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**Slide 1: Communication Tools for Moving Research to Practice**

The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium (ADA-PARC): Interactive Data Displays of Community and Work Disparities

Hosted by AIR’s Center on Knowledge Translation for Disability and Rehabilitation Research (KTDRR). October 24, 26, and 28, 2016, from 1–5 PM Eastern
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Image of American Institutes for Research (AIR) logo.

Image of National Institute on Disability, Independent Living, and Rehabilitation Research (NIDILRR) logo.

**Slide 2: Participatory Action Research to Transfer Knowledge on Health and Participation Disparities with People with Disabilities Back to Community Stakeholders**

* Joy Hammel, Lex Frieden, Janet Smith, Lauren Nolan, Danbi Lee

**Slide 3: Learning Objectives**

- To examine health and participation disparities experienced by people with disabilities post rehabilitation, and their impact on health, citizenship & full participation in society.

- Emphasis on 25 years post-ADA passage

- To identify promising methods, practices and innovative interventions to address these disparities and increase opportunities.

- To evaluate participatory action research strategies that actively involve people with disabilities in the design and evaluation of health and participation-focused interventions, policies and systems changes.

**Slide 4: Why should we be concerned about health & participation disparities experienced by people with disabilities?**

**Slide 5: Nothing About Us Without Us: Access to Participation a Civil Right**

Demonstrations, Protests, Actions, Marches, Rallies, Sit-ins

**Slide 6: Community Stakeholder Survey**

(n=700 disability leaders and stakeholders)

* What does participation look like post Americans with Disabilities Act (25th Anniversary)?
	+ How far have we come?
	+ What are the key issues still remaining?
	+ What can we do to strategize actions to address disparities?

**Slide 7: 25 years after its passing, the ADA’s greatest impact is access to public accommodations**

Bar graph showing the impacts of the American with Disabilities Act 25 years after its passing, according to survey respondents. The y-axis is labeled Percentage of Respondents Indicating Greatest ADA Impact Area, and the range is 0% to 60%. The x-axis is labeled as follows: Equal Employment Opportunities, 25%; Access to Government Services, 22%; Access to Public Accommodations, 55%; Access to Public Transportations, 35%; Access to Education, 28%; Access to Telecommunications,11%; Access to Independent/Community Living, 30%; Access to Healthcare, 10%; Access to Recreation, 5%; Access to Housing, 8%; and Understanding of Disability by Others, 33%.

Data from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 8: Lack of progress towards reaching goals of employment, healthcare and housing access**

Bar graph showing areas of least impact by the Americans with Disabilities Act, according to survey respondents. The y-axis is labeled Percentage of Respondents Indicating Area of Least ADA Impact, and the range is 0% to 45%. The x-axis is labeled as follows: Equal Employment Opportunities, 41%; Access to Government Services, 15%; Access to Public Accommodations, 12%; Access to Public Transportation, 24%; Access to Education, 15%; Access to Telecommunications, 11%; Access to Independent/Community Living,14%; Access to Healthcare, 39%; Access to Recreation, 27%; Access to Housing, 38%; and Understanding of Disability by Others, 24%.

Data from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 9: The Major Barriers to ADA Implementation**

Bar graph showing the major barriers to implementation of the Americans with Disabilities Act, according to survey respondents. The y-axis is labeled Percentage of Respondents Who Indicated Largest Barrier to ADA Implementation, and the range is 0% to 80%. The x-axis is labeled as follows: Lack of Public Awareness, 61%; Lack of Will to Enforce the Law, 75%; Difficult Complaint Process, 55%; Direct Opposition to the ADA, 33%; and Other, 2%.

Data from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 10: ADA-PARC**

The Americans with Disabilities Act Participation Action Research Consortium (ADA-PARC): Documenting & Targeting Participation Disparities among People with Disabilities.

Principal Investigators: Lex Frieden, LLD, & Joy Hammel, PhD, OTR/L.

Collaborating ADA Centers: Southwest ADA Center, Great Lakes ADA Center, Southeast ADA Center, Pacific ADA Center, Rocky Mountain ADA Center, & Mid-Atlantic ADA Center.

**Slide 11: Funding**

This research is funded by the National Institute on Disability, Independent Living, and Rehabilitation Research (NIDILRR), Grant Number H133A120008.

**Slide 12:** **The ADA Participation Action Research Consortium**

Various logos illustrating the organizations involved in the Americans

with Disabilities Act Participation Action Research Consortium.

