

Adult Protective Services

A Report of Community Satisfaction Survey Results



December 2006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION	2
II. HISTORY	2
III. METHODOLOGY	3
IV. SURVEY RESULTS	3
Judicial Results	4
Law Enforcement Results	4
Community Partner Results	4
Community Board Member Results	5
V. ACCOMPLISHMENTS FISCAL YEAR 2006	5
VI. ACTION PLANS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007	6
VII. CONCLUSION	6
VIII. APPENDICES	7
Tables	8-16

Community Satisfaction Survey Results

I. Introduction

The Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (DFPS) is instructed in Human Resources Code, Section 48.006, to develop a community satisfaction survey that solicits information regarding DFPS performance with respect to providing adult protective services. The survey is sent annually to members of the judiciary community, law enforcement agencies, community resource groups and Adult Protective Services (APS) community boards. The 2006 survey builds on the initial survey conducted by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) in November of 2004.

APS envisions that the results of the annual survey will offer strategic development opportunities to sustain community support, augment thriving local community networks, and strengthen volunteer programs and productive resource development in the community to benefit APS clients.

II. History

In April of 2004, HHSC was directed to oversee the systematic reform of the APS program. In order to assess the quality of relations between APS and community agencies and organizations with which they work, HHSC with input from APS and the community relations workgroup, designed four separate surveys to correspond to the diverse service providers with whom APS interacts in the community. The surveys were administered to 1) members of the judiciary, 2) law enforcement agencies, 3) community agencies that provide referrals to APS or serve consumers referred by APS, and 4) the Adult Protective Services Community Boards.

Individuals with access to the Internet were administered a web-based survey. They received an electronic mail message with instructions on how to access and complete the survey on the web. Individuals without access to the Internet received a paper survey via facsimile. The 2004 survey was sent to a total of 331 judiciary partners, 589 individuals in law enforcement, 1,087 community partners, and 16 community board members. A total of 2,023 surveys were conducted. Individuals were asked to indicate whether or not they worked with APS often enough to be able to complete the survey. Individuals who indicated they did not work with APS did not complete the survey.

Response rates for the 2004 survey are displayed in Section VIII Appendices, **Table I** for each of the four survey groups.

III. Methodology

In preparation for the 2006 Survey, APS community engagement specialists and regional management were asked in March 2006 to update the contact data from 2004 including names, addresses, telephone and facsimile numbers, and email addresses for all judiciary partners, law enforcement agencies and community partners with which they had worked in the past year. APS community board members were also included with this information. All regions compiled updated lists and any duplicate names or incomplete addresses were removed from the master contact lists. The judiciary lists included county and district judges, justices of the peace, and district and county attorneys. The law enforcement agency contacts were composed of county sheriff office and city police department personnel. Community agency contacts included a variety of constituencies including county and state agency personnel, churches, non-profit organizations, nursing homes, and senior citizens centers.

In 2004 and 2006 the questionnaires were similar in design, but the content was tailored to be relevant to each professional group surveyed. A combination of Likert scale statements and open-ended questions were used in an attempt to measure the extent of awareness of APS involvement in the community and perceptions of APS staff capability, effectiveness, and professionalism. There were also survey items evaluating the availability of training opportunities for APS staff in the regions.

Individuals with access to the Internet were administered a web-based survey via “Survey Monkey” a web survey application. An email message was received with instructions on accessing and completing the survey online. Individuals without access to the Internet were provided a paper copy either via fax or mail.

IV. Survey Results

In 2006, the survey was sent to a total of 349 judiciary members, 601 law enforcement agents, 1,124 community partners, and 245 APS community board members for a total of 2,319. A total of 2,450 surveys were sent to community stakeholders. Undeliverable or duplicate surveys were removed for analysis purposes.

Response rates for the 2006 survey are displayed in Section VIII Appendices, **Table 2** for each of the four survey groups.

Judicial Results

The responses of judiciary partners to Likert scale statements in 2004 are displayed in Section VIII Appendices, **Table 3**. Individuals were asked to identify their level of agreement with each statement in the 2004 survey. Response categories ranged from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree with a neutral category provided. The number and percent of respondents in each response category for these statements are provided.

