

**Developmental Services Toronto (DSTO)
Fifth Annual Information Fair**

Wrap-Up Report

Information Fair Planning Group

Jennifer Altosaar, Access Facilitator
Navreet Banga, Geneva Centre
Claire Berube, Ministry of Community & Social Services
Paul Cochrane, Community Member
Mary Doris, New Visions Toronto
Nimet Inceoglu, Community Living Toronto
Carol Krause, Consumer Engagement Facilitator
Karyn Farber, Access Facilitator
Peter Marrese, dsto Council
Lorna Powers, Respiteservices.com (Chair)
Daniel Prusin, Bob Rumball Centre
Carol Seare-Hanlon, Jewish Vocational Services
Craig Shields, System Planner
Kristen Tanner, Respiteservices.com

**Prepared For:
Communications Sub-Committee**

**Prepared By:
Craig Shields, System Planner**

May 2010

Introduction

Developmental Services Toronto (dsto) held its fifth annual Information Fair on May 6, 2010. This year the Fair was held at the Yorkland Hotel in the Highway 404 – Sheppard area. As in previous years, the intent of the Fair was to showcase the Toronto developmental services partnership and to promote “system building” by encouraging agencies to see themselves as part of a developmental services system and by providing staff with the opportunity to better get to know that system.

Fifty-five agencies, organizations and groups participated in the 2010 Fair. There were 35 displays by dsto agencies, 12 by dsto-related initiatives and community partners, and 8 by self-advocate / family groups and community organizations. A complete list of display participants is contained in Attachment 1a.

The Fair was planned and carried out by a planning group under the leadership of Lorna Powers, Supervisor with Respiteservices.com (see title page for Planning Group members). In addition, the event itself benefited from the support of a number of volunteers from Respiteservices.com, the Ministry’s Special Services at Home / Assistance for Children with Severe Disabilities office, Geneva Centre’s summer students, and two agencies (Community Living Toronto and Woodgreen). A list of volunteers is included in Attachment 1b.

The 2010 Fair continued the emphasis on evaluating the various aspects of the Fair, with visitors, display staff, and attendees at the presentations all asked to provide feedback to the planners. Much of the remainder of this report summarizes their responses.

Lay-Out

The lay-out for the 2010 Fair was similar to that used the previous year. All display tables were located in a single large room, arranged in alphabetical order. The three panel presentations were held in a separate room upstairs.

Attendance

Overall attendance was up in 2010. In total, 490 people participated in this year’s Fair either as a visitor, a display volunteer, or both. This compares with 445 total participants in 2009. The 2010 Fair attracted the greatest number of family members (212) ever—compared to 115 in 2009. Comparisons in the “Service Provider” / “Display Staff” categories are more difficult to make, because of changes in the way they were counted.

| | <u>2010</u> | <u>2009</u> | <u>2008</u> | <u>2007</u> | <u>2006</u> |
|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Consumer | 229 | 150 | 114 | 110 | 105 |
| Service Provider | 58 | 80 | 202 | 241 | 166 |
| Other | 49 | 16 | 41 | 54 | 14 |
| Display Staff | 154 | 199 | - | - | - |
| Totals | 490 | 445 | 357 | 405 | 285 |

The times for the Fair were the same as last year: 9:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Over half (182 or 54%) of the visitors registered between 9:00 and 11:00 a.m., with another 76 or 23% registering between 11:00 and 1:00 and 53 or 16% between 1:00 and 3:00 p.m. There were only 25 registrations between 3:00 and 5:00 p.m. Details of attendance patterns are contained in Attachment #2.

