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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Nevada 2-1-1 is part of a nationwide network of call centers that provides information and referral (I&R) services to Nevada residents. Information available to callers includes basic human services, physical and mental health resources, employment support services, programs for children, youth, and families, support for seniors and persons with disabilities, and support for community crisis and disaster recovery.

Nevada 2-1-1 is operated by the Financial Guidance Center (FGC) with oversight provided by the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Office of Community Partnerships and Grants (OCPG).

To better understand how the Nevada 2-1-1 program is helping to connect people to the resources they need, the DHHS-OCPG commissioned a research study. The objectives of the research were twofold, and included efforts to:

- Determine the responsiveness of the service delivery system and whether or not the referral(s) provided by Nevada 2-1-1 met the needs of callers; and
- Measure callers’ satisfaction with the service provided by Nevada 2-1-1.

To conduct the study, data was collected directly from individuals who had used the Nevada 2-1-1 help line. From December 2016 through July 2017, 6,834 total phone calls were made in an attempt to administer phone surveys to 2-1-1 clients. Of those calls, 1,200 surveys were administered. In accordance with the Alliance of Information and Referral Systems (AIRS) National I&R Client Data Guide, this number of completed surveys is a statistically significant sample size based on Nevada 2-1-1’s total answered calls of 113,561 during FY 2015-2016. This number of calls represents a 95% confidence level and a standard 3% margin of error.

SNAPSHOT OF RESULTS

Callers’ Experience with Nevada 2-1-1

How clients heard about Nevada 2-1-1
The majority of callers heard about 2-1-1 via a community service provider or a government agency (39.5%) or word of mouth from friends or family (19.7%). Many people (14.3%) cited a common knowledge of the service, stating they had known about it for a long time or that they had experience or knowledge of 2-1-1 from another state. Those who had heard about it from an advertisement (8.5%) referred to 2-1-1 billboards, radio ads, ads in print media, flyers, and signs in buses.

Clients’ perception of Nevada 2-1-1 as a source of information
The majority of callers (59.1%) indicated that 2-1-1 provided them with information that they would not have been able to access because they would not have known where to find it.
Clients’ perception of treatment by Nevada 2-1-1
Callers were overwhelmingly pleased with their treatment by 2-1-1’s call specialists. In general, callers reported that call specialists provided excellent customer service, lent a kind and sympathetic ear, and tried their hardest to help.

- 98.6% of callers indicated they were treated with respect during the call.
- 95.1% of callers indicated they the call specialist understood their needs.
- 96.5% of callers indicated that the call specialist tried their best to be helpful.

Clients’ satisfaction with Nevada 2-1-1 services
Eighty eight percent (n=1040) of callers were happy with the services they received while only 11.8% (139 callers) stated that they were unhappy. Many of those who indicated they were unhappy with the service (46 callers) explained that it was because they did not get the help that they were looking for from the service organization they contacted subsequent to their call with 2-1-1.

In addition, 95% of callers (n=1,179) of callers indicated that they would recommend 2-1-1 services to a friend or family member.

Social Service System Responsiveness

How often clients follow up on the referrals provided by Nevada 2-1-1
Callers were asked if they were successful in contacting referrals that were provided to them. A majority of callers (79.1%) did follow up on the referrals from Nevada 2-1-1.

The reason that clients do not follow up on referrals provided by Nevada 2-1-1
There were a total of 258 callers who indicated that they did not follow-up on referrals provided by Nevada 2-1-1. Of those, approximately 43% of callers indicated they were planning on contacting referrals later. 12% of callers stated that they did not follow up on the referrals provided to them because they came to another solution.

How often clients get the help they need from referrals provided by Nevada 2-1-1
Those clients who did complete follow-up calls were asked whether they received the help they needed for each of the referrals provided. Of 1096 referrals provided to callers in which follow-up occurred, a total of 486 needs were met. The data suggests that caller’s needs were unmet more often than they were met.
It was an important part of this research project to understand the extent to which a callers’ needs were met or unmet according to their category of need. This information can help to inform the social service sector about gaps in services. It may also help Nevada 2-1-1 understand where to enhance the information available within its directory of resources. Housing and shelter is the need category with the greatest number of unmet needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing and Shelter</th>
<th>Utility Assistance</th>
<th>Food Services</th>
<th>Healthcare</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Housing and Shelter Icon" /></td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Utility Assistance Icon" /></td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Food Services Icon" /></td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Healthcare Icon" /></td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Employment Icon" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unmet: 250</td>
<td>unmet: 93</td>
<td>unmet: 69</td>
<td>unmet: 53</td>
<td>unmet: 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>met: 88</td>
<td>met: 33</td>
<td>met: 26</td>
<td>met: 32</td>
<td>met: 37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reasons clients do not get the help they need from referrals provided by Nevada 2-1-1

The reasons why clients did not receive the help needed are varied and sometimes complex. For this question, callers were able to provide multiple explanations for why their needs were not met. The four most prevalent reasons as to why referrals were unsuccessful in addressing needs were:

- 29.7% of callers who indicated their need was unmet identified that it was because they were not eligible for service after a detailed assessment.
- 18.7% of callers who indicated their need was unmet identified that it was because the referral provided didn’t offer the services needed.
- 29.7% of callers who indicated their need was unmet identified that it was because the services needed were no longer available.
- 29.7% of callers who indicated their need was unmet identified that it was because the referral agency didn’t return their call.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Callers’ Experience with Nevada 2-1-1

The majority of 2-1-1’s callers hear about the service from other agencies or service organizations or from friends and family. There may be opportunities for 2-1-1 to conduct more outreach using the less frequently cited sources like local businesses, the news, and advertising.