Logos are shown for the Southwest ADA Center ILRU, Great Lakes ADA Center, Southeast ADA Center, Pacific ADA Center, Rocky Mountain ADA Center, Mid-Atlantic ADA Center, Northwest ADA Center, TIRR Memorial Hermann Rehabilitation and Research, The University of Illinois at Chicago, Syracuse University, the Center on Disability at The Public Health Institute and University of Northern Colorado.

**Slide 13: Purpose of ADA-PARC**

* To collaboratively examine participation disparities experienced by people with disabilities post ADA & Olmstead
* To identify & examine key environmental factors contributing to these disparities
* To benchmark participation disparities and highlight promising practices at state & city levels
* To action-plan strategies for dissemination and utilization of findings to be used by ADA Centers, policy makers, service delivery in community capacity building & systems change initiatives

**Slide 14: Participation Disparities Experienced by People with Disabilities**
<http://centerondisability.org/ada_parc/index.php>

* **Community Living (CL)**Community v. institution living choices and long term care spending, Olmstead systems changes like home and community-based (HCB) waivers, Money Follows the Person & Rebalancing Initiative Programs (BIPs)
* **Community participation (CP)**Health insurance, housing voucher access, access to community resources, transportation, education, voting
* **Work/economic participation (WE)**

Employment status, economic status, housing affordability, cost of living

**Slide 15: KT Methodologies Used**

1. GIS mapping (and accessible tables)

* Visualize and analyze data to understand relationships, patterns, and trends
* Show how geography, proximity, access to resources, services & built environment affect participation
* Compare participation for people with and without disabilities
	+ Potentially available at national, state, city and census tract/neighborhood levels (depending on data set, samples and margin of error)

Graphic of two maps of the United States, each with individual states shaded in different colors.

Image from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 16: KT Methodologies Used**

2. Indexing and benchmarking

* Want a way to compare, or benchmark, your state or city to others
* Want disparity findings to be easy to understand, robust, useful for decision makers, and flexible so can update and run in different ways
* Process
	+ Standardize indicators (to make them all equivalent)
	+ Take mean of individual indices into composites indices
	+ Transform the standard scores into a 1-100 metric
* Multiple studies have found indexing to be a valid method of making decisions and it is used extensively in health disparities research

(Analytis, Kothiyal & Katsikopoulos, 2014)

**Slide 17: Interpretation of the Scores**

Image of a vertical bar shaded from green at the top to red at the bottom.

Near the top of the bar is the label 100: Best opportunity.

Next to the middle of the bar is the label 50: Average.

Near the bottom of the bar is the label 0: Least opportunity, or potential disparity.

Image from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 18: KT Methodologies Used**

3. Risk Ratios

* Compare PWOD to PWD on likelihood of participation or disparity/difference in participation
	+ Example Indicator: Likelihood of living in poverty for PWOD compared to PWD in a specific state or city
		- Risk ratio of 2.62 in Washington DC indicates that PWD in DC are 2.6 times (262%) more likely to live in poverty than PWOD

**Slide 19: Piloting in Representative Cities**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ADA Center**  | **States**  | **Selected Cities** |
| **Southwest (Region 6)**  | Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas  | **Houston, TX** Tulsa, OKAustin, TX | Albuquerque, NM; Little Rock, ARBaton Rouge, LA | New Orleans, LA |
| **Great Lakes (Region 5)**  | Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin  | **Chicago, IL** Detroit, MIIndianapolis, IN | Lansing, MI Columbus, OH Milwaukee, WI | Minneapolis, MN  |
| **Southeast (Region 4)**  | Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee | **Raleigh, NC** Greensboro, NC Asheville, NC Gastonia, NC | Nashville, TN Memphis, TN Birmingham, AL Montgomery, AL | Tampa, FL St. Pete, FLColumbia, SC |
| **Pacific** **(Region 9)** | Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, the Pacific Basin  | **Oakland, CA**San Francisco, CA Riverside, CA Sacramento, CA  | Fresno, CA Santa Barbara, CA Las Vegas, NVPhoenix, AZ  | Tucson, AZHonolulu, HI |
| **Rocky Mountain (Region 8)**  | Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming  | **Denver, CO**  | Salt Lake City, UT | Missoula, MT  |
| **Mid-Atlantic (Region 3)** | DC, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia  | **Baltimore, MD** Washington, DC  | Richmond, VAPittsburgh, PA  |  |
| **Northwest (Region 10)** | Alaska, Idaho, Oregon Washington | **Seattle, WA**Spokane, WA | Tacoma, WAPortland, OR | Boise, ID |

Data from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 20: Participation Area 1: Community Living Findings**

**Slide 21: Indicator 1: Percentage of People with Disabilities Living in an Institution, 2009-2013**

Map of the United States with each state shaded differently. In general, states in the Great Plains regions are darker than those in other parts of the country, indicating that this region had the highest percentage of people with disabilities who lived in an institution between 2009 and 2013. The percentage range in these states was 6.9% to 9.5%.