Promotion / Publicity

The visitor evaluation form asks attendees to indicate how they heard about the Information Fair. As the summary below suggests, agencies, flyer, and email continue to be the most common sources of information about the Fair, with schools also being a significant source. The detailed responses to this question are contained in Attachment #3.

| <u>2010</u> | <u>2009</u> | <u>2008</u> | <u>2007</u> |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| ◦ Agency = 36% | ◦ Agency = 29% | ◦ Agency = 25% | ◦ Agency = 35% |
| ◦ Email = 19% | ◦ Email = 18% | ◦ Email = 20% | ◦ Media = 1% |
| ◦ Flyer = 22% | ◦ Flyer = 17% | ◦ Flyer = 21% | ◦ Flyer = 20% |
| ◦ Friend = 7% | ◦ Friend = 11% | ◦ Friend = 8% | ◦ Friend = 12% |
| ◦ School = 13% | ◦ School = 14% | ◦ School = 13% | ◦ Other = 21% |
| ◦ Website = 4% | ◦ Website = 0% | ◦ Website = 3% | ◦ Website = 11% |
| ◦ Other = 0% | ◦ Other = 11% | ◦ Other = 10% | |

Evaluation: Visitors

All visitors to the Fair were asked to complete a brief one-page evaluation and to return it when they were leaving. The questionnaire asked visitors to rate a number of aspects of the Fair on a 5-point scale with 5 being “excellent” and 1 being “poor.” Ninety visitors returned completed questionnaires. Summaries of their responses are provided below (with responses from 2009 in parentheses), while the detailed responses are contained in Attachment #4.

1. The *location* of the Fair was:

| | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| 5 – Excellent | 4 – Good | 3 – Fair | 2 – Not So Good | 1 – Poor |
| 36% (63%) | 48% (31%) | 12% (4%) | 1% (2%) | 2% (0%) |

The percentage of all visitors rating the location of the Fair as “excellent” dropped significantly when compared to the 2009 ratings. However, with the increase in “good” ratings, the combined total of “excellent” and “good” ratings was 84%; not that far off the 2009 total 94% (the combined total for 2008 was 88%). The 2009 Fair was held at CNIB and the 2008 Fair at North York Civic Centre. It is worth noting that consumers (individuals and family members) tended to rate the location more positively (91% gave it an “excellent” or “good”) compared to a 76% combined rating from service providers.

2. **Access (TTC, parking) to the Fair was:**

| | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| 5 – Excellent | 4 – Good | 3 – Fair | 2 – Not So Good | 1 – Poor |
| 40% (50%) | 41% (32%) | 12% (12%) | 5% (6%) | 2% (0%) |

The overall percentage of “excellent” ratings dropped, but the combined total of “excellent” and “good” remained much the same (81% in 2010 versus 82% in 2009 and 79% in 2008). Again, consumers tended to be more positive about access than service providers, by 82% to 68%.

3. **The hours (9:30 a.m. – 5:00 p.m.) of the Fair were:**

| | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| 5 – Excellent | 4 – Good | 3 – Fair | 2 – Not So Good | 1 – Poor |
| 43% (53%) | 46% (43%) | 9% (4%) | 1% (0%) | 1% (0%) |

The hours for the 2010 Information Fair were the same as those for 2009: 9:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Despite the fact that there was no change in the hours, slightly fewer visitors rated the hours “excellent” or “good” this year; with 89% combined ratings in 2010 compared to 96% in 2009. The ratings of consumers and service providers were virtually the same, with 87% combined ratings for consumers and 88% for service providers.

4. **The physical lay-out (displays, presentations) of the Fair was:**

| | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| 5 – Excellent | 4 – Good | 3 – Fair | 2 – Not So Good | 1 – Poor |
| 31% (49%) | 51% (47%) | 17% (4%) | 1% (0%) | 0% (0%) |

Once again, the combined “excellent” and “good” ratings were down from the previous year (82% in 2010 compared to 96% in 2009), but fairly similar to those for 2008 (80%). There appear to have been two issues with regards to lay-out; not enough space for the aisles and too much noise at times.

5. **The Information provided by displays was:**

| | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| 5 – Excellent | 4 – Good | 3 – Fair | 2 – Not So Good | 1 – Poor |
| 40% (63%) | 57% (35%) | 2% (2%) | 0% (0%) | 0% (0%) |

Although the percentage of “excellent” ratings dropped, the provision of information continues to receive high approval ratings. Ninety-seven percent of respondents rated the information available through the Fair as either “good” or “excellent.” This compares favourably with the 98% combined positive rating in 2009 and the 87% combined rating in 2008.