The responses of judiciary partners to Likert scale statements in 2006 are displayed in Section VIII Appendices, **Table 4**. Individuals were asked to identify their level of agreement with each statement in the 2006 survey. Response categories ranged from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree with a neutral category provided. The number and percent of respondents in each response category for these statements are indicated in the table. The last column in **Table 4** represents the change in percentage of “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” responses between the 2004 and 2006 survey.

Law Enforcement Results

The responses of law enforcement partners to Likert scale statements in 2004 are displayed in Section VIII Appendices, **Table 5**. Individuals were asked to identify their level of agreement with each statement in the 2004 survey. Response categories ranged from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree with a neutral category provided. The number and percent of respondents in each response category for these statements are provided.

The responses of law enforcement partners to Likert scale statements in 2006 are displayed in Section VIII Appendices, **Table 6**. Individuals were asked to identify their level of agreement with each statement in the 2006 survey. Response categories ranged from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree with a neutral category provided. The number and percent of respondents in each response category for these statements are indicated in the table. The last column in **Table 6** represents the change in percentage of “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” responses between the 2004 and 2006 survey.

Community Partner Results

The responses of community partners to Likert scale statements in 2004 are displayed in Section VIII Appendices, **Table 7**. Individuals were asked to identify their level of agreement with each statement in the 2004 survey. Response categories ranged from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree with a neutral category provided. The number and percent of respondents in each response category for these statements are provided.

The responses of community partners to Likert scale statements in 2006 are displayed in Section VIII Appendices, **Table 8**. Individuals were asked to identify their level of agreement with each statement in the 2006 survey. Response categories ranged from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree with a neutral category provided. The number and percent of respondents in each response category for these statements are indicated in the table. The last column in **Table 8** represents the change in percentage of “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” responses between the 2004 and 2006 survey.

Community Board Member Results

The responses of APS community board members to Likert scale statements in 2004 are displayed in Section VIII Appendices, **Table 9**. Individuals were asked to identify their level of agreement with each statement in the 2004 survey. Response categories ranged from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree with a neutral category provided. The number and percent of respondents in each response category for these statements are provided.

The responses of APS community board members to Likert scale statements in 2006 are displayed in Section VIII Appendices, **Table 10**. Individuals were asked to identify their level of agreement with each statement in the 2006 survey. Response categories ranged from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree with a neutral category provided. The number and percent of respondents in each response category for these statements are indicated in the table. The last column in **Table 10** represents the change in percentage of “Strongly Agree” and “Agree” responses between the 2004 and 2006 survey.

V. Accomplishments Fiscal Year 2006

Adult Protective Services (APS) made significant strides in accomplishing goals set forth by the systematic reform instructed by the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) in April 2004. Community engagement program specialists were hired in all regions of the state to increase community partnerships and collaborations with service providers, law enforcement agencies, the judicial community, civic organizations and volunteers. Community Initiative Specialists work with the civic and volunteer communities while Resource and External Relations Specialists work with law enforcement, judicial partners and service providers. These dedicated staff members interact with the community on a daily basis and provide a framework for fostering positive relationships with all staff members of the agency.

APS began a year round public awareness campaign entitled “Protecting Vulnerable Adults from Abuse, Neglect, Financial Exploitation or Isolation is Everyone’s Business”, replacing the “Not Forgotten” campaign. APS launched the new campaign in May in conjunction with Elder Abuse Awareness Month and a new website was unveiled: www.everyonesbusiness.org. Community engagement staff in each region participated in local activities promoting the new campaign, which included media events, proclamations in multiple counties and distribution of new campaign materials. Due to the increased awareness from the new campaign, community engagement staff members are increasingly asked to participate in presentations to civic and volunteer communities, as well as service providers, law enforcement agencies and faith-based organizations around the state.

APS developed three additional mini-campaigns to compliment the year round campaign. Topics included: the dangers of summer heat, financial exploitation, and mental illness/homelessness. These campaigns allowed community engagement staff the opportunity to work with community partners on special projects such as fan drives for elderly in the summer and with the banking industry concerning the dangers of financial exploitation. As mandated by Senate Bill 6, APS developed Special Task Units in counties with a population of 250,000 or more. Nineteen counties met this criteria, with Ector and Midland county officials agreeing to create a bi-county Special Task Unit.

