma	1					1
People would be confused	1					1
Total Other	3	0	0	0	0	3

▪ **Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Sites in Response to Question 9**

The interesting point to be made about the responses to the question asking if there are reasons why integrating services might *not* be a good thing, is that the three sites who thought that this may be a problem are not considered to be integrated. On the other hand, no one from the integrated sites, Coos Bay and White City, gave a reason why having services in one place would *not* be a good thing. This implies that potential problems and concerns about integrated services expressed by clients at non-integrated sites do not come to pass when sites are integrated.

Question 10. Area there any concerns about confidentiality?

Confidentiality was a concern in Portland, White City, and Pendleton. Those in Woodburn were either indifferent or were not concerned; more than four people in Coos Bay were not concerned about confidentiality, nor were some clients in Portland, Woodburn, and Pendleton.

The largest number (9) of responses expressing concern about confidentiality was in Pendleton, where part of the difficulty of anonymity and confidentiality was attributed to the “small town” factor.

Table 20. Are there any concerns about confidentiality?

	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	Total
Yes	3	0	0	2	9	14
Indifferent	0	3+		0	0	3+
No	2	1	4+	0	2	9+

▪ **Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Sites in Response to Question 10**

There were no differences in concerns about confidentiality that were attributable to whether the sites were integrated or not integrated.

Question 11. What sorts of things were barriers to your getting services? [also see questions 13a-13c]

Barriers categorized as “logistics” were cited most often in response to this question. Within that category, transportation was the issue mentioned most often in Coos Bay (5) and in Pendleton (7). Other barriers mentioned in that category included A&D classes at *night*, parking, and having to go across town for a food box. No one in Woodburn or White City mentioned logistical issues as barriers. They did, however, consider items categorized as “rules” to be barriers, such as issues surrounding job training and the requirement to be within 15 minutes of appointment time or have the appointment cancelled. Pendleton was the only site for which no one mentioned anything in the area of rules as being a barrier.

Eleven people cited the area of paperwork as a barrier; 11 people cited childcare issues as barriers. Six of the comments about paperwork came from Coos Bay, with 3 from White City. White City received 9 of the 11 comments about childcare barriers. Most of these were concerns about the safety of their children while in childcare, and did not directly relate to issues of service integration.

Other barriers mentioned included caseworker attitude, time (lack of), humiliation, hassles, and the long wait for housing/no housing. Please see Table 21, below.

Table 21. What sorts of things were barriers to your getting services? [also see question 13a-13c]

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
<i>Logistics</i>						
Transportation			5		7	12
A&D classes at <i>night</i>					1	1
Parking	1					1
Mail doesn't come to residence	1					1
Food box across town			1			1
Total Logistics	2	0	6	0	8	16
<i>Rules</i>						
I have to apply for grown daughter	1					1
Low standard of living		1				1
Car insurance not considered			1			1
Only 6 mos. for job training				1		1
No training w/job council				1		1
Job search <i>before</i> training				1		1
15 min. late, appt. cancelled			1			1
Don't know rights		1				1
Didn't know had to check in			1			1
Total Rules	1	2	3	3	0	9

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
<i>Paperwork</i>						
Papers lost			2			2
Paperwork repetition	1		3			4
Problems understanding/seeing		1	1	3		5
Total Paperwork	1	1	6	3	0	11
<i>Time</i>						
No time		1				1
Lost job because of Dr. appts		1				1
Total Time	0	2	0	0	0	2
<i>Childcare</i>						
Costs	1			1	1	3
Safety concerns				6		6
Not enough available				1		1
Have to do own background check				1		1
Total Childcare	1	0	0	9	1	11
<i>Other</i>						
Caseworker attitude	1					1
Humiliation	3					3
Had to fight for services		1				1
Hassle, no understanding		1				1
Said would help, hasn't		1				1
No housing; long wait (HUD)					3	3
Total Other	4	3	0	0	3	10

▪ **Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Sites in Response to Question 11**

As shown in Table 21, above, there was no substantial difference between integrated and non-integrated sites as far as the types of things that were considered barriers to getting services. Differences were between individual sites, as discussed above.

It might be noted that, with the exception of the barrier attributed to going across town for a food box, none of the responses to the question asking about barriers referred to having to go to more than one location for services. This does not mean that the barriers that were mentioned were irrelevant to the issue of integrated services. On the contrary, the areas put forth as barriers by focus group participants may be of particular importance when planning for integration. For example, even if every possible service is available at one location, transportation may still be a barrier. How will clients get there? Where is there? Do they need to go to a town different from the one in which they live? Is there a bus/bus fare? Taxi

voucher? If clients are served at one location, but the paperwork is lost, repetitive, or not understood, the caseworker has an attitude,” and the experience is “humiliating,” then these are barriers that need to be considered if client satisfaction with services is a goal.

Question 11a. What could be done to improve or change this [barriers]?

Several suggestions were made for improving communication as a means of removing barriers. These suggestions included having employees with people skills, posting signs, using “layman’s language” on forms, and responding promptly to calls. Additional services were suggested as a means of removing barriers also; for example, childcare in the location of the classes and giving more taxi vouchers. Other suggestions for improving/changing barriers included increasing employee training and not starting paperwork from scratch when reapplying. See Table 22, below.

Table 22. What could be done to improve or change this [barriers]?

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	Woodburn	Pendleton	
<i>Communication</i>						
Improve Communication			1			1
Have e-mail			1			1
Post signs			1			1
Use “layman’s language” on forms				1		1
Shouldn’t have to call for two weeks to get help	1					1
Employees need people skills		1				1
Total Communication	1	1	3	1	0	6
<i>Provide additional services</i>						
Childcare where classes are					1	1
Give more taxi vouchers					2	2
Businesses provide day care					1	1
Address phys. abuse, drug abuse, etc., or we return		1				1
Total Additional Services	0	1	0	0	4	5
<i>Other</i>						
Don’t start paperwork over when need help again	1					1
Increase employee training		1	1			2
Look at individual problems		1		1		2
Afraid to say anything or will be taken off		1				1
Total Other	1	3	1	1	0	6

- **Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Sites in Response to Question 11a**

There were no notable differences between integrated and non-integrated sites in response to the question asking about what could be done to eliminate barriers. Two of the integrated sites and one of the non-integrated sites did not mention providing additional services as a possible way to eliminate barriers, although participants at the remaining two non-integrated sites did mention it. See Table 22, above, for additional details.

Question 12. What advice would you give to someone who needs services?

Although this question was asked as another means of giving participants an opportunity to discuss service integration issues, responses did not address those issues directly. It was expected that clients would give advice such as, “Plan to spend an entire day going from place to place,” or “Be sure you have bus tickets/money for gas, because you will need to go to several places to get everything you need.” That did not happen.

However, of the large quantity of comments made in response to this question (105), the advice given falls into a few broad categories: attitude, being proactive, providing assistance, documenting everything, advice NOT to apply, and a few miscellaneous suggestions. The area concerned most closely with service integration is the area categorized as “Provide Assistance.” This included a current client telling a potential new client which agencies and doctors to go to, helping with the application, taking them to the office/worker, explaining the system, and providing transportation, if none is available. These are things that may not be necessary if services are provided in a central location, employees are informed and helpful, and means for transportation is available. In other words, assistance for those needing services would be provided by employees within the system, not by the clients.