Even in an increasingly digital world, 2-1-1 provides a valuable and efficient service to Nevadans seeking resources and services. Users of 2-1-1 feel that the service is either the sole source where they can access the information they received, or that while they could perhaps locate said information elsewhere, 2-1-1 allows them to do so more efficiently.

Call specialists provide excellent customer service. Callers’ were overwhelmingly satisfied with their experience with 2-1-1 and with call specialists’ treatment of them. Callers repeatedly praised the compassion and respect they were shown, and call specialists’ approach to sensitive situations. 2-1-1’s commitment to customer service is reflected both in the high level of satisfaction expressed and in the multiple complimentary commentaries researchers recorded.

Social Service System Responsiveness

The majority of callers followed up on the referrals given to them. However, of those who did not, most were planning on doing so at a later time.

Nearly six of every 10 callers who did follow up with referrals did not receive the help they needed. This lack of met needs may indicate a gap in Nevada’s service system (with a specific emphasis in the housing and shelter services system) and provides an opportunity for further exploration.

Food services, healthcare, and employment referrals most frequently met clients’ needs. While considerably fewer clients had called regarding these needs, their needs were met with greater frequency.

Housing and shelter as well as utility assistance were the needs least frequently met by Nevada’s social service system. Callers expressed needs related to these categories most often, and they were also unmet most often.

The top three reasons that clients did not get the help they needed were: 1) ineligible for service, 2) the referral not offering the service needed, and 3) services were no longer available.
RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the above findings, the following recommendations are presented for consideration:

✔ Increase targeted outreach. Should 2-1-1 seek to increase call volume and as a direct result, the number of Nevadans served, there are opportunities to increase outreach efforts. These efforts could include timely public service announcements during natural disasters or related to current events, and direct outreach to businesses (including property managers and medically related businesses) and medical offices and hospitals.

✔ Offer system navigation and advocacy. It seems that there is a deep need for advocacy. Many people in need of services are forced to navigate the system and advocate for themselves. They often must call many organizations and understand the distinct requirements for each. They may have already been turned down repeatedly, and they often don’t know where to turn to next when they don’t meet requirements for a particular service. As one caller said: “[I am] satisfied with 2-1-1 but not with the calls afterward. For 2-1-1 to really be effective, people, especially those with disabilities, need help navigating the referrals afterward. What use is the nice call specialist and all of her hard work, if I don’t get the help I need?” Perhaps such navigation itself is outside of 2-1-1’s purview; nevertheless, referring a client to an advocate or navigator could be a potential solution.

✔ Expand information contained within the database. Ineligibility for services was the most frequently cited reason for not receiving help. The third most frequently cited reason was that the services needed were no longer available (due to funding, timing of call, etc.). 2-1-1 may want to expand the information gathered from referral organizations to include some eligibility requirements, timing requirements, or other information related to funding cycles. Doing so could provide callers with a better sense of what is needed in order to qualify for services.

✔ Update information in the database as often as possible. 2-1-1 is inherently limited by the accreditation requirement that the organizations in the database be responsible for updating their own information. However, consistent updates of the information within the database may also help to decrease the number of callers that don’t get the help they need because the referral provided did not offer the services needed. Having the most accurate information possible may also help to address that portion of callers who did not follow up with the referrals because they received no referrals or because the referrals did not meet their need.

✔ Share information with leaders of Nevada’s public and private social service organizations. The data gathered within this report provides great insight into successes, gaps, and challenges within the state’s social system, especially related to housing and utility assistance. Information about met and unmet needs could be used to help justify funding increases, drive programmatic changes to better meet expressed needs, develop creative solutions to unresolved challenges, and celebrate success.
BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

NEVADA 2-1-1 PROGRAM

Nevada 2-1-1 is part of a nationwide network of call centers that provides information and referral (I&R) services to Nevada residents. Information available to callers includes basic human services, physical and mental health resources, employment support services, programs for children, youth, and families, support for seniors and persons with disabilities, and support for community crisis and disaster recovery. Nevada 2-1-1 is available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and information is provided in multiple languages.

There are multiple uses for the 2-1-1 system.

- It is a useful resource for individuals who need help and don’t know where to find it. The call center and complimentary online directory provides consumers with information about local resources and how to access services.
- It is also a helpful repository where other service providers can go to find resources needed by their clients. The Nevada 2-1-1 database has listings for an estimated 858 agencies, 2,102 programs, and 3,344 services.¹
- 2-1-1 can assist during times of disaster by directing non-emergency calls away from 9-1-1.
- Lastly, the 2-1-1 system is a mechanism to collect important data about emerging needs, trends, and gaps in services.

With a call volume of approximately 10,000 calls per month, Nevada 2-1-1 is often at the frontlines for Nevada’s communities.

Nevada 2-1-1 is operated by the Financial Guidance Center (FGC) with oversight provided by Nevada DHHS Office of Community Partnerships and Grants (OCPG).

History of Nevada 2-1-1

The three-digit dialing code, 2-1-1, was exclusively assigned to support the distribution of information and referral services by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) in 2000. Following this assignment, the FCC charged each state with establishing its own 2-1-1 system.

In 2005, Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) were amended to establish and maintain a system to provide non-emergency information and referrals concerning health, welfare, human and social services. NRS 232.359 requires the State to maintain a 2-1-1 system.

After the NRS was adopted, the late Governor Kenny Guinn established the Governor’s Partnership on 2-1-1 through an Executive Order in 2006. Former Governor Jim Gibbons renewed the order in 2009, as did Governor Brian Sandoval in 2011.

