

**Device Short-Term Loan FY15
4/1/15 To 6/30/15**

Type of AT Borrowed

AT Device	ABLE Tech	HLA	New View	New View T	OSU CSD	TCC	TSHA	TU	VS-OKC	VS-Tulsa	Total
Vision	23	0	119	33	0	0	0	0	9	1	185
Hearing	9	16	0	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	43
Speech Communication	81	0	0	0	0	7	0	4	0	0	92
Learning, Cognition, Developmental	47	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	52
Mobility, Seating, Positioning	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Daily Living	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Environmental Adaptations	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Vehicle Modifications	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Computers and Related	119	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	123
Recreation, Sports, Leisure	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
TOTAL	314	16	122	34	0	8	18	4	13	1	530

Type of Participant

Type of Participant	ABLE Tech	HLA	New View	New View T	OSU CSD	TCC	TSHA	TU	VS-OKC	VS-Tulsa	Total
Individual with Disability	16	16	122	32	0	4	13	0	11	1	215
Family Members and Others	107	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	112
Education	113	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	117
Employment	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	7
Health, Allied Health, Rehabilitation	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	76
Community Living	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Technology	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	314	16	122	32	0	8	18	4	13	1	528

Purpose of Device Loaned

Purpose	ABLE Tech	HLA	New View	New View T	OSU CSD	TCC	TSHA	TU	VS-OKC	VS-Tulsa	Total
Assist in Decision Making	313	16	122	32	0	7	13	0	2	1	506
Loaner During Repair or Waiting for Funding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	5
Short-term Accommodation	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	0	8
Conduct Professional Training	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	0	9
TOTAL	314	16	122	32	0	8	18	4	13	1	528
Cost of Partner Inventory	\$394,305	\$14,920	\$41,922	\$25,307	\$24,989	\$31,549	\$28,077	\$0	\$63,154	\$30,403	654,626

Access Performance Measures

Primary Purpose for AT	Education	Employment	Community Living	Total
AT device/service will meet needs	216	18	182	416
AT device/service will NOT meet needs	70	0	12	82
Sub Total	286	0	194	480
Have not made a decision	0	0	0	0
Nonrespondent	5	0	3	8
Total	291	18	197	506
Performance Outcome Percentage	100%	100%	100%	100%

Acquisition Performance Measures

Primary Purpose for AT	Education	Employment	Community Living	Total
Could only afford the AT through this statewide program	4	0	1	5
AT was only available through the statewide AT program	0	3	1	4
AT was available through other programs but the system was too complex or the wait time was too long	0	0	2	2
Sub Total	4	3	4	11
None of the above	2	0	0	2
Nonrespondent	7	0	2	9
Total	13	3	6	22
Performance Outcome Percentage	50%	100%	100%	50%

Customer Satisfaction

Satisfaction	ABLE Tech	HLA	New View	New View T	OSU CSD	TCC	TSHA	TU	VS-OKC	VS-Tulsa	Total
Highly Satisfied	266	14	114	32	0	4	5	0	10	0	445
Satisfied	39	0	7	0	0	4	0	4	2	0	56
Satisfied Somewhat	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
Not Satisfied	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non Respondent	6	2	1	0	0	0	13	0	1	0	23
TOTAL	314	16	122	32	0	8	18	4	13	1	528