Table 23. What advice would you give someone who needs services?

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
<i>Attitude</i>						
Keep sense of humor			1			1
Don't expect anything			1			1
Be patient			3			3
Have a good attitude			1			1
Don't be embarrassed	1			1	2	4
Thick skin/be strong		3			1	4
Don't be positive (doesn't help)		1				1
Do what you are told					1	1
Be understanding/Put self in caseworkers' place			2		1	3
Total Attitude	1	4	8	1	5	19
<i>Be Proactive</i>						
Ask for what you need	1	1	7		2	11
Network	1		1			2
Ask non-profits for help	1					1
Bring interpreter		1				1
Be on time		1	3			4
If don't click w/caseworker, -Ask for another				1	1	2
-Talk to Supervisor			1		1	2
-Call a government office					2	2
-Go to Salem main office					1	1
-Call Gordon Smith					1	1
-Get advocate from private agency					1	1
ID need, look in phone book for help with that need					1	1
Read your own file					1	1
Ask questions			4	1		5
Be persistent			3		1	4
Follow up			1			1
Tell all so they can suggest			1			1
Talk to receptionist				1		1
Get a worker & stick with her					1	1
Total Be Proactive	3	3	21	3	13	43

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
<i>Provide Assistance</i>						
Tell which agencies to go to		1		3	4	8
Tell which doctors to go to		2				2
Help with application		4		1		5
Take to office/worker		1		2		3
Explain system		1				1
If no transportation, take them					1	1
Total Provide Assistance	0	9	0	6	5	20
<i>Don't apply</i>						
Don't get involved w/system	1			6	2	9
Don't tell AFS your story & be humiliated		1				1
Get a job		2				2
Go to churches instead		1				1
Total Don't Apply	1	4	0	6	2	13
<i>Document Everything</i>						
Back up your words					1	1
Document everything			1			1
Tell Dr. to write all down			1			1
Bring tape recorder to Dr.			1			1
Tape state workers			1			1
Make copies		2				2
Total Document Everything	0	2	4	0	1	7
<i>Other</i>						
Set realistic budgets	1					1
Have support person		1				1
Don't say you are depressed or you will lose your kids		1				1
Total Other	1	2	0	0	0	3

▪ **Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Sites in Response to Question 12**

There were differences between sites when discussing advice clients would give to someone who needs services, as noted above, but these differences did not appear to be attributable to whether or not the site is integrated.

Question 13. Knowing what we are looking for, could you tell us what improvements could be made so that you would be satisfied with the services you receive?

Of the 112 comments that were made in response to this question, only eight addressed service integration issues directly. This may be seen as an indication that this topic is not at the top of the client priority list when it comes to being satisfied with services received.

The largest number of improvements suggested was in the category of Additional Services. For example, an advocate being available in the lobby was suggested by six people at three locations). Help collecting child support, transportation, and improvements in medical services were suggested by several. In all, this category garnered 39 suggestions.

Changing rules was a priority for 32 people. Shortening the wait in the lobby, no longer taking away something for every gain made, helping ALL kids (whether born in the US or not), and not basing benefits on *gross* pay, were some of the suggestions made by clients for changing rules.

Next in priority based on numbers of comments in this area were issues relating to caseworkers, such as requiring more caseworker education, improving communication, improving attitude, seeing clients as individuals, and treating them with dignity. Suggested caseworker improvements numbered 18.

Of the eight comments directly related to integrated services, the following improvements were suggested: Have a main center, have it in the town where the clients live, and have it not only in one place, but at one time with all information available at that time so that multiple trips are not necessary. The comment was made that even if it took all day, having to make just one trip would be an improvement leading to greater satisfaction with services received.

Of course, clients did not forget to mention paperwork. Five suggestions were made for cutting down on the amount of, repetition of, and trips with paperwork, not requiring documentation such as birth certificates *every* time, and for providing more help with the paperwork.

Unfortunately, this is just the tip of the iceberg on this subject, as such a large number of comments were made about paperwork during discussions following previous questions that they were categorized and compiled with other frequently mentioned problems and concerns, and are presented as 13a-13c. The number of extraneous *positive* comments was large enough to warrant their own category also; see 13d.

Table 24. Knowing what we are looking for, could you tell us what improvements could be made so that you would be satisfied with the services you receive?

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
<i>Change Rules</i>						
Shorten wait in lobby (hours)	2					2
Require drug tests	2		2			4
Don't take away for every gain	4		1			5
Raise income standards	2				1	3
Don't base benefits on gross	2	2				4
Consider car insurance	1					1
Help ALL kids, born here or not		2				2
If kids born here, why need info?		1				1
Don't require 8 hr job because many employers won't at 1st		1				1
Change late time from 5 to 15 min.			1			1
Don't include child support in gross			2			2
Shorten orientation time			2			2
Do intake appt. <i>before</i> job hunt				1		1
Be realistic about \$					1	1
Be more individual				1	1	2
Total Change Rules	13	6	8	2	3	32
<i>Caseworkers</i>						
Require more education/raise quality	2		3			5
Improve communication	1			1	1	3
Treat people w/dignity	1	1				2
Improve attitude	1				1	2
Realize case may have changed			1			1
Ask if homeless or life threatened		1				1
Stop phone tag/get e-mail			1	1		2

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
Commend us for great job			1			1
See us as we are					1	1
Total Caseworkers	5	2	6	2	3	18
<i>Integrated Services Needed</i>						
Need main center		2			1	3
Have in town where you live		2				2
1 place, 1 time & all info available then, even if takes all day				3		3
Total Integrated Services Needed	0	4	0	3	1	8
<i>Additional Services Needed</i>						
Need help with dental	1					1
Need help w/prescription drugs	1					1
Advocate needed (in lobby)	1		4		1	6
Child support help	3					3
Provide pamphlet (qualifications & what's available)		1	1	2	2	6
Support groups ("like this")		1	1			2
Provide a group session first				1		1
Help or figure out where to send us					1	1
OHP improvement					2	2
SCF Improvement					1	1
Transportation			2		1	3
More help for people w/out kids			1			1
Give guidance				1		1
Do research into what others are doing, & do it too					1	1
More help in beginning, before suicidal or depressed					1	1
Housing needed					1	1
Start Habitat for Humanity					1	1
SWAT team for crisis					1	1

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
Support drug-free communities					1	1
Transition time help for 30 days-1 yr after get job		1	2	1		4
Total Additional Services Needed	6	3	11	5	14	39
<i>Paperwork</i>						
Cut down on trips w/papers		1				1
Provide help w/papers		1				1
Cut down on amount of paper		1				1
Let us initial papers, not do again			1			1
Don't require birth certificates every time			1			1
Total Paperwork	0	3	2	0	0	5
<i>Other</i>						
Go incognito & see how treated					2	2
Offer bonus for <i>successful</i> turnarounds, not denials					6	6
Hire people who've been in our place					2	2
Total Other	0	0	0	0	10	10

▪ **Differences Between Integrated and Non-integrated Sites in Response to Question 13**

There were no substantial differences between integrated and non-integrated sites in response to this question. Clients at integrated sites as well as at non-integrated sites offered many suggestions for improvement, including those related specifically to the need for integrated services.

