## **Archived Information**

## ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM

<b>Goal:</b> To increase availability of, funding for, access to, and provision of assistive technology devices and assistive technology services.	Funding History (\$ in millions)			
	Fiscal Year	Appropriation	Fiscal Year	Appropriation
<b>Legislation:</b> Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities Act of	1985	\$0	2000	\$34
1988, as amended, Title I (U.S.C. 2201-2217). P.L. 100-407. Assistive Technology Act 1998 P.L. 105-394 (29 USC 3001).	1990	\$15	2001	\$41
ACT 1990 F.L. 103-394 (29 USC 3001).	1995	\$39	2002 (Requested)	\$61

## **Program Description**

The Assistive Technology (AT) State Grant program supports states in their development of technology-related activities and initiatives that enhance the ability of disabled individuals to access assistive devices and services through systems changes, advocacy, and consumer responsiveness. The AT Act also supports grants to states for alternative financing programs to assist individuals in purchasing assistive devices and services.

The efforts are intended to:

- Increase the availability of assistive devices and services by helping states to review or establish policies and procedures that may help ensure the availability of assistive devices; increase funding for the provision of devices and revise policies that impede device availability; build state and local capability to provide services; and improve coordination among public and private agencies;
- Increase the awareness and knowledge about assistive technology among persons with disabilities, their families, professionals who work with disabled persons, employers, community organizations, and other involved groups;
- Increase public and government awareness of the needs of individuals with disabilities for assistive technology devices and services; and
- Establish, expand, or maintain alternative financing programs for individuals with disabilities.

The AT Act requires that 87.5 percent of the funds appropriated for Title I be used for the AT State grant program, 7.9 percent of the funds be used for Protection and Advocacy (P&A) for AT, and 4.6 percent of the funds be spent on technical assistance activities. The AT Act also prescribes the amount each state is to receive under the AT State grant program, and sets a minimum allotment for grantees under the P&A program.

## **Program Performance**

OBJECTIVE 1: THROUGH SYSTEMIC ACTIVITY, IMPROVE ACCESS TO AND AVAILABILITY OF ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY (AT) FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES WHO REQUIRE ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY.

Indica	Indicator 1.1 Information: The number of individuals with disabilities who receive information about AT will increase by 10 percent annually.			
	Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
Number of persons who received information		Status: Negative trend away from target.	<b>Source:</b> 56 state projects have submitted an	
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		annual performance report to the National
1997:	88,003		<b>Explanation:</b> The significant increase from FY	Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation
1998:	614,942		1997 to FY 1998 is due to an increase in the data	Research (NIDRR). At present there is no
1999:	97,027	676,000	sample size (35 states to 42 states) and the	standardized or universal reporting format.
2000:	Data Available 12/01	744,000	implementation of state-operated Web sites	Frequency: Annually.
2001:		818,000	facilitating electronic requests for information.	Next collection update: Fall 2001.
2002:		900,000	Only actual requests for information were	Date to be reported: December 2001.
			counted.  The performance data for 99 shows a significant decrease and a performance target that was not met. Initially, it was anticipated that the target would be met based on electronic requests for information alone. There are a number of external factors that have influenced the data collection for FY99. The OMB approved form that States had been using for annual performance reporting expired in 1998. States were encouraged to continue to use the old performance guidelines however, most States elected not to use this format. Further, web based inquiries and information requests were not counted in FY99 and it was impossible to extract this data from certain States. NIDRR is in the process of developing a completely revised webbased instrument for annual data collection. Pilot testing will take place early in 2001. However, States cannot be required to use the new system for one year.	Validation Procedure: Nationally recognized organization was awarded a technical assistance (TA) grant to review existing data collection instrument as to validity, reliability, and accuracy and will revise, refine as necessary, and develop new and improved GPRA-responsive procedures for collecting data.  Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: All states had been using same instrument since 1996. While we have been able to capture some useful data and are able to report on this particular GPRA indicator, the process is cumbersome, burdensome and does not take advantage of technological capabilities. This instrument expired in FY98. FY99 data reflects lack of consistent definitions, high rates of non-response, lack of current data and a smaller sample size. New (TA) grantee will develop and assist NIDRR to implement a comprehensive, timely, responsive and user-friendly Web-based approach to data collection that will address this indicator adequately.