Governor Sandoval’s Executive Order expired on December 31, 2013. Following that expiration, 2-1-1 operated under a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the key operational partners, with the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) serving as the lead agency responsible for coordinating and overseeing 2-1-1 activities.

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

To better understand how the Nevada 2-1-1 program is helping to connect people to the resources they need, the Nevada Department of Health and Human Services Office of Community Partnerships and Grants (OCPG) commissioned a research study. The objectives of the research were twofold, and included efforts to:

- Determine the responsiveness of the service delivery system and whether or not the referral(s) provided by Nevada 2-1-1 met the needs of callers; and
- Measure callers’ satisfaction with the service provided by Nevada 2-1-1.

This report details how information was collected from clients and provides insights into callers’ experiences with 2-1-1 and Nevada’s service delivery system. Recommendations based on findings are also presented.

METHODOLOGY

DATA COLLECTION METHODS

Based on an agreement reached in November 2016, Financial Guidance Center (FGC) asked every caller to the Nevada 2-1-1 helpline if they would consent to being called so that information could be collected regarding referrals being provided and to ask about the quality of the service they received from 2-1-1.

For those callers agreeing to be contacted, FGC provided researchers with key information about the caller (first name, phone number, and zip code), his or her needs, and the referrals he or she received. This information was provided to the researchers every week and was entered into a customized database.

2-1-1 clients who were called by researchers to complete the survey were randomly selected using a built-in function in Microsoft’s programming language, Visual Basic, which selected them from the list of the people who had called 2-1-1 within the last 10 days.
SURVEY TOOL

The survey tool was developed based on the Alliance of Information and Referral Systems (AIRS) National I&R Client Data Guide, and finalized in conjunction with the Nevada 2-1-1 state oversight agency (OCPG) and the Nevada 2-1-1 operating agency (FGC). The survey script and questions can be found in Appendix A.

The survey consisted of nine questions. The initial set of questions was designed to measure customer satisfaction with the Nevada 2-1-1 system and with the call specialist’s efforts. The next set of questions was designed to understand clients’ success in following up with referrals, the potential limitations of Nevada’s service system, and clients perception of their ability to access information in other ways. The final question asked the client to rate their overall experience on scale from “very satisfied” to “very dissatisfied.”

RESEARCH APPROACH

From December 2016 through July 2017, 6,834 total phone calls were made in an attempt to administer phone surveys to 2-1-1 clients. Of those calls, 1,200 surveys were administered. In accordance with the AIRS National I&R Client Data Guide, this number of completed surveys is a statistically significant sample size based on Nevada 2-1-1’s total answered calls of 113,561 during FY 2015-2016. This number of calls represents a 95% confidence level and a standard 3% margin of error.

An initial set of 50 successful calls were completed in December 2016 to test the survey tool, note any necessary revisions to the survey, and ensure that the researchers were fully trained in use of the tool and in proper documentation. Thereafter, calls were placed at a rate of 150-175 per month for the following six months. A single phone call was attempted for each randomly selected 2-1-1 client unless a client requested that he or she receive a phone call at a later time. If a client specified a time and date, then a second call was attempted.

Calls were made at varying times of the day during the standard work week between the hours of 9:00 am and 5:30 pm (Pacific Standard Time). Calls were also attempted on two Saturdays in hopes of increasing the possibility of connecting with 2-1-1 clients who could not be reached during the standard work week. After more than 3,400 calls attempted and 594 surveys administered, it was established that from 10:00 am to noon and 2:00 pm to 5:00 pm, the success rate was greater than other times of day. From that point forward, calls were only attempted during these hours, unless requested by a client who had asked to be called back at a specific time. This increased researcher’s efficiency and ability to meet monthly call targets.

On a monthly basis, the research team met to review the data, ensure consistency in data entry, and anticipate any challenges to aggregating and analyzing data. The documentation approach to open-ended questions was refined over time to increase the ability to meaningfully interpret the data.
LIMITATIONS

It is important to note research limitations that may affect the interpretation of data presented in this report. The times of calls, the callers’ preferred language, and the exclusion of callers with specific needs (as classified under the AIRS Taxonomy) should be considered when understanding the results of this research study.

First, the days and times when phone calls were made may have affected the diversity of the sample, as no calls were made in the evenings after 5:30 pm and very few were made on a weekend day. Consequently, those unable to answer due to work or other obligations may not be fully represented in this sample.

Additionally, as explained above, survey respondents were randomly selected by the database. However, if, upon selection by the database, a call fell under any of categories in the table below, they were also eliminated from the call pool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Calls Not Pursued</th>
<th>Rationale for Removal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary language other than English or Spanish</td>
<td>Researchers were unable to administer surveys in any language besides English or Spanish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“X-1-1 &amp; Static Calls”</td>
<td>The caller may have been identified as “abusive” or had accidentally called the 2-1-1 line when trying to call another helpline like 3-1-1 or 4-1-1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Text”</td>
<td>It was assumed that if text was the preferred mode of contact then a phone call would be less likely to be answered. Additionally, there were no means to administer the survey via text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Declined”</td>
<td>Callers did not provide their consent to be called for survey participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calls pertaining to holiday related needs</td>
<td>Callers with holiday related needs (e.g., Christmas Baskets, Easter Events, Holiday Gifts/Toys, etc.) were also omitted from the call list because understanding the ability of the service delivery system to help in these situations was not a priority for exploration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No referral provided</td>
<td>If a client was not provided a referral or that referral need was not entered into the database, it was impossible to administer a large portion of the survey related to the service system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, clients whose needs fell under the following taxonomy codes were also eliminated from the call pool:

- Child Abuse Reporting/Emergency Response
- Domestic Violence Counseling
- Children’s Protective Services
- Elder/Dependent Adult Abuse Reporting
- Domestic Violence Shelters
- Domestic Violence Hotlines
- Domestic Violence Intervention Programs
- Domestic/Family Violence Legal Services
- Spouse/Intimate Partner Abuse Counseling

While the reason for excluding these callers was to protect them in case the perpetrator of the abuse were to answer the phone or be near when the caller was answering questions, this exclusion does limit potential information about the responsiveness of Nevada’s abuse, violence, and protective services.