**Data source**. U.S. Census Bureau, 2013a, Table S2601A.

**Calculation**. Number of people with a disability living in an institution divided by the total # of people with any disability.
**Note**. Institutions include: Nursing homes, hospital facilities, and correctional and juvenile institutions.

Image from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 22: Indicator: Percentage of People with Disabilities Who Have Asked to Move out of Nursing Homes to the Community (CMS, 2013)**

Map of the United States with states on the West Coast shaded in darker colors than many of the other states, indicating the highest percentage of people with disabilities who have asked to move out of nursing homes into the community. The percentage range in these states was 25.2% to 35.3%.

Image from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 23: Indicator 5. Ratio of HCBS (Community-based) Expenditures to Total Long Term Care State Spending (LTSS), 2013**

Map of the United States. In general, the states in the West are in a darker shade than states in the East. This darker shade indicates that these states have the highest percentage of HCBS (Community-based) Expenditures to Total Long Term Care State Spending. The percentage range is 52.5% to 90.8%.

**Data source**. Burwell, Saucier, & Walker, 2010, HCBS Participants and Expenditures from UCSF Annual Data Collection; Nursing Homes and ICF/DD participants from MSIS; Nursing Homes and ICF/DD Expenditures.
**Note**. HCBS includes 1915(c) waivers, Home Health & State Pan PCS; Long Term Support & Services (LTSS) includes HCBS, nursing homes and ICF/DD. AZ, HI, RI & VT served most of their HHBS population within managed care programs.

Image from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 24: Benchmarking: Indexing Community Living Resources at State Level (2013 data)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Best States** | **Worst states** |
| **1. Ratio of HCBS participants to total long term support services** | 79 | Arizona | 6 | Rhode Island |
| 76 | New Mexico | 31 | Mississippi |
| 73 | Alaska | 34 | Alabama, Indiana |
| 66 | California, Oregon | 35 | Georgia, Tennessee |
| **2. Ratio of HCBS expenditures to total long term support services** | 93 | New Mexico | 26 | Mississippi |
| 79 | Oregon | 31 | New Jersey |
| 73 | Minnesota | 35 | Indiana |
| 70 | Arizona | 36 | Florida |
| 69 | Alaska, Virginia | 37 | Michigan |
| **3. Number of MFP transitions since inception** | 135 | Utah | 47     | Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, DC, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Iowa, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin |
| 64 | Texas |
| 56 | Ohio |
| 54 | West Virginia |
| 51 | Connecticut, Maryland |
| ***Composite: Community living resources*** | *79* | *Utah* | *31* | *Rhode Island* |
| *72* | *New Mexico* | *35* | *Mississippi* |
| *65* | *Arizona* | *39* | *Indiana* |
| *64* | *Oregon* | *40* | *Alabama* |
| *63* | *Alaska* | *41* | *Florida, New Jersey, North Dakota* |

**Slide 25: Participation Area 2: Work & Economic Participation**

**Slide 26: Indicator 1. People with and without Disabilities Who Are Employed: Age 18-64, 2013**

Image of two maps of the United States. The map on the left, labeled With a Disability That Are Employed, show states shaded in lighter colors, indicating lower percentages of people with disabilities who are employed in those states. The map on the right, labeled Without a Disability That Are Employed, show states shaded in darker colors, indicating higher percentages of people without disabilities who are employed in those states.

**Data source**. U.S. Census Bureau, 2013b, Table B18120.
**Calculation**. This percentage is calculated by dividing the number in each group (people with disabilities or people without disabilities) who are currently employed by the total population of each group.

Image from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 27: Indicator 2. People with and without Disabilities Who Are Unemployed: Age 18-64, 2013**

Image of two maps of the United States. The map on the left, labeled With a Disability That Are Unemployed, is shaded in mostly darker colors, indicating higher percentages of people with disabilities who are unemployed in those states. The map on the right, labeled Without a Disability That Are Unemployed, is shaded in mostly lighter colors, indicating lower percentages of people without a disability who are unemployed in those states.