Indica			ned to provide AT services will increase by		
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality		
Number of professionals trained		Status: Target met.	<b>Source:</b> 56 state projects have submitted an		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		annual performance report to the National	
1997:	77,204		<b>Explanation:</b> The FY99 data reflects the	Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation	
1998:	81,760		reporting of 35 States on this indicator. Data v		
1999:	84,186	86,000	extrapolated to the best of our ability from Sta		
2000:	Data Available 12/01	90,000	that did include data on professionals trained.	Frequency: Annually.	
2001:		95,000	Had all States reported on this indicator, clear		
2002:		100,000	the performance target would have been	Date to be reported: December 2001.	
			exceeded. The new web based instrument will capture collection elements on professional	Validation Procedure:	
			1 *	vandation Procedure:	
			training.	Limitations of Data and Planned	
				Improvements: The new web based system will	
				facilitate periodic and regular updates whereby	
				each State will routinely enter <i>current</i> data.	
				Aggregated data will be easier to analyze and	
				report thereby eliminating year old data.	
Indica	tor 1.3 Barrier reduction: Annua	lly, grantees activities will resu	lt in legislative and policy changes that red	in legislative and policy changes that reduce barriers.	
	Targets and Perform	nance Data	Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
Percent	age of the 56 grantees responsible for a	change in at least one area	Status: Positive movement toward target.	<b>Source:</b> 56 state projects have submitted an	
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets		annual performance report to the National	
1997:	95%		Explanation:	Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation	
1998:	92%		1. The FY 99 data indicate that 49 out of 56		
1999:	88%	95%	states are engaged in barrier	standardized or universal reporting format.	
2000:	Data Available 12/01	95%	reduction/elimination. The reduction is	Frequency: Annually.	
2001:		95%	accounted for by the difficulty in extracti		
2002:		95%	data from annual performance reports.	Date to be reported: December 2001.	
			Currently, there is no uniform way of	Volidation Duocadamas A	
			reporting legislative and policy changes to reduce barriers.	hat Validation Procedure: An important part of the scope of work for the new grantee referred to	
			2. Eighty-four (84) percent or more of the	above is to develop accurate strategies for	
			states have been successful in implement		
			change. It is difficult, however, to expres		
			the outcomes of the work using the curre		
			data collection instrument.	definitions.	
			3. The FY 99 data at left demonstrate that	Limitations of Data and Planned	
			most of the state projects were instrumen		
			in making legislative or policy changes	1.2.	
			affecting access to AT. The new instrume		
			will include data elements that will more		
			accurately address systems change and w		
			use standard definitions.		

Indicat	Indicator 1.4 Individuals who receive loans: The number of individuals with disabilities who receive loans per \$1 million invested will meet or exceed the				
baselin	baseline.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Status: Unable to judge.	Source: Web based reporting system.	
1997				Frequency: Annually.	
1998			<b>Explanation:</b> This new alternative financing	Next collection update: Fall, 2001.	
1999:	No Data Available	N/A	program was funded for the first time in	Date to be reported: December 2001.	
2000:	Data Available 12/01	N/A	September, 2000. A baseline will be established		
2001:		N/A	once data are available.	Validation Procedure: Data will be supplied by	
2002:		N/A		the new reporting instrument. No formal verification will be applied.	
				Limitations of Data and Planned	
				Improvements: N/A.	

OBJECTIVE 2: THROUGH PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY, INCREASE ACCESS TO AND FUNDING OF ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY DEVICES AND SERVICES FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES.

1	Indicator 2.1 Funding sources: The number of individuals receiving protection and advocacy services resulting in AT device and/or service will increase 5					
percer	percent annually.					
	Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality		
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	Status: No FY 1999 data available.	Source: Annual Performance Reports		
1999:	No Data Available	No specific target set		Frequency: Annually.		
2000:	Data Available 7/01	Unable to judge	<b>Explanation:</b> This is a new indicator. The	Next collection update: FY 2001.		
2001:		Unable to judge	Assistive Technology Act of 1998 (AT Act) was	Date to be reported: July 2001.		
2002:		Unable to judge	signed into law in November 1998. Section 102			
		3 2	authorizes grants to states to provide protection	Validation Procedure: Data will be provided by		
			and advocacy services to individuals with	grantees. No formal verification procedure		
			disabilities to increase access to AT.	applied.		
			This data has not yet been routinely collected by			
			the new grantees under this authority. In FY	Limitations of Data and Planned		
			2001, the grantees performance reports will	Improvements: Data not yet available.		
			contain data on this indicator.	However, data will be collected as part of annual		
				performance reporting requirements.		