The following results should be viewed with these exclusions and limitations in mind.
RESULTS

The results presented in this report are separated by the two areas of research inquiry and include:

Callers’ Experience with Nevada 2-1-1
- How clients heard about Nevada 2-1-1
- Clients’ perception of Nevada 2-1-1 as a source of information
- Clients’ satisfaction with Nevada 2-1-1 services
- Clients’ perception of treatment by Nevada 2-1-1

Social Service System Responsiveness
- How often clients follow up on the referrals provided by Nevada 2-1-1
- The reason that clients do not follow up on referrals provided by Nevada 2-1-1
- How often clients get the help they need from referrals provided by Nevada 2-1-1
- The reasons clients do not get the help they need from referrals provided by Nevada 2-1-1

CALLERS’ EXPERIENCE WITH NEVADA 2-1-1

2-1-1 is invested in providing callers with positive and valuable experiences when they call Nevada 2-1-1. In an effort to understand the quality of callers’ experiences, research focused on understanding clients’ perception of their call. This section describes how clients learned about 2-1-1, as well as their satisfaction with their interaction with the call specialist and the service they received.

HOW CLIENTS HEARD ABOUT 2-1-1

Clients connect with 2-1-1 through various sources. By identifying how clients hear about 2-1-1, the organization can increase awareness about its services by targeting key audiences through the channels they use to gain information.

The majority of callers heard about 2-1-1 via a community service provider or a government agency (39.5%) or word of mouth from friends or family (19.7%). Many people (14.3%) cited a common knowledge of the service, stating they had known about it for a long time or that they had experience or knowledge of 2-1-1 from another state. Those who had heard about it from an advertisement (8.5%) referred to 2-1-1 billboards, radio ads, ads in print media, flyers, and signs in buses.
A total of 2.4% of callers were given information by a business, frequently specified as an apartment complex, a medically related business, or a utility company. These sources of 2-1-1 callers could provide opportunities for more outreach, should 2-1-1 seek to increase call volume.

Finally, while only a small percentage of callers noted this as a source (.5%), it may be important to highlight those clients who had called because they had seen something about 2-1-1 on the news. This could be the result of public service announcements made on the news during a natural disaster (such as the severe flooding that happened in Northern Nevada in the early months of 2017) or another story where 2-1-1 was mentioned, and may represent an opportunity for 2-1-1’s outreach efforts, especially as it steps further into its role as a non-emergency service assisting during disasters.
PERCEPTION OF 2-1-1 AS A SOURCE OF INFORMATION

2-1-1 also seeks to understand its position as a source of specific social service information. As a result, callers were asked whether or not they believed they would have learned about the resources they were provided without contacting 2-1-1.

The majority of callers (59.1%) indicated that 2-1-1 provided them with information that they would not have been able to access because they would not have known where to find it. However, of those that indicated they could have learned about the resources they received through some other means did not necessarily believe that they could have done so as quickly (17.2%). These results may speak to the value of the service that 2-1-1 provides in helping clients begin to navigate a complex social service system with greater efficiency.

Do you believe you would have learned about the resources provided to you without contacting 2-1-1?

(n=1183)
PERCEPTION OF TREATMENT BY 2-1-1 CALL SPECIALISTS

Callers were overwhelmingly pleased with their treatment by 2-1-1’s call specialists. In general, callers reported that call specialists provided excellent customer service, lent a kind and sympathetic ear, and tried their hardest to help.

Questions geared towards assessing a client’s perception of treatment by 2-1-1 call specialists and the results are provided below.

Callers say...

"The call specialist was so compassionate. She understood the urgency of my situation and my need. She reviewed everything with me twice. She was so patient and calm and understanding that it made it much easier on me.”

Do you feel like you were treated with respect during the call?

98.6% of callers...

Indicated they were treated with respect during the call.

When you called 2-1-1, did the call specialist understand what you needed?

95.1% of callers...

Indicated that the call specialist understood their needs.

Did the call specialist try their best to be helpful?

96.5% of callers...

Indicated that the call specialist tried their best to be helpful.
The positive perception demonstrated in these results affirms 2-1-1’s commitment to customer service. Furthermore, although some clients were displeased with the information they received or the outcome of their follow-up calls, they also frequently complimented the call specialists’ attitude and willingness to seek information although they didn’t have a ready answer. Multiple comments attest to the high level of client service 2-1-1 offers.

SATISFACTION WITH 2-1-1 SERVICES

Clients were also asked three additional questions to understand their satisfaction with 2-1-1 as whole. The questions gauging client satisfaction and the related results are provided below.

Were you happy with the service you received when you contacted Nevada 2-1-1?

Eighty eight percent (n=1040) of callers were happy with the services they received while only 11.8% (139 callers) stated that they were unhappy. Many of those who indicated they were unhappy with the service (46 callers) explained that it was because they did not get the help that they were looking for from the service organization they contacted subsequent to their call with 2-1-1. Even when they were “unhappy” with the services received, most callers would still recommend 2-1-1 to a friend or a family member.

Callers say...