13a-13c. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/areas needing improvement

One of the benefits of the focus group format is the richness of the responses to questions under discussion. However, this can also be a problem when discussions drift to areas not related to the question being discussed. Although the discussion can be led back to the appropriate area, the question remains about what to do with this extraneous, often valuable, information. Categories 13a through 13c were created as a means of capturing and organizing those comments made during focus groups that may otherwise have been lost, as they were not made in response to the questions presented, but rather were given *regardless* of the question presented.

The additional areas of concern/problems noted in 13a through 13c should be considered for planning purposes, especially when looking at barriers to services received, as well as when looking at suggested improvements.

13a. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/areas needing improvement – MISCELLANEOUS

The greatest number of miscellaneous comments (44) was in regard to issues of fairness. Several people thought that caseworkers arbitrarily give more benefits to some than to others. Many rules were also seen as unfair, such as the rule saying that if you have a car of much value, you will not get food stamps.

An additional 40 comments were made about medical *services*. Fifteen of these were related to problems experienced with clinics, such as not being able to find a clinic in town that will accept the medical card or waiting for hours in a dental office with a child in pain. Thirteen comments were about medical *coverage*, such as “OHP won’t pay for my cane,” “OHP only pays for dentures once every eight years,” or “I have a good doctor, but he is out of the area, so I have to pay him myself.”

Other medical problems/complaints include co-payments that clients cannot afford, and the difficulty working people have because of the time required waiting in clinics and being put on hold while using a reluctant employer’s phone. One client was fired from her job because of the time she spent at doctor appointments. Many clients are single mothers, with no alternative but to miss work when their sick children need to see a doctor. Fairness was another issue connected with medical complaints, as some felt that they (those with OHP) are treated differently than other patients. For example, “I waited longer in emergency because I’m OHP.”

Table 25. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/areas needing improvement – MISCELLANEOUS

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
<i>System Abuse</i>						
Some get help who shouldn't / take care of those who need it	1	1		2		4
People on drugs ruin it for all			1			1
Some people have kids to get more				2		2
Total System Abuse	1	1	1	4	0	7
<i>Fairness (caseworkers)</i>						
They pick & choose who to help	1	1			1	3
Give more to some/Discriminate	3	2	2	1		8
Shouldn't assume things & take away benefits		1				1
Subtotal Caseworker Fairness	4	4	2	1	1	12
<i>Rules</i>						
Should use same guidelines	1			6	6+	13+
Car rules are unfair		3				3
Lived in tent but AFS said lived w/parents		1				1
Got job w/Jobs Plus, now no stamps. If not JP, keep benefits			1	2		3
Had jobs program & kept benefits				2		2
Had to spend back child support all in 1 mo. to get stamps				1		1
Didn't get collected child support				1		1
If get grant or scholarship for school, no stamps				1	1	2
For everything give, take something away					1	1
Subtotal Rules Fairness	1	4	1	13	8+	27+
<i>Other</i>						
Single parent works hard, gets nothing				1		1
They make it hard to get off				1		1
2 jobs aren't enough	1					1
Mothers need clothes too		1				1

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
Calling state rep. made things worse		1				1
Subtotal Other Fairness	1	2	0	2	0	5
TOTAL Fairness	6	10	3	16	9+	44
<i>Clinic/Medical Problems</i>						
<i>Coverage-OHP</i>						
Wouldn't approve surgery			1			1
Won't pay for circumcision			1			1
Won't pay for cane					1	1
Needs better pain mgmt care					1	1
Have good Dr., but out of area					1	1
Won't pay for bandage			1			1
Won't pay for my medication			3			3
Won't pay for anti-depressants			1			1
Only pay for dentures every 8 yrs			1			1
Only pay for glasses every 2 yrs			1			1
Referrals run out before tx ends					1	1
Subtotal coverage	0	0	9	0	4	13
<i>Co-Payments</i>						
Can't afford	1					1
Unfair	1					1
Couldn't pay/lost coverage			1			1
Subtotal co-payments	2	0	1	0	0	3
<i>Clinic Problems</i>						
Won't take med card, so I pay					1	1
Won't take med card for eyes; I have to go to another town					1	1
Waited hours for dental help for child in pain-got none		2				2
Not all clinics speak Spanish		2				2
Not all accept med card		1				1
Couldn't find dental help			1			1
Can't bring kids (so have to pay childcare for 4-5 hr wait)	1					1
Can't bring food & drink for kids, even when wait hours		3				3
MH Dr. not good w/people			1			1

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
MH switched Drs often but when complained, was dropped			1			1
Waited longer in emergency because I'm OHP				1		1
Subtotal Clinic Problems	1	8	3	1	2	15
<i>Other Medical Problems</i>						
Mismanagement			2			2
If you call OHP, find out nothing					1	1
Subtotal Other Medical Problems	0	0	2	0	1	3
<i>Time for Medical</i>						
Takes too much time from work		2				2
Difficult to call from work; on hold too long		2				2
Takes hours of waiting		2				2
Subtotal Time for Medical	0	6	0	0	0	6
Total Clinic/Medical Problems	3	14	15	1	7	40
<i>Agency/Other Time Problems</i>						
Not flexible		2			1	3
Inconvenient w/work hours		1			2	3
Don't have time to get help		1				1
Caseworkers should have time for us		1				1
Total Time Problems	0	5	0	0	3	8

- **Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Services**

Participants from the integrated and non-integrated sites made extraneous comments about a variety of concerns, problems, and suggestions for improvement while providing answers to the specific focus group questions. Clients from integrated and non-integrated sites shared many areas of concern, as discussed above. There was no one area of miscellaneous comments that appeared to be directly attributable to whether the sites were integrated or not.

- **Differences Between Hispanic and Non-Hispanic Groups**

There was a difference between the Hispanic and non-Hispanic groups in the additional comments they made about problems or improvements they would like to see. The Hispanic group mentioned several areas in which time spent accessing services was a problem, such as too much time spent in waiting rooms, having to take time off from work to access services, being put on hold too long, and having to spend too much time waiting for help.

The translator for the Hispanic group, Bernardino De La Torre, said that for most of Mexico, especially the rural areas, things move more slowly than they do in the United States. Also, people are slower to process feelings. Because most of the clients in the Hispanic focus group were from rural areas of Oaxaca, Bernardino suggested taking very seriously their complaints that they are waiting too long for services. If they are complaining, then they ARE waiting too long for services.

We do not know if they were told in advance how long they would have to wait for services, but if they were told, they may not have understood. In any case, this is a problem that needs to be addressed. Please see Table 23, above, for additional problems and concerns.

13b. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/areas needing improvement – PAPERWORK

The largest number (12) of the 40 complaints about paperwork that surfaced during the focus groups was about the frequency of re-certification. This was followed by complaints about paperwork being lost in the office (5), too much proof being required (4), and other concerns such as paperwork not being appropriate to the applicant’s circumstances (for example, this is particularly confusing for grandparents filling out applications on behalf of their grandchildren because the paperwork does not fit their circumstance). See previous questions 7a, 9, 11, 11a, 12, and 13 for additional comments about paperwork.