6. **Overall the Information Fair was:**

| | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| 5 – Excellent | 4 – Good | 3 – Fair | 2 – Not So Good | 1 – Poor |
| 51% (62%) | 45% (36%) | 3% (2%) | 0% (0%) | 0% (0%) |

Ninety-six percent of respondents rated the overall 2010 Information Fair as either “good” or “excellent.” This compares favourably to the 98% and 90% combined positive ratings received for the 2009 and 2008 Information Fairs.

Evaluation: Display Staff

Display staff were also asked to complete a one-page questionnaire about the Fair. Some of the questions were the same as for visitors (location, access, lay-out, overall), and some (networking, food) were specific to display staff. The rating system was the same as for the visitor questionnaire; a 5-point scale with 5 being “excellent” and 1 being “poor.” Eighty-three completed questionnaires were received from display staff (46 from dsto agencies, 24 from community partners, and 13 from self-advocate and family groups / organizations). Summaries of their responses are provided below (with responses from 2009 in parentheses), while the detailed responses—including responses by category—are contained in Attachment #5.

1. *The location of the Fair was:*

| | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| 5 – Excellent | 4 – Good | 3 – Fair | 2 – Not So Good | 1 – Poor |
| 17% (42%) | 51% (49%) | 23% (6%) | 7% (2%) | 1% (0%) |

There was not as much enthusiasm for the location of the Fair in 2010 as there was in 2009. Although the “good” ratings rose slightly, the “excellent” ratings dropped sharply for the 2010 Fair. Overall, the combined positive ratings dropped from 91% in 2009 to 68% in 2010. The 2009 location was particularly well received, however. It is worth remembering that the combined positive ratings for the 2008 Fair were 79%.

2. *Access (TTC, parking) to the Fair was:*

| | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| 5 – Excellent | 4 – Good | 3 – Fair | 2 – Not So Good | 1 – Poor |
| 29% (29%) | 47% (49%) | 18% (13%) | 4% (5%) | 1% (4%) |

The ratings for “Access” were very similar to those of the previous year. The combined positive rating for 2010 was 76% compared to 78% in 2009. Both the 2009 and 2010 sites had lower ratings than for the two years that the Fair was held at the North York Civic Centre, which is on the subway line. The combined positive ratings for both those years 88%.

3. *The physical lay-out (displays, presentations) of the Fair was:*

| | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| 5 – Excellent | 4 – Good | 3 – Fair | 2 – Not So Good | 1 – Poor |
| 14% (49%) | 54% (49%) | 25% (1%) | 7% (0%) | 0% (0%) |

“Physical Lay-Out” went from having the lowest positive rating of the six dimensions in 2008 (75%) to having the highest positive rating in 2009 (98%). This year the approval ratings dropped below the 2008 level at a combined positive rating of 68%. Comments on evaluation forms cited cramped space, noise, poor lighting, and age as reasons for the lower ratings.

4. *The opportunity for networking was:*

| | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| 5 – Excellent | 4 – Good | 3 – Fair | 2 – Not So Good | 1 – Poor |
| 48% (54%) | 47% (42%) | 4% (4%) | 1% (0%) | 0% (0%) |

Ninety-five percent of respondents rated the opportunity for networking at the 2010 Fair as either “good” or “excellent.” This is slightly higher than the 92% rating in 2008, and virtually the same as the all-time high ratings of 96% in 2009 and 2007. This is a particularly gratifying rating since the planning group places emphasis on creating an environment that promotes networking.