“They went above and beyond. I would give it a 12 out of 10. The call specialist was kind and patient. Honestly, the service was phenomenal. I was in the middle of a break down and she was so helpful!”
Would you recommend this service to a friend or family member?

Ninety five percent (n=1179) of callers indicated that they would recommend 2-1-1’s services to a friend or family member. Of those who said they would not recommend the service to a friend or a family member (50 callers), some felt that the referrals weren’t accurate (7 callers) or that 2-1-1 just didn’t have the information they needed (13 callers). Very few (4 callers) indicated that they had a negative interaction with the call specialist, which again speaks to the customer service provided by 2-1-1’s call specialists.

Finally, at the end of the survey, callers were asked their overall level of satisfaction with the service they received. While this question echoed the previous question asking whether the client was happy, answers were presented on a scale and designed to allow clients to provide a more nuanced summary of their experience. Additionally, for this question, every attempt was made to clarify that the question was related specifically to 2-1-1, yet when answering this final question, some clients still seemed to incorporate their dissatisfaction with the services to which they had connected after calling 2-1-1 with their actual experience with 2-1-1. This should be taken into account when interpreting the following results.

**Behind the Numbers….Sandra’s Story**

Sandra* and her daughter had recently moved to the area and were looking for some rental assistance and some information about low-cost rentals after they had experienced some trouble with their current landlord. 2-1-1 provided them with referrals related to housing, as well other additional resources for food and clothing just in case they needed it. Sandra was extremely satisfied with the help she received from the call specialist.

Although Sandra didn’t qualify for services from all of the referrals she received, she told us: “If it wasn’t for 2-1-1, I wouldn’t have known about a lot of services. I am totally satisfied with the customer service and real concern that the call specialist showed me.”

*Name changed to protect caller’s identity.*
**Overall, how satisfied were you with the service you received?**

![Bar chart showing satisfaction levels](chart.png)

The vast majority of callers were either satisfied (26.2%) or very satisfied (64.2%) with the service they received. Callers indicated that even when they did not receive the help that they needed from the service organizations that they were referred to, they were still content with their overall experience calling 2-1-1.

A small number of clients indicated that they were dissatisfied (3.9%) or very dissatisfied (2.5%). These clients often felt as if they had not received referrals in their area specific to their needs or had unique needs that they felt the call specialist struggled to understand.

Callers who chose “Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied” (3.2%) frequently chose this option when they felt that the service was good, but that the referrals they received were either unsuccessful or did not meet their need.

Some clients (n=22) refused to complete a survey when called to participate and indicated that it was due to their dissatisfaction with 2-1-1. This number is not represented in the table above. While the number of callers is not a significant number given the total volume of calls made, interactions with these clients were the result of their frustration with both 2-1-1 and the services to which they were referred.
SOCIAL SERVICE SYSTEM RESPONSIVENESS

One of the key elements of exploration within the scope of this research project was to help Nevada 2-1-1 understand what happens after a client connects with a call specialist, focusing specifically on how the social service system responds to the needs of its service population. This section explores how often callers followed up on referrals provided and whether callers received the help needed.

CALLERS’ FOLLOW-UP ON REFERRALS PROVIDED

Callers were asked if they were successful in contacting referrals that were provided to them. A majority of callers did follow up on the referrals from Nevada 2-1-1.

79.1% of callers... Followed-up on the referrals provided to them by Nevada 2-1-1.

Beyond understanding the extent that callers followed up on referrals, the Nevada 2-1-1 program was interested in understanding the reason that 18.6% of callers did not follow up.2

REASON CALLERS DID NOT FOLLOW UP

The majority of those who did not follow up with referrals provided by 2-1-1 planned on contacting the referrals later. It should be noted that because calls to clients were made within ten days of their original phone call to 2-1-1, some of the failure to follow up may have been because there was not sufficient time for them to do so between the original call to 2-1-1 and the call received from researchers.

2 2.0% of callers did not answer this question. The reason for this was most often that the caller had contacted Nevada 2-1-1 for another person and was not knowledgeable about whether follow-up had occurred or not.
The following figure demonstrates the reasons that 2-1-1 callers did not follow up on the referrals provided to them.

(n=258)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Will contact referrals later</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Came to another solution</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No referral provided</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral already known</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral didn't meet need</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting to see if things change before making contact</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No resources available</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (detail)</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation &quot;went away&quot; on its own</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 43% of callers indicated they were planning on contacting referrals later. 12% of callers stated that they did not follow up on the referrals provided to them because they came to another solution. An example of this situation may be the person who required rental assistance, received referrals from 2-1-1, and instead of calling these referrals, borrowed the funds from a friend or a family member. Some of these callers signaled that they would keep the information given to them and use it in the future should the need arise.

Of particular interest may be the 9.7% who claimed that no referrals were provided to them. 2-1-1 has a policy of providing at least three referrals to every caller, so attempts were made when this answer was given to understand whether the caller was dissatisfied with the referrals he or she received or actually had not received any. This percentage only represents callers who insisted that they received no referrals. Separate from that, 5.4% explained that although they were given referrals, the call specialist stated that there were no resources available within their geographic region or no resources were available to directly meet their needs.

A total of 8.9% of callers also chose not to follow up because they were already familiar with the resources they were given during their call. Many of these callers also shared that they felt they would not receive the help they needed from these organizations or that they had already reached out to those agencies and were identified as ineligible for service or otherwise turned away.
FREQUENCY OF HELP RECEIVED

Those clients who did complete follow-up calls were asked whether they received the help they needed for each of the referrals provided. Of 1096 referrals provided to callers in which follow-up occurred, a total of 486 needs were met. The graph below represents the percentage of referrals provided in which a caller’s needs were met.