Table 26. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/areas needing improvement – PAPERWORK

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
Re-certify too often	3	3	4		2	12
Too much proof required	1			2	1	4
Slow	1					1
Papers are all over office	1					1
Lost in office	2	1	2			5
Their error, 3x had to redo	1					1
“Computer error” = no meds	1					1
Size of med card so large everyone sees (embarrassing)		1				1
They waste \$ on paperwork		1				1
Arbitrary re proof		3				3
No one looks at wellness questionnaire, but we fill out		1				1
If anything left blank, toss out			1			1
Gifts have to be reported				2		2
Inappropriate application for circumstances				3		3
Quantity					1	1
Prefer to turn in personally instead of send to Salem (to avoid problems/loss)		2				2
Total Paperwork	10	12	7	7	4	40

▪ **Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Sites**

There were no differences. Complaints about paperwork were received at all sites.

13c. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/areas needing improvement – CASEWORKERS (negative)

Fifty-five negative extraneous comments about caseworkers were made during focus group discussions. Thirteen were about attitude/rudeness/being intimidating. This was following by 12 of the 55 comments being complaints about the frequency with which caseworkers change. Not returning calls accounted for eight of the caseworker complaints.

Table 27. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/ areas needing improvement – CASEWORKERS (Negative)

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
Don't care	1	1				2
Don't return calls	2	1	2	3		8
Take weeks to respond	2					2
Are always "in a meeting"	1					1
Had several changes	1	1	2	2	6	12
Attitude problem/rude/intimidating	1	2	3	3	4	13
Don't put us first	1					1
Don't help their own people		1				1
Should look at us as individuals		3				3
Changed & never met		1			2	3
Extremely personal questions		1				1
Give help arbitrarily			1	1		2
Changed so often, don't know my history					1	1
Indifferent/not people oriented				2		2
Degrading/embarrassing/shouldn't have to beg		3				3
Total Negative Caseworker Comments	9	14	8	11	13	55

▪ **Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Sites**

Negative complaints were made about caseworkers at every location. Comments about caseworkers were also made in response to questions 7a, 8a, 9, 11, 11a, and 13.

Note: Comments made by clients were not by any means always negative. In addition to positive remarks about services in general, a quantity of positive comments were made about caseworkers in particular, as the following category shows:

13d. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/areas needing improvement – SERVICES/CASEWORKERS/MANAGERS (Positive)

Many clients found caseworkers to be helpful (11), and an additional 9 people said that caseworkers/managers go out of their way to help. Another 9 comments were about caseworkers/managers being nice/caring/supportive. The largest number of the 65 positive comments came from White City, with 27. See Table 28 for additional information.

Table 28. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/areas needing improvement – SERVICES/CASEWORKERS/MANAGERS (Positive)

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
<i>Services/Caseworkers/Mgrs.</i>						
Helpful			3	5	3	11
Go out of way to help	1		3	3	2	9
Responded/helped right away			1	3		4
Improved			1		1	2
Nice/caring/supportive				4	5	9
Know everything				2		2
No problems/great experience			2	2	3	7
Some have specialties				2		2
Offered/help w/everything				1	1	2
"I love every worker"				1		1
Takes time for everyone					1	1
Treated me fairly					2	2
"Saved my life"					1	1
Total Positive Services / Caseworkers / Managers	1	0	10	23	19	53
<i>Understanding re Workload</i>						
Too much workload/busy	1		4	3	2	10
"It" is the nature of the job			1			1
Would need a "whole crew to listen to everything!"				1		1
Total Workload Understanding	1	0	5	4	2	12
Total Positive Comments	2	0	15	27	21	65

- **Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Sites**

As shown in Table 28, there are differences in the miscellaneous positive comments made about services, caseworkers, and managers that could be attributable to whether or not the sites are integrated. The number of positive comments coming from clients in both Coos Bay and White City (integrated sites) were many, while those from Portland and Woodburn (non-integrated sites) were few or none. This explains the different “tone” commented on by focus group facilitators, who noticed a definite, more positive, tone in both White City and in Coos Bay. However, Pendleton (a non-integrated site) also had a significant number of positive comments, and therefore we cannot say that the positive tone was attributable to “fully integrated services,” but perhaps to some aspects of that integration which produce greater client satisfaction, such as improved communication and/or employee knowledge/helpfulness.

It must be remembered that clients did not distinguish between caseworkers from DHS divisions and those from other agencies. This may be particularly pertinent when looking at the numbers for Pendleton, as the list of non-DHS agencies being accessed was long. As was noted earlier, clients expressed concern for and understanding of the workload of the caseworkers. This was particularly true in Coos Bay, White City, and Pendleton, where 11 of the 12 comments of this type originated.

14. Suggestions for participants by participants (a category created to capture the spontaneous suggestions participants made to each other)

Although this was not one of the questions posed during the focus groups, some of the suggestions participants made to other participants were captured and have been included in this category. This includes suggestions such as, “Go to a homeless shelter first so that you can get Section 8,” “Look on your OHP ‘green’ card for dental coverage,” “You have a right to change workers,” and “Scholarships and financial aid are available for college.”

Table 29 shows that participants in Portland gave the greatest number of suggestions to other participants. It should be noted that one of the participants in Portland was a former case manager who was exceptionally knowledgeable about services that are available.

Participants did a lot of networking; help and encouragement were offered; phone numbers changed hands. Many expressed appreciation for the opportunity to get together and talk about their concerns. Please see Table 29, below.

Table 29. Suggestions for Participants by Participants [a category created to capture the spontaneous suggestions participants made to each other]

Suggestions	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
Portland Pilot for emergency housing	1					1
Go to a homeless shelter 1st, so you can get Section 8	1					1
July 1 is the fiscal year & the prime time to go for help	1					1
AFS has motel certificates	1					1
Housing is available for families	1					1
AFS will pay for you to get apt.	1					1
Social service agencies will call your landlord & say they'll pay "x" amount of rent	1					1
Look on your OHP "green" card for dental coverage	1					1
Scholarships & financial aid are available for your kid's college	1					1
You only pay for housing based on income	1					1
Teen employment information	1					1
HIP (helps pay work's medical premium)	1					1
Churches will help		3				3
You have a right to change workers		1				1
Have a hearing if necessary		1				1
Don't get hot under the collar, or no service		1				1
Walmart gives shoes & socks at Christmastime, no questions asked			1			1
CAPECO will pay for college & books					1	1
CAPECO will inspect housing					1	1
There is a grievance process & they will listen then			1			1
Total	13	6	2	0	2	22

- **Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Sites**

Suggestions by participants for other participants were noted at all sites except White City, as noted above and in Table 29. There were no differences attributable to whether or not the sites were integrated.

15. Commendations not included elsewhere in the report and requests for copies of the report

As shown in Table 30, some clients wanted a note to be made about special help they received, including the name of the organization providing that help. These included REACH, Portland Development, Goodwill (3), and Hollywood Video. Three clients asked to have a copy of the final report.

Several clients thanked the facilitators for the opportunity to participate; many expressed the wish that this could continue, perhaps on a monthly basis. One client suggested putting together a panel of clients. Another client said that they need support groups, “like this.”