**Data source**. U.S. Census Bureau, 2013b, Table B18120.
**Calculation**. Number in each group (people with disabilities or people without disabilities) who are currently unemployed but are actively looking for work divided by the total number of persons in the labor force for each group.

Image from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 28: Indicator 3. People with and without Disabilities Not in the Labor Force: Age 18-64, 2013**

Image of two maps of the United States. The map on the left, labeled With a Disability and Not in the Labor Force, is shaded in darker colors in general, indicating higher percentages of people with disabilities who are not in the labor force. The map on the right, labeled Without a Disability and Not in the Labor Force, is shaded in lighter colors in general, indicating lower percentages of people without disabilities who are not in the labor force.

**Data source**. U.S. Census Bureau, 2013b, Table B18120.
**Calculation**. Number in each group (people with disabilities or people without disabilities) who are not in the labor force divided by the total number of persons in each group.
**Note**. Individuals not in the labor force include students, homemakers, retired workers, seasonal workers interviewed in an off season who were not looking for work, institutionalized people, and people doing only incidental unpaid family work (less than 15 hours).

Image from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 29: Indicator 12: Percentage of People with and without Disabilities Below the Poverty Level: Age 18 to 64, 2013**

Image of two maps of the United States. The map on the left, labeled People With Disabilities Below the Poverty Level, is shaded in darker colors in general, indicating higher percentages of people with disabilities who are below the poverty level. The map on the right, labeled People Without Disabilities Below the Poverty Level, is shaded in lighter colors in general, indicating lower percentages of people without disabilities who are below the poverty level.

**Data source**. U.S. Census Bureau, 2013c,Table C18130, “Age by disability status by poverty status.”
**Calculation**. Number in each group (people with disabilities or people without disabilities) who are below the poverty level divided by the total population of each group.
**Note**. The poverty level refers to income that is below a minimum threshold based on family size and composition.

Image from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 30: Work/Economic Indices at State Level (2013)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Best States (least poverty, etc.)** | **Worst states (most poverty etc.)** |
| **Percentage of people below poverty level** | 81 | Alaska | 15 | District of Columbia |
| 75 | Wyoming | 30 | Kentucky |
| 71 | Delaware | 31 | Mississippi |
| 70 | New Hampshire | 33 | Maine |
| 68 | New Jersey | 35 | West Virginia |
| **Percentage of people not in labor force** | 77 | North Dakota,  | 20 | West Virginia |
| 77 | South Dakota | 28 | Kentucky |
| 72 | Wyoming | 29 | Alabama |
| 68 | Minnesota | 31 | Mississippi |
| 66 | Alaska, Nebraska | 34 | South Carolina |
| **Percentage of people unemployed** | 81 | North Dakota | 22 | District of Columbia |
| 79 | West Virginia | 26 | Nevada |
| 70 | South Dakota | 27 | Connecticut |
| 69 | Oklahoma | 34 | Oregon |
|  69 |  Wyoming | 35 | Vermont |
| ***Composite: Not working and poor*** | *73* | *North Dakota* | *28* | *District of Columbia* |
| *72* | *Wyoming* | *39* | *Michigan* |
| *68* | *South Dakota* | *40* | *Kentucky, Mississippi* |
| *64* | *Nebraska* | *41* | *Florida, North Carolina* |

**Slide 31: Work/Economic Indices at City Level**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Best Cities (least poverty etc.)** | **Worst Cities (most poverty etc.)** |
| **Percentage of people below poverty level** | 91 | Anchorage | 20 | Detroit |
| 71 | Honolulu | 26 | Asheville |
| 69 | Riverside | 33 | Birmingham |
| 67 | Las Vegas | 33 | Minneapolis |
| 66 | Austin, Raleigh | 32 | Milwaukee |
| **Percentage of people not in labor force** | 83 | Missoula | 19 | Birmingham |
| 76 | Austin | 22 | Detroit |
| 72 | Raleigh | 35 | Montgomery |
| 71 | Anchorage | 35 | St. Petersburg |
| 69 | Santa Barbara | 36 | New Orleans |
| **Percentage of people unemployed** | 82 | Gastonia | 24 | Santa Barbara |
| 76 | Honolulu | 25 | Little Rock |
| 74 | San Francisco | 29 | Columbia |
| 72 | Montgomery | 33 | Minneapolis |
| 66 | Tulsa | 36 | Baltimore |
| ***Composite: Not working and poor*** | *73* | *Anchorage* | *26* | *Detroit* |
| *67* | *Honolulu* | *36* | *Birmingham* |
| *66* | *Austin* | *38* | *Asheville* |
| *61* | *Gastonia* | *38* | *Milwaukee* |
| *60* | *Raleigh* | *40* | *Lansing, Minneapolis* |