It is evident that caller’s needs were unmet more often than they were met, which could suggest challenges within the social service system and/or 2-1-1. To better comprehend this discrepancy, the next sections further explore what needs clients expressed and the reasons they offered for those needs being met or unmet.
NEEDS MET AND UNMET

It was an important part of this research project to understand the extent to which a callers’ needs were met or unmet according to their category of need. This information can help to inform the social service sector about gaps in services. It may also help Nevada 2-1-1 understand where to enhance the information available within its directory of resources.

A comprehensive table of met and unmet needs can be found on the following page.
Nevada 2-1-1 reported\(^3\) that in 2015-2016 the primary need for which callers contacted the service was housing and shelter. This is followed by food and then utility assistance.

In the categories of food services, health care, and employment, callers were likely to have their needs met. A total of 72.6% of callers received the food services for which they were looking. Several callers expressed that they were grateful that 2-1-1 was able to provide them with the hours and locations for food pantries and not just another number to call. Although health care and employment related needs were not expressed as frequently, organizations that were referred to were able to meet caller’s needs more often than not.

Housing and shelter is the need category with the greatest number of unmet needs. While the percentage of needs that are unmet for this category is particularly high, this information should be taken in context of the sheer quantity of callers asking for housing resources. These data may also indicate that the service system is unable to handle the volume of clients.

Similarly, utility assistance is in high demand, and more than half of those needing help in this category were turned away once they contact the agency to which they were referred.

The reasons why clients did not receive the help needed are varied and sometimes complex. For this question, callers were able to provide multiple explanations for why their needs were not met. Because callers often received more than one referral per need, there may have been more than one reason provided (i.e., two or three reasons for each need). The four most prevalent reasons as to why referrals were unsuccessful in addressing needs were:

- **29.7%** of callers... 
  Indicated they were not eligible for service after a detailed assessment.

- **18.7%** of callers... 
  Indicated that the referral provided didn’t offer the services needed.

- **17.4%** of callers... 
  Indicated that the services needed were no longer available.

- **15.9%** of callers... 
  Indicated that the referral agency did not return their call.

A more comprehensive account of the reasons referrals were unsuccessful in addressing needs is provided in Appendix A of this report.
Most commonly, after calling the agency or organization, clients discovered they were not eligible for services due to income guidelines, residency requirements, and other organizational requirements they did not meet. Some who were ineligible stated that their impression was that there were few services that could help prevent them from falling into a dire situation. For example, many had called services in anticipation of being evicted for failure to pay rent only to find out that they did not qualify because their situation was not yet considered an emergency or that they had to be unemployed in order to receive help.

The second most frequently cited reason that callers did not receive the help they needed was that the referrals did not offer the services needed. This could indicate a lack of communication between service agencies and 2-1-1 about what services an agency offers, miscommunication on the part of the individual requesting help about what was needed, or a combination of both. Only 5.5% (33) of callers who did not receive the help they needed indicated that the referral information itself was outdated or inaccurate.

Another reason cited by callers that did not receive the help they needed was that the services were no longer available (17.4%). This meant that the agency had offered the service at some point, and most frequently, the reason the services were unavailable was that the agency had exhausted program funding. Some agencies require that applicants request help only during certain times of the month (for example, rental or utility assistance at the beginning of the month only) or on a first come, first serve basis, and so they are frequently out of funding as applicants seek help towards the end of the month.

It may be important to note that 96 callers (15.9%) indicated that the reason they didn't receive the help needed was because the referral agency had not yet returned their calls. When this option was chosen, it meant that a client had left a message and did receive a call back, he/she never had the opportunity to speak to someone because they were unable to navigate the electronic calling system, or that they never reached a person or a voicemail rendering them unable to leave a message.

**Behind the Numbers**

17.4% of callers indicated that an agency no longer made a service available. For many of these callers, an agency’s lack of funds prevented receipt of services. People seeking help from agencies that helped with monthly services (rental or utilities assistance) often reported that this was the case, especially towards the end of the fiscal year (late June).

**{Beatrice’s Story}**

Beatrice* is an elderly woman who was facing eviction from her home and looking for rental assistance. She reported that she had called a senior law center to help with the eviction, but then did not receive a call back for at least two weeks. At one day until the end of the 30-day period specified in her eviction notice, she still had not resolved her situation. She had no family or friends with whom she could stay, and additionally, had no way to move her items out of the house.

When she called the resource provided to her by 2-1-1 for rental assistance to move into a new home, they were out of funds for the fiscal year and unable to direct her to another resource.

*Name changed to protect caller's identity.*
Finally, of the many reasons callers did not receive the help they needed, 13.1% identified that the service needed was pending. This answer was chosen when a client stated that they had yet to receive services but that they were in the process of completing an application, waiting to hear back if they qualified, or had established an appointment with a caseworker or agency to assess their situation.