All in all, it was an experience appreciated by the clients, and one which provided good public relations for the Department of Human Services.

Table 30. Commendations not included elsewhere in report and requests for copies of report

Content Category	Sites					Total
	Portland	Woodburn	Coos Bay	White City	Pendleton	
<i>Commended</i>						
REACH – helped clean condemned house	1					1
Portland Development - \$20,000 loan for home repairs	1					1
Goodwill		3				3
Hollywood Video (good employer)		1				1
Total Commendations	2	4	0	0	0	6
<i>Wants copy of report</i>	1	2				3
Total Wants Copy of Report	1	2	0	0	0	3

- **Differences Between Integrated and Non-Integrated Sites**

There were no differences between integrated and non-integrated sites in regard to the commendations they made or the number of people requesting a copy of the report.

IV. CLIENT REPOSSES – By Site

This section presents information about each of the ten focus groups organized according to the five focus group sites: Portland, Woodburn, Coos Bay, White City, and The Dalles. For each site, the following information is provided: site facilities, focus group participants and location, service integration, additional concerns, and other comments.

Information about site facilities for all sites was provided by the Department of Human Services. Information included in Service Integration, Additional Concerns, and Other Comments sections was provided by the clients who participated in the focus groups.

PORTLAND, OREGON

Site Facilities

Portland DHS facilities are not co-housed. They are located at different facilities throughout the greater Portland area. Although each branch office has established relationships with DHS partners and community service groups throughout the area, a comprehensive network of DHS divisions has not been uniformly established throughout the area.

Focus Group 1: Portland; April 4, 2000; 2 p.m.

Participants and Location

For this first focus group, four of the 12 invited clients were in attendance. Two were seniors from SDSO, one was a middle aged former case manager, and one until recently was a homeless mother; all were women. Ages ranged from 38 to 77. The group was held in an auditorium at a Portland Community College location near the Cascade campus in Portland.

Service Integration

Clients did not consider services to be integrated; it was necessary to go to several places to get needed help, however two clients thought that they received more than expected (information about services they were eligible for) on an initial visit. Although there were advantages seen in having one building to go to for everything, concern was expressed about “hoards” of people converging on one place causing shortages, having a problem in one area affecting another area, and the fact that each place has its own “flavor” and this would be lost.

Not knowing “where to go” made the system seem confusing. As one participant said, “Instead of going across town, why not have them in the same building? If I go across town and they say they have run out, then I have spent half my day trying to get somewhere.” Stigma was also mentioned as a concern. There were no concerns about confidentiality.

Additional Concerns

Other concerns were parking, paperwork, inability to get housing, bafflement about having to apply for a daughter who is over 21 and has a child, and frustration with having to spend a good part of the day waiting to see a caseworker.

Other Comments

Reach, Portland Development, NW Pilot, IMPACT, and AFS were either recommended or given commendation for being especially helpful.

There was considerable information sharing and suggestions made by participants for participants. One person asked for a copy of our report. All expressed appreciation for the opportunity to talk about their experiences.

Focus Group 2: Portland; April 4, 2000; 7 p.m.

Participants and Location

This lively group consisted of six women and two men, with ages ranging from 26-52. Once again, the focus group took place at a Portland Community College building in NE Portland.

Service Integration

Clients did not consider the site to be integrated. Participants did not express concern about having to go to more than one location, nor did they mention seeing advantages to integration. They were, however, concerned that with integrated services caseworkers would get confused, files were a concern, more appointments may have to be made, caseworkers are already overloaded (“paperwork on the floor, on the desk, everywhere”). Also, “The whole office doesn’t need to know about my situation. They should be able to talk to different agencies and stuff like that, just not the entire office.” Another participant mentioned preferring to go to more than one person. “If you had more than one person, they could have less clients.”

Additional Concerns

Among other concerns were with the caseworkers’ attitudes, workers giving insufficient help, not returning calls, having caseworkers changed many times (“four times since August”), quantity, repetitiveness, and loss of paperwork, insufficient help getting child support. Also losing benefits for every gain you make in working, and using “gross” income as a determinant for qualification.

Other Comments

The “operator” at AFS was seen as a good resource. Understanding was expressed by several toward the quantity of work the caseworkers have.

Participants shared information and phone numbers. Many said they would like to do this again. Suggestions were made for a monthly forum and for forming a panel of participants. Participants were very positive toward the focus group experience and the opportunity to express concerns.

WOODBURN, OREGON

Site Facilities

Woodburn DHS facilities are not co-housed and are located at different facilities throughout the area. Although the branch office has established relationships with DHS partners and community service groups, a comprehensive network of DHS divisions has not been uniformly established.

Focus Group 3: Woodburn; April 7, 2000; 7 p.m.

Participants and Location

This group was conducted with the help of a Spanish-speaking interpreter. Two of the eight women attending spoke English and Spanish, however the remainder spoke Spanish only. Ages ranged from 19 to 37. Many, if not most, of the participants are employed. The focus group took place at the Woodburn, Oregon, Campus of Chemeketa Community College.

Service Integration

Clients did not consider the services to be integrated. Of special concern was the necessity to go to Salem for some things (food stamps and housing were mentioned), especially when regulations do not allow clients to have a car that is worth much. This is considered especially difficult for single mothers, as it necessitates taking their children in an old car down the freeway from Woodburn to Salem to access services.

Frustration was expressed with having to provide different proofs and copies at the different places, especially when having to miss work to do it. Therefore, having services in one place “For all of us it is a good idea. My question is: I went to fill out the application for the stamps and they changed the location to Salem! And if we forget one piece of paper we have to go all the way back. It was in Woodburn before.” No one saw any disadvantages to having services integrated, although one person said that it would depend on whether it would take more time or be quicker. Confidentiality was not a problem, “Because it is about my problems, I don’t care who helps me.”

Additional Concerns

In addition to concerns about cars, childcare, quantity and amount of paperwork, and confusing and/or lack of information about qualifications and services, this group felt that there was discrimination in the way they are treated. In addition, they did not think that attempts to use Spanish-speaking caseworkers and paperwork in Spanish were very successful: “Sometimes they give us papers in Spanish, and it is Spanish we don’t understand. I prefer to read it in English because it is less confusing. They don’t translate like we speak,” and “Put people who are capable in these jobs, not just ones that speak a certain language...”

Also, there was concern about their friends and family who do not qualify for services, especially the children who were born in Mexico for whom there are no food stamps or medical care. Clients also have problems finding clinics that will accept their medical cards and clinics where Spanish is spoken. When they do go to the clinic, it often takes several hours and they have to miss work and either bring all the kids or pay day care.

Other Comments

A comment was made that it is good to be able to give opinions. Churches were mentioned as a good resource.

Focus Group 4: Woodburn; April 10, 2000; 2 p.m.

Participants and Location

This large group consisted of 10 women, at least two of whom were Hispanic. This group had the greatest age range—from 19 to 80. The location was the conference room at the Woodburn branch AFS office.

Service Integration

Clients did not consider services to be integrated. Because of a shortage of caseworkers (according to a client), clients have to go to Salem for food stamps, and some do not have caseworkers. For instance, one client had caseworkers changed three times and "...then they said you are sent to Salem. I said what if I have a question? They said to call and whoever is available will answer; you don't have a caseworker."