The community engagement staff serve as coordinators of these task units and work with community partners and APS staff members on complex client cases. The community engagement staff are working diligently with county officials to establish Special Task Units to meet this critical mandate.

Community engagement staff provide technical support to local advisory boards and coalitions in priority communities around the state. Currently, there are nineteen active APS advisory boards in the state, with two in the development stages.

VI. Action Plans for Fiscal Year 2007

The Adult Protective Services program will share survey results with each region for evaluation by regional management and implementation of changes necessary to address community concerns. The results of each region's survey will also be shared with the presiding judge of the statutory probate courts in that region and courts with jurisdiction over probate matters in that region. The results will not include any confidential information.

Regional community engagement action plans will focus on increased collaborations and interactions with law enforcement, code enforcement officials, the financial community and mental health professionals. APS staff will actively participate in Community Resource Coordinating Groups for Adults and other local service provider coalitions. New initiatives including the delivery of fire and fall prevention training to senior groups in collaboration with local fire departments will be developed.

Regional community engagement action plans also will include efforts to develop additional local advisory boards and to support and strengthen existing boards and coalitions. We recognize these boards as invaluable partners in our goal to protect older adults and persons with disabilities from abuse, neglect and exploitation.

The year round public awareness campaign will continue to address important issues in protecting older adults and individuals with disabilities in Texas. Law enforcement, judiciary partners, and service providers will be targeted audiences for increasing their knowledge of APS programs and the needs of vulnerable adults. We will continue soliciting the assistance of local advisory boards in our outreach efforts to engage the local community.

Planning will begin immediately for the FY2007 survey with development of strategies to improve efficiency of the survey design and distribution efforts in order to increase our response rate. APS regional management will receive evaluation comments and suggestions from FY2006 survey respondents within their geographic areas and will provide follow up as appropriate.

VI. Conclusion

The survey results provide important data for developing or enhancing community initiatives to support or sustain local efforts in protecting the most vulnerable adults in Texas. APS is committed to continuing to identify and build key community partnerships in health and human services at the local level, improve our performance, and strengthen our resources to benefit APS clients.

VIII. Appendices

Survey Responses

Table 1 - 2004 Response Rate by Group8
Table 2 - 2006 Response Rate by Group8

Judicial Results

Table 3 – 2004 Judicial Survey Responses9
Table 4 – 2006 Judicial Survey Responses10

Law Enforcement Results

Table 5 – 2004 Law Enforcement Survey Responses11
Table 6 – 2006 Law Enforcement Survey Responses12

Community Partner Results

Table 7 – 2004 Community Partner Responses13
Table 8 – 2006 Community Partner Responses14

Community Board Member Results

Table 9 – 2004 APS Community Board Member Responses15
Table 10 – 2006 APS Community Board Member Responses16

Table 1 - 2004 Response Rate by Group

Group	Total Surveys Distributed	Number of respondents who indicated they work with APS	Usable Surveys as a Percent of Total Distributed
Judicial Partners	331	67	20.20%
Law Enforcement Agents	589	177	20.10%
Community Partners	1,087	529	48.70%
Community Board Members	16	8	50.0%
TOTAL	2,023	781	38.60%

Table 2 - 2006 Response Rate by Group

Group	Total Surveys Distributed	Total Survey Responses	Usable Surveys as a Percent of Total Distributed
Judicial Partners	349	58	16.60%
Law Enforcement Agents	601	106	17.60%
Community Partners	1,124	242	21.50%
Community Board Members	245	46	18.70%
TOTAL	2,319	452	19.50%