---

**UNMET NEEDS SPOTLIGHT**

**HOUSING AND UTILITY ASSISTANCE**

The needs most commonly unmet were housing and utility assistance. Insight into opportunities and challenges related these needs may be gained exploring why these needs were unmet. It should be noted that percentage of reasons may add up to more than 100% because callers were able to identify multiple reasons for their needs having been unmet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing and Shelter</th>
<th>Utility Assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ineligible after detailed assessment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ineligible after detailed assessment</strong> 46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td><strong>Services no longer available</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td><strong>Agency didn’t return call</strong> 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td><strong>Agency didn’t return call</strong> 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Referral did not offer the services needed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lacked needed ID/documentation</strong> 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td><strong>Services pending</strong> 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services pending</strong></td>
<td><strong>Referral did not offer the services needed</strong> 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td><strong>Services pending</strong> 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waiting list</strong></td>
<td><strong>Waiting list</strong> 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td><strong>Agency information was inaccurate</strong> 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agency information was inaccurate</strong></td>
<td><strong>Application process too complicated</strong> 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td><strong>Organization didn’t feel welcoming</strong> 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lacked needed ID/documentation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Organization didn’t feel welcoming</strong> 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td><strong>Other</strong> 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization didn’t feel welcoming</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other</strong> 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td><strong>Other</strong> 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other</strong> 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td><strong>Other</strong> 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td><strong>Other</strong> 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td><strong>Other</strong> 9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For 4.6% of callers, **the lack of a Nevada identification or other documentation** prevented receipt of services. Although this reason was cited significantly less frequently than the others, the consequence of lacking documentation can be very severe.

**{Charles’ Story}**

Charles* is a young man who found himself homeless and living on the streets of Las Vegas when he called 2-1-1. After following up on his referrals, he found that none of the agencies—including some of the shelters—to which he was referred were able to accept him because he had an out-of-state ID. He was unable to obtain a Nevada ID because he did not have access to his birth certificate. Without a state ID or the ability to obtain one, Charles felt hopeless:

“Nevada has no services to help me get off the streets!”

*Name changed to protect caller’s identity.*
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The data regarding the social service system in Nevada paired with those reflecting callers’ experience with 2-1-1 provide great insight into 2-1-1’s pivotal role as a source of referrals and information for the people of Nevada in need of supports and services. This section provides a summary of the high-level findings as supported by the research results. It also includes a list of recommendations aimed at strengthening the field, strengthening the practice of Nevada 2-1-1, and how research studies may be structured in the future based on lessons learned.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Callers’ Experience with Nevada 2-1-1

The majority of 2-1-1’s callers hear about the service from other agencies or service organizations or from friends and family. There may be opportunities for 2-1-1 to conduct more outreach using the less frequently cited sources like local businesses, the news, and advertising.

Even in an increasingly digital world, 2-1-1 provides a valuable and efficient service to Nevadans seeking resources and services. Users of 2-1-1 feel that the service is either the sole source where they can access the information they received, or that while they could perhaps locate said information elsewhere, 2-1-1 allows them to do so more efficiently.

Call specialists provide excellent customer service. Callers’ were overwhelmingly satisfied with their experience with 2-1-1 and with call specialists’ treatment of them. Callers repeatedly praised the compassion and respect they were shown, and call specialists’ approach to sensitive situations. 2-1-1’s commitment to customer service is reflected both in the high level of satisfaction expressed and in the multiple complimentary commentaries researchers recorded.

Social Service System Responsiveness

The majority of callers followed up on the referrals given to them. However, of those who did not, most were planning on doing so at a later time.

An area for consideration and potential follow-up for 2-1-1 may be to further explore the issue related to callers who claimed they did not receive a referral or those who stated that the referral did not meet their need.
Nearly six of every 10 callers who did follow up with referrals did not receive the help they needed. This lack of met needs may indicate a gap in Nevada’s service system (with a specific emphasis in the housing and shelter services system) and provides an opportunity for further exploration.

Food services, healthcare, and employment referrals most frequently met clients’ needs. While considerably fewer clients had called regarding these needs, their needs were met with greater frequency.

Housing and shelter and utility assistance were the needs least frequently met by Nevada’s social service system. Callers expressed needs related to these categories most often, and they were also unmet most often.

The top three reasons that clients did not get the help they needed were the following:

1. Ineligibility for service
2. The referral not offering the service needed
3. Services were no longer available

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the above findings, the following recommendations are presented for consideration:

✓ Increase targeted outreach. Should 2-1-1 seek to increase call volume and as a direct result, the number of Nevadans served, there are opportunities to increase outreach efforts. These efforts could include timely public service announcements during natural disasters or related to current events, and direct outreach to businesses (including property managers and medically related businesses) and medical offices and hospitals.

✓ Offer system navigation and advocacy. It seems that there is a deep need for advocacy. Many people in need of services are forced to navigate the system and advocate for themselves. They often must call many organizations and understand the distinct requirements for each. They may have already been turned down repeatedly, and they often don’t know where to turn to next when they don’t meet requirements for a particular service. As one caller said: “[I am] satisfied with 2-1-1 but not with the calls afterward. For 2-1-1 to really be effective, people, especially those with disabilities, need help navigating the referrals afterward. What use is the nice call specialist and all of her hard work, if I don’t get the help I need?” Perhaps such navigation itself is outside of 2-1-1’s purview; nevertheless, referring a client to an advocate or navigator could be a potential solution.

✓ Expand information contained within the database. Ineligibility for services was the most frequently cited reason for not receiving help. The third most frequently cited reason was that the services needed were no longer available (due to funding, timing of call, etc.). 2-1-1 may want to expand the information gathered from referral organizations to include some eligibility requirements,
timing requirements, or other information related to funding cycles. Doing so could provide callers with a better sense of what is needed in order to qualify for services.

- **Update information in the database as often as possible.** 2-1-1 is inherently limited by the accreditation requirement that the organizations in the database be responsible for updating their own information. However, consistent updates of the information within the database may also help to decrease the number of callers that don’t get the help they need because the referral provided did not offer the services needed. Having the most accurate information possible may also help to address that portion of callers who did not follow up with the referrals because they received no referrals or because the referrals did not meet their need.