5. *The refreshments / meals were:*

| | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| 5 – Excellent | 4 – Good | 3 – Fair | 2 – Not So Good | 1 – Poor |
| 20% (16%) | 29% (53%) | 32% (19%) | 17% (8%) | 3% (4%) |

The ratings for food continue to drop, from a positive rating of 91% in 2008 to 69% in 2009 (at the time, the lowest positive rating of any dimension of the Fair ever), to 49% in 2010. This drop was not entirely unexpected. Budget constraints limited the amount and type of food for the 2010 Fair. Food remains, however, an aspect of the Fair that the planning group needs to consider.

6. *Overall the Information Fair was:*

| | | | | |
|----------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| 5 – Excellent | 4 – Good | 3 – Fair | 2 – Not So Good | 1 – Poor |
| 30% (34%) | 51% (60%) | 16% (6%) | 1% (0%) | 1% (0%) |

The combined positive ratings for the 2010 Fair overall were down slightly in 2010 (81% versus 94% in 2009). This likely reflects some of the concerns noted above in relation to location, access, lay-out, and even possibly food. It is important to keep this drop in rating in perspective. As with the visitors, the display staff respondents were extremely positive about the value of the Information Fair.

Evaluation: Presentations

For the fourth year in a row, the Information Fair offered presentations on themes of interest primarily to families. This year’s presentations included one repeat from 2009 (*Making the Transition for Children’s to Adult’s Services*) as well as first-time sessions on *Exploring Creative Alternative to Government-Funded Programs* and *Person-Directed Planning*. The presentations were held in a room on the ground floor of the building, with signs and volunteers available to help guide people to the sessions.

The sessions were extremely well attended when compared to most previous years (which typically ran around 40 – 45 attendees). Head counts suggested that the first two sessions had between 90 and 100 attendees each, with about 45 attendees for the third session.

All of the presentations received positive evaluations. When the ratings of “good” and “excellent” are combined, the session on *Making the Transition from Children’s to Adult’s Services* received a positive rating of 76%, *Exploring Creative Alternatives to Government Funded Programs* a rating of 85%, and *Developing a Person Directed Plan* a rating of 83%. The detailed responses are contained in Attachment #6.

One hundred and thirty-three evaluation forms were completed by attendees at the three sessions. Of these, 1 or 1% identified themselves as self-advocate, 76 (57%) as parents, 3 (2%) as other family/care-giver, 23 (17%) as service providers in developmental services, 15 (11%) as service providers in other sectors, and 15 as "other" (e.g. students, school personnel). It is interesting to note that although the presentations were designed primarily for families, a significant percentage of attendees were service providers, indicating that they too are seeking information on the same topics. (NB: Attendees were asked to complete an evaluation for each session, so if they attended more than one session they would be counted in this roll-up more than once). The detailed figures are contained in Attachment #7.

Conclusion

In many ways the 2010 Information Fair was the most successful ever. It had the highest attendance to-date, nearly doubling the number of parents from previous Fairs. It also had the highest attendance ever at its three presentations. Plus the 2010 Fair continued to get high approval ratings from visitors for the information provided (97% rated it "good" or "excellent") and from display staff for opportunities to network (95% rated it "good" or "excellent").

There are some issues related to the venue, which the Planning Group will need to consider in its selection of a site for next year's Fair. Some issues, like crowding, may be able to be addressed by a different lay-out. But others, like low lighting and noise will be harder to address.

The Planning Group would like to thank all of the display participants, volunteers, and visitors for making the 2010 Information Fair such a success.

Approved by the Information Fair Work Group June 1, 2010 and by the Communications Sub-Committee June 9, 2010