Table 3 – 2004 Judicial Survey Responses

	Survey Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Respondent Total
1	In this community, the judicial system has strong relations with organizations that advocate for or support the elderly and individuals with disabilities.	25.4% (17)	52.2% (35)	14.9% (10)	7.5% (5)	0.0% (0)	67
2	APS cases are appropriately documented to support legal actions requested.	14.9% (10)	43.3% (29)	34.4% (23)	4.5% (3)	3.0% (2)	67
3	APS seeks appropriate and timely court action.	17.9% (12)	41.8% (28)	29.9% (20)	7.5% (5)	3.05% (2)	67
4	APS attorneys are well prepared in dealings with the courts.	16.4% (11)	29.9% (20)	44.8% (30)	3.0% (2)	6.0% (4)	67
5	APS provides adequate information to support judicial actions.	17.9% (12)	56.7% (38)	17.9% (12)	6.0% (4)	1.5% (1)	67
6	APS documentation supports the judicial action requested.	17.9% (12)	49.3% (33)	28.4% (19)	0.0% (0)	4.5% (3)	67
7	There is a good relationship between the courts and APS in this community.	26.9% (18)	52.2% (35)	14.9% (10)	4.5% (3)	1.5% (1)	67
8	There are regular meetings with APS to discuss mutual issues and concerns.	3.0% (2)	6.0% (4)	34.3% (23)	43.3% (29)	13.4%(9)	67
9	Training is available for APS workers in your community on APS related judicial procedures and requirements.	4.5% (3)	6.0% (4)	68.7% (46)	14.9% (10)	6.0% (4)	67
10	APS staff attend this training.	1.5% (1)	1.5% (1)	86.6% (58)	7.5% (5)	3.0% (2)	67
11	APS records are accurate.	13.4% (9)	43.3% (29)	37.3% (25)	0.0% (0)	6.0% (4)	67
12	APS records are complete.	13.4% (9)	41.8% (28)	37.3 % (25)	1.5%(1)	6.0% (4)	67

Table 4 – 2006 Judicial Survey Responses

	Survey Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Change
1	In this community, the judicial system interacts with organizations that advocate for or support the elderly and individuals with disabilities.	41% (20)	35% (17)	18% (9)	4% (2)	2% (1)	49	New
2	APS provides appropriate and accurate documentation/information to support legal actions requested.	27% (13)	57% (28)	16% (8)	0% (0)	0% (0)	49	↑
3	APS seeks appropriate and timely court action.	29% (14)	43% (21)	24% (12)	4% (2)	0% (0)	49	↑
4	APS caseworkers are prepared in dealings with the courts.	29% (14)	45% (22)	20% (10)	6% (3)	0% (0)	49	New
5	APS staff members are prepared when testifying in court.	27% (13)	46% (22)	25% (12)	2% (1)	0% (0)	48	New
6	DFPS attorneys are prepared in dealings with the court.	17% (8)	43% (20)	37% (17)	2% (1)	0% (0)	46	↑
7	There is a good relationship between the courts and APS in this community.	34% (17)	40% (20)	20% (10)	6% (3)	0% (0)	50	↓

Table 5 – 2004 Law Enforcement Survey Responses

	Survey Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Respondent Total
1	In this community, law enforcement has strong relations with organizations that advocate for or support the elderly and individuals with disabilities.	18.1% (32)	53.1% (94)	15.8% (28)	15.8% (28)	11.3% (20)	177
2	APS caseworkers are well prepared in dealings with law enforcement.	8.5% (15)	56.5% (100)	23.7% (42)	10.2% (18)	1.1%(2)	177
3	Information gathered by APS workers is helpful to law enforcement when they are asked to intervene in a case.	14.1% (25)	60.5% (107)	19.8% (35)	5.1%(9)	0.6% (1)	177
4	APS caseworkers appear to understand law enforcement protocols and guidelines.	4.5% (8)	50.8% (90)	30.5% (54)	13.6% (24)	0.6%(1)	177
5	Referrals from APS are appropriate.	6.2% (11)	59.9% (106)	29.9% (53)	3.4%(6)	0.6% (1)	177
6	Referrals from APS are timely.	4.0% (7)	49.7% (88)	34.5% (61)	10.2% (18)	1.7% (3)	177
7	Training is available for APS workers in your community related to law enforcement procedures and requirements.	0.0% (0)	9.6% (17)	57.6% (102)	28.2% (50)	4.5% (8)	177
8	APS staff attend this training.	0.0% (0)	3.4% (6)	78.0%(138)	15.3% (27)	3.4% (6)	177
9	APS staff are prepared with information and facts when engaging law enforcement in APS cases.	8.5% (15)	53.1% (94)	30.5% (54)	6.8%(12)	1.1% (2)	177
10	APS workers know how to engage law enforcement in APS cases.	8.5% (15)	53.1% (94)	30.5% (54)	6.8%(12)	1.1% (2)	177
11	APS workers know when to engage law enforcement in APS cases.	7.3% (13)	50.3% (89)	36.2% (64)	5.1%(9)	1.1% (2)	177
12	APS records are accurate.	2.8%(5)	42.9% (76)	53.1%(94)	1.1% (2)	0.0% (0)	177
13	There is a good working relationship between law enforcement and APS in this community.	13.6% (24)	57.1% (101)	20.3% (36)	7.9% (14)	1.1% (2)	177