**Slide 32: Work Economic Risk Ratio: Poverty Likelihood at City Level**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Ratio** | **Top Cities** | **Bottom Cities** |
| **Likelihood of having more PWD in poverty than PWOD** | 1.38 | Detroit | 2.81 | Asheville |
| 1.48 | Riverside | 2.71 | San Francisco  |
| 1.49 | Tucson | 2.70 | St. Petersburg |
| 1.53 | Baton Rouge | 2.65 | Seattle |
| 1.55 | Phoenix | 2.62 | Washington DC |

* Risk ratio of 1.38 in Detroit indicates that PWD in Detroit are 1.38 times (138%) more likely to live in poverty than PWOD.
* Risk ratio of 2.81 in Asheville indicates that PWD in Asheville are 2.8 times (281%) more likely to live in poverty than PWOD.
* What are we doing in rehabilitation to take this level of poverty into account? Are we seeing “surviving on very limited incomes”, “system management” and “accessing resources & information” as key functional skills we work on in rehabilitation?

**Slide 33: Participation Area 3: Community Participation**

What key resources do PWD need access to fully participate in the community?

**Slide 34: Access to Affordable, Accessible and Integrated Housing Affects Overall Participation**

Affordable, accessible & integrated housing disparities in Cook County.

Map of Florida broken down by county. Each county is shaded in light or dark teal colors. The counties shaded in darker colors reveal that the disabled who are living below the poverty level experience the greatest disparities in access to affordable, accessible, and integrated housing.

Image from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 35: Risk Ratio: Comparing Housing Choice Vouchers (integrated) versus Public Housing**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Ratio** | **Top Cities** | **Bottom Cities** |
| **Likelihood of having more PWD with vouchers than PWD living in public housing** | 2.80 | Greensboro | 0.43 | Minneapolis |
| 2.64 | Santa Barbara | 0.44 | Little Rock |
| 2.08 | Richmond | 0.50 | Boise |
| 1.73 | St. Petersburg | 0.55 | Memphis |
| 1.67 | Honolulu, Missoula | 0.57 | Milwaukee |

* Risk ratio of 2.80 in Greensboro indicates that PWD are 2.80 times (280%) MORE likely to have a voucher to live in integrated community than live in public housing
* Risk ratio of 0.43 in Minneapolis indicates that the likelihood of PWD having a voucher is 43% LESS likely than living in public housing.
* Housing voucher access key environmental predictor of community living, integration, and participation, especially for Olmstead population

**Slide 36: Proximity to Community Resources** (Walk Score)

Graph showing the walk score, or proximity to community resources, of major U.S. cities, which are ranked on a scale from 0 to 100. San Francisco ranked highest with a score of 85. Indianapolis ranked lowest with a score of 29.

**Data source**: www.walkscore.com

**Slide 37: Access to Public Transit** (Transit Score)

Graph showing the transit score of U.S. cities, which are ranked from 0 to 100. San Francisco ranked highest, with a score of 85. Raleigh ranked lowest, with a score of 23.

**Data source**: www.walkscore.com

**Slide 38: Transportation Access Houston, Texas Train Lines**

Image showing transportation access for persons with disabilities on train lines in Houston, Texas. Map of the Houston area shows neighborhoods shaded from yellow to dark brown. The yellow shading represents areas with low numbers of people with disabilities, and the brown shading represents areas with higher numbers of people with disabilities. The train line is located near the middle of the map.

Image from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 39: Transportation Access - Houston, Texas Train Lines**

Same image as on slide 38; however, in this graph, the neighborhoods are not shaded. The graph shows that 5% of persons with disabilities live within one-half mile of a train stop and 4% of all people live within one-half mile of the train stop.

Image from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 40: Transportation Access - Chicago, Illinois El Lines**

Map of the El Lines in the Chicago area showing that 31% percent of persons with disabilities live within one-half mile of a train stop and 34% of all people live within one-half mile of a train stop.