Attachment #1a

Developmental Services Toronto
Information Fair
May 6, 2010

List of Display Participants

| | |
|---|---|
| Addus | Bob Rumball Centre for the Deaf |
| CARD – Community Association for Riding For the Disabled | Christian Horizons |
| Community Care Access Centre | Common Ground |
| Community Living Toronto – Self Advocacy Council | Community Living Toronto |
| CORE (Centre for Opportunities, Respect & Empowerment) | ConnectABILITY website |
| dsto Access Facilitators | Corbrook |
| Family Service Toronto | COTA Health |
| Frontier College – Independent Studies Program | dsto Council |
| Griffin Centre / Griffin Community Support Network | F.A.M.E. (Family Association for Mental Health) |
| Humber College – Community Education Through Cooperative Integration Prog. | Geneva Centre for Autism |
| L’Arche Toronto | Goodwill |
| Meta Centre | Harmony Place |
| Montage Support Services | Heep Chi Association |
| Muki Baum Treatment Centres | Jewish Vocational Services Toronto |
| New Visions Toronto | Kerry’s Place Autism Services |
| Operation Springboard | Mary Centre |
| Passport Initiative | Ministry of Community & Social Services (ODSP, SSAH) |
| Pegasus | New Leaf |
| Reena | Office of the Public Guardian & Trustee |
| Safehaven | Passport Mentoring |
| SSAH Family Advisory Committee | Person Directed Planning Initiative |
| Surex Community Services | Respiteservices.com |
| Toronto Family Network | Salvation Army - Broadview Village |
| Variety Village | SprOUT |
| Vita Community Living Services | Surrey Place Centre |
| Woodgreen Community Services | Toronto Networks of Specialized Care |
| | Vita Rights Group |
| | York Community Services |

Attachment #1b

Developmental Services Toronto
Information Fair
May 6, 2010

List of Volunteers

Agency Volunteers

Nuzha Hafleen – Woodgreen
Ann Lindsay – Community Living Toronto

Geneva Summer Students

Danielle Cudmore

Ministry SSAH/ACSD Office

Adriana Mitri
Amina Asalu
Margaret Taylor
Sarah Chung
Paulette Davis

Respiteservices.com

Natalie Healy
Michelle Maksymchuk
Alexandra Shannan
Sacha Hamming
Ingrid Clifford
Kristen McAlpine

Attachment #2

Developmental Services Toronto
Information Fair
May 6, 2010

Summary of Attendance

(With figures for the 2009 Fair in parentheses)

| <u>Time</u> | <u>Individual</u> | <u>Family</u> | <u>Service Provider</u> | <u>Other</u> | <u>Sub-Total</u> | <u>Display Staff</u> |
|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 9:00 – 11:00 | 4 (7) | 115 (65) | 32 (n.a.) | 31 (8) | 182 (80) | 99 |
| 11:00 – 1:00 | 1 (5) | 57 (34) | 6 (n.a.) | 12 (6) | 76 (45) | 25 |
| 1:00 - 3:00 | 11 (16) | 27 (23) | 14 (n.a.) | 1 (2) | 53 (41) | 29 |
| 3:00 –5:00 | 1 (0) | 13 (0) | 6 (na) | 5 (0) | 25 (0) | 1 |
| TOTALS | <u>17 (28)</u> | <u>212 (122)</u> | <u>58 (n.a.)</u> | <u>49 (16)</u> | <u>336 (166)</u> | <u>154</u> |

Attachment #3

Developmental Services Toronto
Information Fair
May 6, 2010

How People Learned About The Information Fair

| Category | Agency | Email | Flyer | Friend | School | Website | Total |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Self-Advocate / Family Member | 27 | 14 | 19 | 5 | 10 | 2 | 77 |
| Provider (DS) | 9 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 25 |
| Provider (Other) | 4 | 3 | 1 | - | 1 | 1 | 10 |
| Other/Category Unknown | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | - | 10 |
| TOTALS | 44 (36%) | 23 (19%) | 27 (22%) | 8 (7%) | 16 (13%) | 5 (4%) | 122 |

Attachment #4

Developmental Services Toronto
Information Fair
May 6, 2010

Visitor Evaluations

CONSUMERS (includes self-advocates, parent, and other family/caregiver)

| Question | 5 Excellent | 4 Good | 3 Fair | 2 Not So Good | 1 Poor | No Entry | Total |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Location | 24 | 26 | 4 | - | 1 | - | 55 |
| Access | 21 | 24 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 55 |
| Hours | 24 | 24 | 5 | 1 | 1 | - | 55 |
| Lay-Out | 13 | 32 | 8 | 1 | - | 1 | 55 |
| Information | 20 | 33 | 2 | - | - | - | 55 |
| Overall Rating | 29 | 25 | 1 | - | - | - | 55 |