Table 6 – 2006 Law Enforcement Survey Responses

	Survey Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Change
1	In this community, law enforcement has strong relationships with organizations that advocate for or support the elderly and individuals with disabilities.	23% (23)	46% (46)	20% (20)	10% (10)	1% (1)	100	↓
2	APS staff members are prepared with information and facts when working with law enforcement on APS cases.	15% (15)	57% (56)	22% (22)	5% (5)	1% (1)	99	↑
3	APS caseworkers understand law enforcement protocols and guidelines.	11% (11)	32% (32)	45% (45)	10% (10)	1% (1)	99	↓
4	Referrals to law enforcement from APS are appropriate and timely.	11% (11)	45% (45)	37% (37)	7% (7) 0% (0)	0% (0)	100	↓
5	APS workers know how to engage law enforcement in APS cases.	13% (13)	40% (40)	38% (38)	7% (7)	2% (2)	100	↓
6	APS workers know when to engage law enforcement in APS cases.	13% (13)	36% (36)	43% (43)	6% (6)	2% (2)	100	↓
7	There is a good relationship between law enforcement and APS in this community.	19% (19)	50% (49)	24% (24)	5% (5)	1% (1)	98	↓

Table 7 – 2004 Community Partner Responses

	Survey Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Respondent Total
1	In this community, there are strong relationships among organizations and agencies that advocate for or support the elderly and individuals with disabilities.	21.2% (112)	49.3% (261)	17.0% (90)	10.8% (57)	1.7% (9)	529
2	APS is an important component of my community's resource network.	36.9% (195)	42.5% (225)	10.8% (57)	7.6% (40)	2.3% (12)	529
3	APS workers are aware of the agencies and organizations that advocate for or support the elderly and individuals with disabilities.	28.0% (148)	46.3% (245)	19.1% (101)	4.3% (23)	2.3% (12)	529
4	APS workers understand my agency's regulations and guidelines.	19.1% (101)	38.2% (202)	25.9% (137)	12.7% (67)	4.2% (22)	529
5	APS workers are prepared when they contact me to assist in a case.	25.3% (134)	43.5% (230)	16.4% (87)	11.3% (60)	3.4% (18)	529
6	Referrals from APS are appropriate.	21.6% (114)	45.0% (238)	28.2% (149)	3.0%(16)	2.3% (12)	529
7	APS workers handle cases appropriately.	23.8% (126)	40.3% (213)	23.6% (125)	9.6% (51)	2.6% (14)	529
8	Risk to the individual is clearly described.	17.6% (93)	44.6% (236)	30.6% (162)	5.1% (27)	2.1%(11)	529
9	My staff members understand APS protocols and procedures.	14.2% (75)	44.6% (236)	26.7% (151)	12.1% (64)	2.5% (13)	529
10	Referrals from APS are timely.	16.3% (86)	41.0% (217)	35.3% (187)	4.9% (26)	2.5% (13)	529
11	Referrals from APS are made consistent with my agency's requirements.	14.6% (77)	42.2% (223)	36.5% (193)	4.9% (26)	2.5% (13)	529
12	APS records are accurate.	11.3% (60)	31.6% (167)	51.6% (273)	4.0% (21)	1.5% (8)	529
13	APS records complete.	10.8% (57)	28.9% (153)	54.1% (286)	4.2% (22)	2.1% (11)	529
14	APS documentation supports the action requested.	12.1% (64)	32.7% (173)	49.1% (260)	4.0% (21)	2.1% (11)	529
15	There is a good working relationship between APS and other community agencies in this community.	25.5% (135)	27.4% (198)	27.8% (147)	5.3% (28)	4.0%	529

