

Archived Information

CLIENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (CAP)

<p>Goal: To provide assistance and information to help individuals with disabilities secure the benefits available under the Vocational Rehabilitation State Grants program and other programs funded under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended.</p> <p>Legislation: Section 112 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended by P.L. 105-220. (29 USC 732.)</p>	Funding History (\$ in millions)			
	Fiscal Year	Appropriation	Fiscal Year	Appropriation
	1985	\$6	2000	\$11
	1990	\$8	2001	\$12
	1995	\$10	2002 (Requested)	\$12

Program Description

The Client Assistance Program (CAP) inform and advise clients and client-applicants of all services and benefits available under the Rehabilitation Act and assist clients and client-applicants in their relationships with programs, projects and services funded under the Act. The CAP also may inform individuals with disabilities of the benefits available under Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Each state must have a CAP to receive its allotments under the State Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) program. The State Governor is required to designate a public or private entity to carry out CAP activities. CAPs must be independent of any entity that provides services under the Act, with the exception of a few "non-independent" CAPs which were "grandfathered" in during the 1984 reauthorization of the Act. CAPs also must have the authority to pursue legal, administrative, and other appropriate remedies to ensure the protection of the rights of individuals with disabilities who are receiving services under the Act. All programs and projects funded under the Act are required to inform clients and client-applicants of the availability and purpose of the CAP and to provide information on how to contact the CAP.

CAP is authorized to provide a variety of advocacy services, including: information/referral, advice/interpretation, negotiation, advocacy during informal reviews, advocacy during alternative dispute resolution procedures, advocacy during formal administrative hearings, and legal representation during court actions. In addition to these services, the CAP may advocate on behalf of an individual with an issue arising under Title I of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), provided that issue is connected with the services the individual is receiving from a program, project or service funded under the Act. CAPs also engage in systemic advocacy to benefit large numbers of individuals facing a similar issue. Systemic advocacy can take a variety of forms, but most often CAPs engage in discussions with VR and other programs funded under the Act to improve policies and/or procedures that affect directly or indirectly the quality of the service delivery system.

Program Performance

OBJECTIVE 1: CLIENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS (CAPS) MEET EXPECTATIONS OF INDIVIDUALS SERVED IN TERMS OF THEIR SATISFACTION WITH THE CAP SERVICES RECEIVED.

Indicator 1.1 Satisfied CAP clients: The number of CAPs achieving or exceeding a client satisfaction rate of 87 percent will increase.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The number of CAPs that achieve or exceed a client satisfaction rate of 87 percent</i>			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Status: No 2000 data, but progress toward target is likely.</p> <p>Explanation: Number of CAPs that achieved or exceeded a client satisfaction rate of 87 percent increased in 1999. FY 1999 is the second year for the revised reporting instrument. We are not sure if this increase is indicative of a trend or just a one-time occurrence. Targets have been established to reflect a moderate increase each year.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Appropriate reviews of annual data are conducted by ED program specialists. On-site compliance reviews are conducted and random sampling of on-site files is cross-checked with reported data for verification.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Nationally, only 26 percent of the total number of satisfaction surveys mailed to consumers by CAPs during FY 1999 were returned. Therefore, in some cases the satisfaction rate is based on a small number of surveys. Self-reporting by grantees may also pose some limitation for this indicator.</p>
1998:	34 (60% of CAPs)		
1999:	39 (69.6% of CAPs)	No target set	
2000:	Data Available 4/01	40	
2001:		41	
2002:		42	

OBJECTIVE 2: RESOLVE CASES AT LOWEST POSSIBLE LEVEL.

Indicator 2.1 Alternative dispute resolution (ADR): The percentage of cases resolved through the use of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) will increase.			
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality
<i>The percentage of cases resolved through ADR will increase</i>			
Year	Actual Performance	Performance Targets	<p>Status: No 2000 data, but progress toward target is likely.</p> <p>Explanation: FY 1999 data show an increase in percentage from the previous year. Decline in actual number for 1999 was due to revised reporting. Not all CAP programs reported only one primary service per case. So, percentages for 1998 and 1999 are based on total number of services provided. Eventually this number will equal cases resolved.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Same as 1.1.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Same as 1.1.</p>
1998:	4,388 (38.8 %)		
1999:	3,898 (45.1%)	No target set	
2000:	Data Available 4/01	46.0%	
2001:		47.0%	
2002:		48.0%	

OBJECTIVE 3: ACCURATELY IDENTIFY PROBLEM AREAS REQUIRING SYSTEMIC CHANGE AND ENGAGE IN SYSTEMIC ACTIVITY TO IMPROVE SERVICES UNDER THE REHABILITATION ACT.

Indicator 3.1 Effects of systemic change: The percentage of CAPs that report changes in policies and practices as a result of their efforts will achieve or exceed baseline.				
Targets and Performance Data		Assessment of Progress	Sources and Data Quality	
<i>Percent of CAPs reported that their systematic advocacy resulted in a change in policy or practice</i>		<p>Status: No 2000 data, but progress toward target is likely.</p> <p>Explanation: In FY 1998, a sampling of reports was used to estimate actual performance. Data for 1999 are based on a complete review of all narrative reports from CAPs. Targets for 2000-2002 are based on actual performance in 1999.</p>	<p>Source: CAP FY 1999 performance report, RSA-227, narrative section. <i>Frequency:</i> Annually. <i>Next collection update:</i> January 2001. <i>Date to be reported:</i> April 2001.</p> <p>Validation Procedure: Same as 1.1.</p> <p>Limitations of Data and Planned Improvements: Data will be limited because it is self-reported and in a narrative format. The data submitted are reviewed by program specialists, but data validity will be unattainable.</p>	
Year	Actual Performance			Performance Targets
1998:	50.9%			
1999:	43%			No target set
2000:	Data Available 4/01			44%
2001:				45%
2002:		46%		