All thought that having services in one place would be a good thing, (depending on where it is), except that caseworkers are already overworked, need people skills, and are changed too often. Another concern about having integrated services is "you don't want to be stuck with someone." As it is, "They don't switch your information, so you have to apply all over the place." One client said that she doesn't like having to send paperwork to Salem because of the time it takes and the possibility of it getting lost. "Lots of people living in Woodburn have to go to Salem. Like I do." Confidentiality was not a concern.

Additional Concerns

Concern was expressed that people are not seen as individuals, that there is too much (and sometimes inappropriate) paperwork and re-certification, paperwork is lost, caseworkers are difficult to reach, and food stamps are based on gross pay. It was felt that there is an unfair distribution of services. Discrimination was also mentioned, "You are looked down on because you are White—why do you need food stamps?"

Other Comments

Sympathy was felt towards some of the caseworkers who do try but have too much pressure, and one participant told about a caseworker who came to her house to find out why she was not in school and asked how she could help. "She took me out to lunch, and just talked about *me*. It felt good to be heard. She was listening and things were done."

Participants exchanged information about rights, and three recommended Goodwill for help. Another participant wanted everyone to know that her employer, Hollywood Video, has been wonderful to her and understanding when her children are sick. Another client suggested forming a support group, "Exactly what we are doing right now."

All were worried that they would have to report as income the childcare and transportation reimbursements they received for participating in the focus groups, as well as the gift certificates. An employee of AFS was asked , and came in to say that they do not have to report these things. NPC later verified this with Ron Taylor of AFS in Salem. Two participants asked to have a copy of the final report.

COOS BAY, OREGON

Site Facilities

The Newmark Center has been serving as a DHS integration site for four years. Within a partnership of approximately 27 organizations, Adult & Family Services (AFS), Community Partnership Team (CPT), Services to Children & Families (SCF) and Vocational Rehabilitation (VRD) are active participants in providing both collaborative and increasingly integrated services. Through the Newmark Center's Point of Entry, the community can access a wide variety of services from family safety and stability to employment-related training and long-term education.

The Point of Entry at the Newmark Center is a shared reception, assessment, and initial intake system with representatives from AFS, Community Action, Southwestern Oregon Community College, Green Thumb, South Coast Business Employment (SCBEC), the Employment Department, Veterans Programs, Women's Crisis Service, and volunteers recruited by CPT. The CPT's Family Center provides drop-in childcare for participants in Newmark programs.

Co-case management at the Newmark Center includes AFS, SCBEC, SCF, Community Action, the Community College, Community Corrections, and VRD.

Focus Group 5: Coos Bay; April 17, 2000; 2 p.m.

Participants and Location

Eight women and one man attended this focus group, with ages ranging from 25 to 54. The focus group took place in a classroom at the Newmark Center in Coos Bay.

Service Integration

Participants receive many services at the Newmark Center, and a food bank is across the street one day a week. Several participants were involved with Vocational Rehabilitation; all were receiving food stamps; most have OHP. Other services mentioned were adult education, Mental Health, Jobs Plus, WIC, Senior and Disabled Services, and SSI.

Vocational Rehabilitation has recently moved to the Newmark Center. One client said, "It is nice to have everything in one building. It is better." Another said that it would be good if they could look in the computer and tell you where to go, but they don't do that. Another comment was made that "This isn't typical of most areas, so this is a much better thing."

Transportation was an obstacle to many. For example, "I don't have a car so NO services are really available to me." One client was told that since she lives six miles out of town, she can come to the Newmark Center for transportation money. When she tried that, however, no one knew anything about it. The opposite was noted by another client who said, "We came in for food stamps, and the person we dealt with helped us get all the stuff." Another said, "You have to ask for what you want. Even with all the services here." However, the Newmark Center was seen as the place to go with all problems and questions.

Confidentiality was not seen as a problem because “...other people can look at your information over the computer, but not if you don’t sign.”

Additional Concerns

Other concerns included various problems with paperwork, such as “How many times do you have to show your birth certificate and ODL? I mean, it never changes!” Not knowing the rules, being treated rudely or “like an idiot” by caseworkers, and lack of communication were some of the other concerns. More training was suggested as a solution. In reference to caseworkers, one client said, “I have had three or four say they don’t know anything.” Suggestions were also made for clients to be persistent, ask a lot of questions, and keep a record or tape of all conversations with state workers, doctors, etc. There were many complaints about OHP not covering things that were seen as necessary.

Other Comments

Clients shared information with each other, including the fact that Walmart gives away brand new shoes and socks at Christmas time, no questions asked.

Focus Group 6: Coos Bay; April 17, 2000; 7 p.m.

Participants and Site

For the 7 p.m. focus group in Coos Bay, eight people participated—two men and six women. Ages ranged from 20 to 48. All but one participant access multiple services, including four using Mental Health services. The site for the focus group was the Newmark Center.

Service Integration

Services are considered to be integrated. One client reported that they have a 3-hour orientation including people from six different agencies who come in to talk and give names and phone numbers. “It is so that you can get work-ready.” Another client said that the caseworker gives a printout of what is necessary to get benefits.

Clients praised the Newmark and all the services they receive there: AFS, GED, childcare referral, and the “work reform program.” One participant said that they can “even do resumes here and use the computer, and it’s free!” Another comment was, “It is excellent that they moved everything into one building.”

It was also noted that employees must have been given some customer service training because the clients are treated better than they were in the past. The only drawback to integration that was mentioned was the possibility of being in another part of the building (for example, typing) and then being late for an appointment in another part of the building and having to reschedule.

There were no concerns about confidentiality. Transportation was seen as a barrier to getting services and to getting jobs.

Additional Concerns

There was concern about there not being enough staff people, repetitive paperwork, problems associated with not having enough money for insurance, etc., and difficulties in getting calls returned.

Other Comments

Quite a few comments were positive, and once again concern was shown that the staff is overworked. Clients mentioned the importance of being on time, filling papers out correctly, and asking other clients for information.

Suggestions were made for posting signs in the lobby and for having an advocate in the lobby that could provide information.

WHITE CITY, OREGON

Site Facilities

The Rogue Family Center in White City was the office selected for the client focus groups. The Rogue Family Center houses 39 staff from state, county, and private non-profit agencies. AFS provides “point of entry” services on site, and SCF also has a staff person on site.

Many direct-access services are provided by county and private, non-profit agencies at this location. Staff permanently at the site represent Jackson County Health and Human Services, WIC, Mental Health, the Employment Department, the JOB Council, On-Track (A&D out-patient treatment), ACCESS (local CAP agency and Food Bank), Goodwill, Victim Witness Program, Jackson County Parole and Probation, and the Sheriff’s office.

Focus Group 7: White City; April 19, 2000; 2 p.m.

Participants and Location

The afternoon focus group took place at the Rogue Valley Community College building at the White City Domiciliary. Approximately 800 disabled veterans and others live in the former barracks at the “Dom.” White City is located near Medford in Southern Oregon.

There were five women and two men in attendance. The women’s ages ranged from 31 to 55. The men were 29 and 42 years of age.