Image from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 41: Transportation Access - Houston, Texas Bus Lines**

Map of the bus lines in Houston showing that 52% of persons with disabilities live within one-quarter mile of a bus stop and 49% of all people live within a quarter mile of a bus stop.

Image from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 42: Transportation Access - Chicago, Illinois Bus Lines**

Map of the bus lines in Chicago showing that 94% of persons with disabilities live within one-quarter mile of a bus stop and 93% of all people live within a quarter mile of a bus stop.

Image from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 43: Using the Data to Change Systems: Targeting Inaccessible Transportation Stations**

Map of Chicago with the number of people with disabilities in neighborhoods shaded in the El line stops separated by Non-ADA-accessible stations and ADA-accessible stations.

Image from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 44: Access to Disability Resources**

Houston, Texas: Centers for Independent Living. 22% of PWD in Houston are within 5 miles of a CIL. Map of Houston, Texas, with three areas highlighted in circles. In the center of each highlighted circle is an icon representing a Center of Independent Living (CIL). One circle indicates that 19% of persons with disabilities live within 5 miles of a CIL; the second circle shows that 6% of persons with disabilities live within 5 miles of a CIL; and the third circle indicates that 1% of people with disabilities live within 5 miles of a CIL.

Image from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 45: Access to Disability Resources**

Chicago, Illinois, Centers for Independent Living. 43% of people with disabilities in Chicago are within 5 miles of a CIL. Map of Chicago with three areas highlighted in circles. In the center of each highlighted circle is an icon indicating a Center for Independent Living (CIL). One circle indicates that 15% of persons with disabilities live within 5 miles of a CIL; the second circle shows that 22% of persons with disabilities live within 5 miles of a CIL; and the third circle indicates that 8% of persons with disabilities live within 5 miles of a CIL.

Image from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 46: Benchmarking Community Participation Access to Resources: City Level Indexing**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Indices** | **Best Cities** | **Worst Cities** |
| **CP Resources (Walk score distance to resources (grocery, pharmacy, library)** | 84 | San Francisco | 28 | Indianapolis |
| 73 | Chicago | 31 | Anchorage |
| 72 | Washington DC | 32 | Gastonia |
| 70 | Seattle | 34 | Montgomery |
| 68 | Minneapolis | 35 | Nashville |
| **Proportion of PWD living within 5 miles of a CIL** | 71 | Missoula | 27 | Gastonia |
| 71 | Oakland | 27 | Honolulu |
| 71 | Santa Barbara | 27 | Minneapolis |
| 69 | Spokane | 27 | New Orleans |
| 66 | Washington DC | 27 | St. Petersburg |
| **Access to healthy food/Food desert** | 71 | Chicago | 10 | Lansing |
| 68 | Baltimore | 24 | Birmingham |
| 68 | San Francisco | 32 | Anchorage |
| 68 | Washington DC | 32 | Montgomery |
| 67 | Detroit, Santa Barbara | 35 | Little Rock |
| ***Composite: Access to resources*** | *71* | *San Francisco* | *34* | *Gastonia* |
| *69* | *Washington DC* | *36* | *Indianapolis* |
| *68* | *Santa Barbara* | *37* | *Columbia* |
| *67* | *Oakland* | *39* | *Birmingham, Lansing* |
| *63* | *Chicago, Seattle* | *39* | *Montgomery, Nashville* |

Data from The Americans with Disabilities Act Participatory Action Research Consortium

**Slide 47: Ongoing Knowledge Translation Actions**

* Update GIS data annually, add cities, and respond to requests from community to map intersecting disparities by income, race/ethnicity, age, gender, & type of disability = PAR in response to community requests.
* Evaluate how benchmarks scorecards are used by communities and if valuable in their actions.
* Share data with people with disabilities, ADA Centers, Community Advisory Boards & policy makers to assess value, accessibility & usability, and educate rehabilitation professionals about the value and use of data.
* Develop online resources to provide accompanying technical assistance, training & promising practice cases for use by communities to take action & evaluate their use and impact.
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**Slide 49: Questions and Discussion**

**Slide 50: Disclaimer**

The author(s) developed and presented the contents of this file at an online conference sponsored by the Center on KTDRR. The online conference was developed under a grant from the National Institute on Disability, Independent Living, and Rehabilitation Research (NIDILRR grant number 90DP0027).  NIDILRR is a Center within the Administration for Community Living (ACL), Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). The contents of this presentation do not necessarily represent the policy of NIDILRR, ACL, HHS, and you should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government.