SERVICE PROVIDER (includes service provider in developmental services and other sectors)

| Question | 5 Excellent | 4 Good | 3 Fair | 2 Not So Good | 1 Poor | No Entry | Total |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Location | 6 | 13 | 5 | - | 1 | - | 25 |
| Access | 8 | 9 | 5 | 1 | - | 2 | 25 |
| Hours | 8 | 14 | 3 | - | - | - | 25 |
| Lay-Out | 9 | 10 | 7 | - | - | - | 25 |
| Information | 9 | 15 | - | - | - | 1 | 25 |
| Overall Rating | 9 | 12 | 2 | - | - | 2 | 25 |

OTHER or UNIDENTIFIED

| Question | 5 Excellent | 4 Good | 3 Fair | 2 Not So Good | 1 Poor | No Entry | Total |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Location | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | - | 1 | 10 |
| Access | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | - | - | 10 |
| Hours | 7 | 3 | - | - | - | - | 10 |
| Lay-Out | 6 | 4 | - | - | - | - | 10 |
| Information | 7 | 3 | - | - | - | - | 10 |
| Overall Rating | 7 | 3 | - | - | - | - | 10 |

TOTALS (Includes all responses from above 3 respondent categories)

| Question | 5 Excellent | 4 Good | 3 Fair | 2 Not So Good | 1 Poor | No Entry | Total |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Location | 32 | 43 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 90 |
| Access | 34 | 35 | 10 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 90 |
| Hours | 39 | 41 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 90 |
| Lay-Out | 28 | 46 | 15 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 90 |
| Information | 36 | 51 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 90 |
| Overall Rating | 45 | 40 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 90 |

Attachment #5

Developmental Services Toronto
Information Fair
May 6, 2010

Display Staff Evaluations**DSTO AGENCIES**

| Question | 5 Excellent | 4 Good | 3 Fair | 2 Not So Good | 1 Poor | No Entry | Total |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Location | 10 | 23 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 46 |
| Access | 13 | 17 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 46 |
| Lay-Out | 8 | 25 | 9 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| Networking | 21 | 23 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| Food | 9 | 10 | 15 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 46 |
| Overall Rating | 13 | 24 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 46 |

COMMUNITY PARTNERS

| Question | 5 Excellent | 4 Good | 3 Fair | 2 Not So Good | 1 Poor | No Entry | Total |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Location | 3 | 13 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Access | 7 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Lay-Out | 1 | 12 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Networking | 11 | 12 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Food | 3 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 24 |
| Overall Rating | 6 | 12 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |

SELF-ADVOCATE AND FAMILY GROUPS & ORGANIZATIONS

| Question | 5 Excellent | 4 Good | 3 Fair | 2 Not So Good | 1 Poor | No Entry | Total |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Location | 1 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 13 |
| Access | 2 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13 |
| Lay-Out | 2 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 |
| Networking | 8 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Food | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 13 |
| Overall Rating | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 |

TOTALS (Includes all responses from above 3 respondent categories)

| Question | 5 Excellent | 4 Good | 3 Fair | 2 Not So Good | 1 Poor | No Entry | Total |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Location | 14 (17%) | 41 (51%) | 19 (23%) | 6 (7%) | 1 (1%) | 2 | 83 |
| Access | 22 (29%) | 36 (47%) | 14 (18%) | 3 (4%) | 1 (1%) | 7 | 83 |
| Lay-Out | 11 (14%) | 44 (54%) | 20 (25%) | 6 (7%) | 0 | 2 | 83 |
| Networking | 40 (48%) | 39 (47%) | 3 (4%) | 1 (1%) | 0 | 0 | 83 |
| Food | 15 (20%) | 22 (29%) | 24 (32%) | 13 (17%) | 2 (3%) | 7 | 83 |
| Overall Rating | 25 (30%) | 42 (51%) | 13 (16%) | 1 (1%) | 1 (1%) | 1 | 83 |