Service Integration

The White City location is considered by clients to be integrated. Services being accessed by this focus group’s clients included food stamps, medical, childcare, WIC, SSI and SS Disability, and a non-needy caregiver grant to pay for grandkids being raised by a client.

Many clients mentioned being satisfied with the help they received, including the services of an advocate. As in other locations, the receptionist was praised, “The receptionist told me all about it, and they point you in all directions.” At this location everyone also agreed that the caseworker is a good person to call with problems and questions.

The office itself was recommended as the place to go for services, “The Rogue Family Center is good for everything. They are always there for you.” Another person said, “At Rogue Valley it’s convenient because you can bring your kids and sometimes they have a grandma there who plays with the kids.” White City offers “everything—food bank, clothes...” Another participant mentioned learning the computer there. No one thought that there were disadvantages to getting all services in one place.

There was some concern about confidentiality. One client mentioned that her neighbor works at Rogue Valley and that bothers her.

Additional Concerns

Of concern were caseworkers being changed often, not having calls returned, having food stamps and medical benefits eliminated if taking a Jobs Plus job as opposed to a “regular” job (not the first time or place we heard this), services not happening quickly enough, confusing and inappropriate paperwork, unfairness in distribution of services, and childcare issues. The improvement suggested was to see the people as individuals.

Other Comments

One person mentioned that caseworkers are busy and so need to be bugged, but many praised the workers for their help. As one client said, “I just had the manager say, ‘I haven’t met you, but what can I do for you?’ and she called me!” Overall a very positive atmosphere at this group.

Focus Group 8: White City; April 19, 2000; 7 p.m.

Participants and Location

This evening group included nine women; ages ranged from 22 to 68. Most are receiving food stamps and medical only; one has help with day care. This session took place at the Rogue Valley Community College building at the Domiciliary in White City.

Service Integration

The White City location is considered by clients to be integrated. This group’s participants were not receiving a wide variety of services, so may not be aware of integration problems or benefits when dealing with a wider variety of services. The variety of services offered was seen by some as being dependent on the case worker. One client said that there isn’t one particular person that can be called with problems and questions. Another client agreed, but said that she talks to the desk person. However, those were exceptions, as most praised the caseworkers, “I can go to the desk or talk to any of them and they will help me right away.” Another commented, “They would have to hire a whole new crew to have someone here to listen to everything.”

Participants all agreed that having an opportunity to get all services at one place would be a good thing, “Like that we don’t have to come to Medford.” Although, for those living in Shady Cove, the “WIC lady” comes to that area monthly and that is considered to be very helpful. Several people suggested that it would be helpful to have all the paperwork taken care of at one time. “I agree there should be one place and one appointment and all information should be available right from the start, even if it takes all day as long as it is just one day and not take stuff home and then bring it back.” In a similar vein, it was suggested that a pamphlet be available listing everything that was offered. No one saw any disadvantages in having services in one place.

Confidentiality had been a concern for one person in the past, but would be of no concern to any of the participants now.

Additional Concerns

Barriers and concerns included the need to “bitch” in order to get what you need; voice mail; using gross income to figure benefits; the length of time it takes to process reports; not knowing who the supervisor or manager is; confusing, repetitious, and/or inappropriate documentation; being embarrassed about having a low reading level; not understanding the forms; unfairness of the distribution of services; and transportation. There is a bus, but it stops at White City and doesn’t go East from there. Therefore, some clients have to have a car, hitchhike or find rides.

Other Comments

Several caseworkers were praised for being readily available and for being quick. For example, “I went yesterday to apply to have my daughter put on medical and they called that afternoon and said it is ready.” And, “My worker gets everything done that day.” Others have problems reaching their workers and are not called back within a reasonable time, “I called two weeks ago and my caseworker just called me back two days ago.”

Suggestions were made for having explanations on the forms in “layman’s language,” for having a policy of *having* to return calls within 72 hours, and for making services available during hours that working people can access, such as Saturday.

PENDLETON, OREGON

Site Facilities

The Pendleton State Office Building houses multiple DHS divisions, state agencies, and community partners, including Adult and Family Services (AFS), Blue Mountain Community College JOBS Program, Department of Child Support, Services to Children and Families (SCF), Community Partnership Team – Volunteer Program, and Vocational Rehabilitation Division (VRD). The Health Division is also in the building. The building next door houses the Employment Department and the Work-Links One-Stop Center. A local A&D partner is on site twice a month.

Focus Group 9: Pendleton; April 21, 2000; 2 p.m.

Participants and Location

The Jury Room at City Hall was the setting for the afternoon focus group in Pendleton. The six women and three men participating in this focus group had ages ranging from 24 to 54 years.

Service Integration

Participants in this focus group used a wide variety of services within the past year, (many of which were not through DHS divisions): CAPECO (Community Action Program of East-Central Oregon, a non-profit community action agency), Vocational Rehabilitation, food stamps, medical, HUD, “work experience,” OMAP, E. Oregon Alcohol Foundation, Sr. and Disabled Services, SS, WIC, JOBS, SCF, cash assistance, Umatilla County Mental Health, Corrections, SSI, Pendleton SDS, and Human Resources.

Clients did not consider services to be integrated. One client said, “Every organization is so *disorganized* they send you somewhere and you go there and they say go here...” All nodded agreement. When asked who they call with problems and questions, one response was, “A counselor in each agency.” Another was, “At AFS the receptionists know more than our caseworker,” a remark heard in focus groups in more than one location. As for the one office where they can go with questions or problems, the Governor’s office was recommended, as was the vocational rehabilitation office where one person handles 85 clients but, “She is so caring that she gave me three business cards if I meet someone who needs services.” Another client said that Umatilla County Detox saved his life a couple of times. A person at CAPECO was also praised for being willing to help. A caseworker at D&A rehab was praised because, “She went out of the way to pay for everything. She looked at me as a person, and that is the only reason I am clean today.” Another client said, “I was happy with it all.” They all agreed that having services in one place would be a good thing.

One problem with the current non-integrated system is that “different places test differently, and don’t know what each others’ scores mean. That should be consistent.” Another suggested, “I would like to see one agency where they would sit you down and find out what your needs are and find what would fit those needs.”

Possible disadvantages to having integrated services included, “It depends on who you have, just like in any other program.” There were several concerns about confidentiality: 1) “You have to sign releases and you know they talk anyway.” 2) “Nothing is confidential.” 3) “Especially when your file moves from one person to another.” 4) “I worked on a job where I had access to all the SCF files, and I saw all of that. I think it is a big issue, especially in a small community.” An opposing view was given by another client, “I am not worried about my anonymity because I want someone else who needs help to go for recovery.”

Additional Concerns

Barriers to getting services were childcare, transportation, and A&D classes being held at night when “the only people who are available to take care of my kids then are drunk or drugging.”

Other concerns were not having money to make the co-pay for OHP and therefore losing medical coverage, caseworkers changing frequently, inadequate information, affordable housing (a big issue with this group), and being required to go to rehab when no longer having problems in that area.

