



February 2, 2013

Dear RDA Research Department,

I am writing with concerns regarding the lack of quality and peer review for a particular research report written by Barbara Lucenko and Lijian He, "Assessment Findings for Persons with Developmental Disabilities Served in Residential Habilitation Centers and Community and Community Settings" (RDA Report 5.36). This report has been referred to as factual information and used extensively in legislation which resulted in the passage of SB 5459 in 2011.

The data in this report appears excellent but the inaccurate conclusions and "Key Findings" report are troubling and not supported by the data. The purpose of this report was to "examine the similarity of support needs among DDD clients living in the following three settings: 1.) Residential Habilitation Centers (long-term residents of RHCs with recent full assessments of need), 2.) Community residential, and 3.) DDD Clients supported in other community-based settings.

That data clearly indicated that those in the RHC had significantly higher support needs overall than those who lived in the other two community settings. Yet, the data did not support the hypothesis which DDD desired and therefore, I assume, the authors chose to combine the two populations which were to be compared into one population. The final conclusions and key findings only referred to two types of residences: 1.) RHC and community residential settings and 2.) other community-based settings. This manipulation of results greatly affected the interpretation of some excellent data and has been used inappropriately.

Given the extreme misleading information which came out of this report, I request that this report be examined for accuracy and factual statistical information which reflects the data obtained. The lack of integrity in this report is appalling and knowing that this information was used in legislation which has harmed some of our citizens shows not only irresponsibility but also negligence on the part of the Research Data Analysis Division and those advocates and legislators who used this report as factual information to pass SB 5459.

I attempted many times to contact the authors of this report, DSHS administration and key legislators who were supporting SB 5459. The lack of concern regarding these important questions was eye-opening. I believe it is time to stop ignoring the sub-standard research that was done in this report and to look critically at the results of the data.

Thank you,
Cheryl Felak