Table 8 – 2006 Community Partner Responses

	Survey Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Change
1	In this community, there are strong relationships among organizations and agencies that advocate for or support the elderly and individuals with disabilities.	34% (80)	48% (112)	11% (26)	6% (13)	1% (2)	233	↑
2	APS is an important component of my community's resource and social service network.	54% (126)	35% (83)	9% (20)	2% (4)	0% (1)	234	↑
3	APS workers understand my agency's purpose and guidelines.	37% (86)	45% (103)	14% (32)	4% (9)	0% (1)	231	↑
4	APS workers are prepared when they contact me to assist on a case.	42% (97)	38% (88)	14% (33)	5% (12)	0% (0)	230	↑
5	Referrals to my agency from APS are appropriate and timely.	36% (80)	38% (84)	24% (53)	2% (5)	0% (1)	223	↑
6	APS ensures the safety and dignity of vulnerable adults in this community.	44% (102)	40% (93)	13% (31)	2% (5)	1% (2)	233	New
7	There is a good relationship between this agency and APS in this community.	52% (121)	36% (84)	9% (21)	2%(4)	1% (2)	232	↑

Table 9 – 2004 APS Community Board Member Responses

	Survey Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Respondent Total
1	In this community, there are strong relations among organizations and agencies that advocate for or support the elderly and individuals with disabilities.	12.5% (1)	50.0% (4)	0.0% (0)	12.5% (1)	25.0% (2)	8
2	There is a good working relationship between APS and other community agencies.	0.0% (0)	62.5% (5)	12.5% (1)	12.5% (1)	12.5% (1)	8
3	APS is an important component of my community's resource network.	75.0% (6)	12.5% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	12.5% (1)	8
4	APS workers are aware of the agencies and organizations that advocate for or support the elderly and individuals with disabilities.	50.0% (4)	25.0% (2)	12.5% (1)	0.0% (0)	12.5% (1)	8
5	APS staff understand my board's mission and purpose.	37.5% (3)	25.0% (2)	25.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	12.5% (1)	8
6	Board members understand APS protocols and procedures.	37.5% (3)	12.5% (1)	25.0% (2)	12.5% (1)	12.5% (1)	8
7	In general, the board has a good working relationship with APS.	62.5% (5)	25.0% (2)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	12.5% (1)	8
8	The APS supervisor in this area interacts positively with the board.	75.0% (6)	0.0% (0)	12.5% (1)	0.0% (0)	12.5% (1)	8
9	The APS workers in this area interact positively with the board.	75.0% (6)	12.5% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	12.5% (1)	8
10	APS staff regularly attend board meetings/events.	75.0% (6)	12.5% (1)	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	12.5% (1)	8
11	The board is aware of the needs and priorities of APS in this area.	50.0% (4)	12.5% (1)	12.5% (1)	12.5% (1)	12.5% (1)	8
12	Board members feel valued by APS staff.	50.0% (4)	25.0% (2)	12.5% (1)	0.0% (0)	12.5% (1)	8

Table 10 – 2006 APS Community Board Member Responses

	Survey Question	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total	Change
1	In this community, there are strong relationships among organizations and agencies that advocate for or support the elderly and individuals with disabilities.	32% (13)	42% (17)	10% (4)	15% (6)	0% (0)	40	↑
2	APS is an important component of my community's resource network.	55% (22)	35% (14)	10% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	40	↑
3	APS staff members understand my board's mission and purpose.	45% (18)	38% (15)	10% (4)	8% (3)	0% (0)	40	↑
4	In general, the board has a good working relationship with APS.	60% (24)	30% (12)	10% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	40	↑
5	APS staff members interact positively with the board.	60% (24)	35% (14)	5% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	40	↑
6	APS staff members regularly attend board meetings/events.	52% (21)	40% (16)	8% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)	40	↑
7	The board is aware of the needs and priorities of the APS population in the community.	50% (20)	40% (16)	10% (4)	0% (0)	0%(0)	40	↑
8	Board members feel valued by APS staff.	54% (21)	31% (12)	13% (5)	0% (0)	3% (1)	39	↑