Other Comments

Many suggestions were made for improvements: “The businesses should get together and create a center for childcare,” “The state could copy programs that work, such as Habitat for Humanity,” “Send people in ‘incognito’ to apply for services and see what happens,” and “Give bonuses to caseworkers for *successful* turnarounds only.” Several clients thought that caseworkers are given a bonus for every person they deny and don’t help, as well as every person they get off welfare, even the ones that move away. It was suggested that supervisors should have to be accountable, as well as caseworkers, for successes only. It was also suggested that caseworkers have more training, be more compassionate, and know what people are going through.

Other suggestions: have consumer advocates, tie rental housing to local availability (“Why have them empty when people need places to live?”), diversify services like vans or taxis—have someone on welfare drive at least part time, have a SWAT team that goes out to people in crisis, support people-enforced drug-free communities, and structure guidelines to individual situations.

Focus Group 10: Pendleton; April 21, 2000; 7 p.m.

Participants and Location

Four women and one man met in the Community Room at City Hall in the city of Pendleton for this focus group. Their ages ranged from 33 to 56. A storm broke a few minutes prior to the time of the meeting, and most likely was the reason the group wasn’t larger. Those attending arrived prior to the storm.

Service Integration

Clients considered services to be partially integrated. “Vocational rehab, AFS, and SCF are all in the same building and that is good.” A comment on integration of services was, “They already share information between agencies. I think it would help them immensely. It would make our services come quicker.”

There were also reasons for thinking that integrated services might not be a good thing, “I think that would overload them. The way it is now it is portioned out.” And, “If all services are in one place, it is good if you live close to it, but not otherwise.”

Confidentiality was an issue for some, for example the nurse in one client’s doctor’s office is her busybody neighbor, so she had to quit going to that doctor. Another person quit going to AA meetings because, “...there was no such thing as anonymous.”

Additional concerns

Of concern were rude comments by case workers, caseworkers changing frequently, confusing and/or repetitious paperwork, quantity of paperwork, transportation, fairness, and several OHP problems, including co-pay problems, insufficient pain management, and difficulty finding an eye doctor in the area that will accept OHP.

Other Comments

The receptionist at AFS was recommended as being “...very helpful and will route you where you need to go.” Other clients call their caseworker with problems and questions. A variety of offices were recommended as places to go with questions/problems: SDS, Umatilla County Mental Health (several recommendations), and AFS. The Jobs Club program was also applauded for offering a 16-week self-reliance seminar and testing (motor skills, dyslexia) with an outcome that was career oriented. “They joined forces with CAPECO and always were involved with rehab.”

V. CONCLUSION

From the clients' perspective, having services in one place would be a good thing because of convenience and efficiency. Participants at non-integrated sites, locations where most services are not available in one place, had several reservations about bringing these services together, none of which were reported by participants at the integrated sites.

Although services may be integrated as far as physical site is concerned, there are other issues that need to be addressed as well before clients will be satisfied with the services they receive. These issues include location and accessibility of the site (including transportation and convenient hours), as well as internal factors such as caseworker communication and coordination of paperwork.

Integrating services was not a priority for the focus group participants; they had many other issues around the services they receive that were of greater concern to them. However, because of the positive tone at integrated sites and because problems associated with service integration from the perspective of clients at non-integrated sites did not come to pass at integrated sites, integrating services is recommended as a way to increase client satisfaction, as long as other issues, as mentioned above, are addressed as well.

Recommendations

With the help of information shared by clients participating in the focus groups, as well as their suggestions for improvements, NPC Research makes the following recommendations:

For planning purposes when locating an integrated site:

- Locate services near the clients' homes. The location of the site is critical to accessibility by the clients. Having the site in the clients' hometown is the first preference. In smaller towns where this may be impractical, and when those towns are many miles from the central site, an outreach worker providing services at those remote towns on a regular basis (e.g., the WIC representative in the White City area) is recommended.
- Locate the site in an area accessible to clients by public transportation or provide the means for clients to reach the site. As one client said, "I don't have a car, so really NO services are available to me."

For all integrated sites (both current and future) and in lieu of integration for non-integrated sites:

- Provide access to transportation. The most efficient and centrally located site will not be effective if clients are not able to reach it. Bus service, taxi vouchers, and money for gasoline are aids to transportation that have been provided at some sites. One or more of these services needs to be available to all clients at all sites.

- Consider providing additional caseworker training. Clients at all sites suggested improved caseworker efficiency and attitude as a means of increasing client satisfaction with services. Clients are reluctant to entrust their paperwork (and indeed their means of living) to employees they perceive to be lacking in knowledge and people skills.
- Consider providing additional caseworkers. Participants at all sites, except Woodburn, perceive caseworkers to be overloaded with work, resulting in multiple problems for the clients as a result of such things as lost paperwork and inability to take the time to understand individual needs.
- Minimize stigma. There is stigma attached to receiving some services, leaving clients reluctant to access other services in close proximity. Having multiple services in one building may maximize the stigma for those accessing the more benign services because they are concerned that judgments may be made about clients going into the building. On the other hand, having a variety of services, both those with a stigma attached and those without, may lessen the stigma for those actually accessing the stigmatized services. Every consideration should be made for keeping services being accessed by clients a private matter between the caseworker and the client.
- Coordinate paperwork. Repetitive, inappropriate, and confusing are some of the adjectives clients used to describe paperwork. Unless clients see paperwork used efficiently, they will doubt the efficiency of all services, whether integrated or not.
- Coordinate visits. Even though clients are able to access services at one site, if they must make multiple visits to do so they will not be satisfied that their services are truly coordinated.
- Provide alternative office hours for those clients who work during the day, so that clients will not have to miss work and put their jobs in jeopardy in order to access services.
- Continue to provide a periodic forum for clients to express their experiences with service delivery. Not only do clients provide valuable insight into where efficiencies and inefficiencies lie, they are also a source of suggestions for improvement.

APPENDIX A

Focus Group Questions

FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS

Questions asked of clients participating in focus groups

1. What services have you been getting during the past 12 months?
2. How did you first hear about the services that were available to you?
3. Did you come in for just one service?
- 3a. Did the person you talked to tell you about other services that were available to you?
4. Did you find out later [after the initial contact] that you were eligible for something that you weren't told about? How?
5. How quickly did you get what you needed?
- 5a. Could it have been done quicker? How?
6. If you have problems or questions, whom do you call?
- 6a. Is there one office where you can go with all your questions or problems? What office is that?
7. Was the system confusing?
- 7a. What made it confusing?
8. If you had an opportunity to get all services at one place, would you think it is a good thing?
- 8a. Why is it a good thing to have all services in one place?
9. Are there reasons why it might NOT be a good thing?
10. Are there any concerns about confidentiality?
11. What sorts of things are barriers to your getting services?
- 11a. What could be done to improve or change this?
12. What advice would you give to someone who needs service?
13. Knowing what we are looking for, could you tell us what improvements could be made so that you would be satisfied with the services you receive?

Additional comments provided by clients participating in focus groups

- 13a. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/areas needing improvement – MISCELLANEOUS
- 13b. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/areas needing improvement – PAPERWORK
- 13c. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/areas needing improvement – CASEWORKERS (Negative)
- 13d. Additional comments made during focus groups regarding problems/areas needing improvement – SERVICES/CASEWORKERS/MANAGERS (Positive)
- 14. Suggestions by participants for participants
- 15. Commendations not included elsewhere in report and requests for copies of report