Attachment #6

Developmental Services Toronto
Information Fair
May 6, 2010

Presentation Evaluations**MAKING THE TRANSITION FROM CHILDREN'S SERVICES TO ADULT SERVICES -
10:0 A.M.**

| <u>Question</u> | <u>5 Excellent</u> | <u>4 Good</u> | <u>3 Fair</u> | <u>2 Not So Good</u> | <u>1 Poor</u> | <u>No Entry</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Presentation Content | 11 (18%) | 41 (68%) | 8 (13%) | | | 2 | 62 |
| Discussion Content | 13 (21%) | 33 (54%) | 15 (25%) | | | 1 | 62 |
| Overall | 14 (23%) | 33 (53%) | 15 (24%) | | | 0 | 62 |
| | <u>Too Long</u> | <u>Too Short</u> | <u>Just Right</u> | | | | |
| Presentation Length | 1 (2%) | 14 (23%) | 46 (75%) | | | 1 | 62 |
| Discussion Length | 0 | 17 (28%) | 44 (72%) | | | 1 | 62 |

**EXPLORING CREATIVE ALTERNATIVES TO GOVERNMENT-FUNDED PROGRAMS
- 11:30 A.M.**

| <u>Question</u> | <u>5 Excellent</u> | <u>4 Good</u> | <u>3 Fair</u> | <u>2 Not So Good</u> | <u>1 Poor</u> | <u>No Entry</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Presentation Content | 12 (29%) | 23 (56%) | 5 (12%) | 1 (2%) | | 1 | 42 |
| Discussion Content | 9 (21%) | 26 (62%) | 5 (12%) | 2 (5%) | | | 42 |
| Overall | 10 (24%) | 25 (61%) | 4 (10%) | 2 (5%) | | 1 | 42 |
| | <u>Too Long</u> | <u>Too Short</u> | <u>Just Right</u> | | | | |
| Presentation Length | 5 (13%) | 3 (8%) | 31 (79%) | | | 3 | 42 |
| Discussion Length | 4 (10%) | 6 (15%) | 29 (74%) | | | 3 | 42 |

DEVELOPING A PERSON DIRECTED PLAN - 1:00 P.M.

| <u>Question</u> | <u>5 Excellent</u> | <u>4 Good</u> | <u>3 Fair</u> | <u>2 Not So Good</u> | <u>1 Poor</u> | <u>No Entry</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Presentation Content | 5 (18%) | 20 (71%) | 2 (7%) | 1 (4%) | | 1 | 29 |
| Discussion Content | 4 (15%) | 18 (67%) | 5 (18%) | | | 2 | 29 |
| Overall | 6 (21%) | 18 (62%) | 4 (14%) | 1 (3%) | | | 29 |
| | <u>Too Long</u> | <u>Too Short</u> | <u>Just Right</u> | | | | |
| Presentation Length | 2 (7%) | 2 (7%) | 25 (86%) | | | | 29 |
| Discussion Length | 2 (7%) | 3 (11%) | 23 (82%) | | | 1 | 29 |

Attachment #7

Developmental Services Toronto
Information Fair
May 6, 2010

**Summary of Those Who Completed
Presentation Evaluations**

| <u>Presentation</u> | <u>Self Advocate</u> | <u>Parent</u> | <u>Other Family</u> | <u>Provider (DS)</u> | <u>Provider (Other)</u> | <u>Other</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Children's to Adult's Services 10:00 | 0 | 35 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 62 |
| Creative Alternatives to Govt. Programs 11:30 | 0 | 26 | 1 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 42 |
| Person-Directed Planning 1:00 | 1 | 15 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 3 | 29 |
| Totals: | 1 (1%) | 76 (57%) | 3 (2%) | 23 (17%) | 15 (11%) | 15 (11%) | 133 |