- **Share information with leaders of Nevada’s public and private social service organizations.** The data gathered within this report provides great insight into successes, gaps, and challenges within the state’s social system, especially related to housing and utility assistance. Information about met and unmet needs could be used to help justify funding increases, drive programmatic changes to better meet expressed needs, develop creative solutions to unresolved challenges, and celebrate success.

The following research recommendations and potential further lines of inquiry are also presented for consideration in future research:

- **Be clear about obtaining consent for calls.** Some of the clients who refused to participate in the survey indicated that they had not agreed to be surveyed and were upset about receiving a follow-up call. There was nowhere to record this information; however, this is an important note for call specialists and for any future research projects.

- **Ensure that questions regarding satisfaction are clear.** The question, “Overall, how satisfied were you with the service you received?” required additional explanation. The question could be clarified by adding “from 2-1-1” to the question. Furthermore, while it may seem that this question, is perhaps duplicative of the question “Were you happy with the service you received?”, it does provide respondents an opportunity to provide a more nuanced answer by offering a Likert-type scale versus a yes-no response.

- **Maintain data quality throughout the duration of the survey process.** As explained in the methodology, the research team regularly convened to review answers and ensure high quality data collection. Doing so ensured that even questions for which open-ended responses were possible met a high quality standard and were able to be aggregated and therefore, analyzed.

- **Adhere to the AIRS Taxonomy of Needs Categories.** For the purpose of this research, needs specified were classified into larger categories based on those designations available on the Nevada 2-1-1 website. However, in order to build a body of research for I&R Services across the country, a strict use and understanding of the AIRS taxonomy needs categories would better allow for research to easily be shared and aggregated.
Further lines of inquiry or analysis may include the following:

- **Track and analyze responses depending on the times of year.** For example, anecdotally, researchers noted that responses related to lack of funding seemed to increase towards the end of the fiscal year ending in June. Tracking surges in types of need or times where needs go unmet may help 2-1-1 provide more fitting referrals.

- **Track and analyze responses related to zip code.** Research could shine a light on potential service discrepancies within specific communities by seeking to understand if a greater number of met or unmet needs falls within a specific geographical region.

- **Analyze each category of need based on the reasons why needs were met or unmet.** While this report highlights this information for the two categories of need most frequently unmet (housing and utility assistance), it may also be useful to understand these reasons for each category of need and disseminate that information to service providers within that industry to strengthen the social service system.
APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW TOOL

The following interview tools—one in English and one in Spanish—were used to survey clients. Each tool provides both the script, the questions, and the potential answers. The script used to introduce the survey and process to 2-1-1 clients is presented in italics, and instructions and information for the researcher are presented in bold. These instructions for the researcher are only included in the English version, as the researchers were bilingual.

ENGLISH SCRIPT AND SURVEY

Hello, my name is ____________________. I am calling to follow up with you about a phone call you recently made to Nevada 2-1-1 for referral services. During that call, you mentioned that you would be interested providing some feedback about your experience to help us improve the Nevada 2-1-1 system. Do you have a few minutes to take a brief survey?

If not, is there a better time to call back?

Preferred time/day: ________________________________

We have a total of nine questions to ask about your experience. We expect the call will take around five minutes. All of the information you provide will be kept confidential and will not be associated with you directly. Just so you are aware, I am not a call specialist of 2-1-1 so I don’t have access to certain information. We do ask that if you need additional services or referrals, that you call 2-1-1 directly.

First, I will ask you about your experience with 2-1-1, and then I will ask you about the referrals that they provided.

1. How did you hear about 2-1-1?
   a. A friend or family member
   b. A Community Service Provider or Government Agency
   c. An advertisement
   d. Web search
   e. Other: Please specify

2. Do you feel like you were treated with respect during that call?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. No answer
3. When you called 2-1-1, did the call specialist understand what you needed? *(If it is necessary to clarify, the “call specialist” is the person that helped you when you called 2-1-1.)*
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Partially *(If the caller answers “partially” please record the context of the answer if possible).*
   d. I don’t know – Unsure
   e. No answer

4. Did the call specialist try their best to be helpful?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. I don’t know – Unsure
   d. No Answer

5a. Were you happy with the service you received when you contacted Nevada 2-1-1?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. No Answer

5b. I am sorry to hear that. Could you tell me a little more about that?
   a. Issue was with I&R service (e.g. impolite, did not provide accurate information)
      - Inappropriate referral provided
      - Call Specialist was impolite
      - Other (provide detail)
   b. Issue was with organization contacted as a result of the referral (e.g. did not receive the help they needed because of something to do with the organization providing services)
   c. Other (provide detail)

6a. Would you recommend this service to a friend or a family member?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. No Answer

6b. Could you share why you would not recommend the service, so we can try and improve?
   a. Referrals didn’t meet need.
   b. Difficult interaction with the call specialist
   c. Didn’t have information I was looking for
   d. Other: (detail will be recorded)
The last set of questions are meant to help us understand if you were able to access the assistance you needed when you called Nevada 2-1-1. When you called, it was our understanding that you were looking for help with: __________________, ________________________ and ______________.

Please go through question 7 for each “presenting need,” up to three needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7a. Were you successful in contacting the referrals that were provided to you for _______ (Need)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Yes [Follow-up Question]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. No [Follow-up Question]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. No Answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7b. If the client answered YES, follow up with the following question:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once you called, did you get the help you needed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Yes [Follow-up Question]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. No [Follow-up Question]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. No Answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If client Indicated NO follow-up with the question below:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7d. Could you tell me a little more about why you have not contacted the referrals that were provided to you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Came to another solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Situation “went away” on its own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Will contact referrals later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Waiting to see if things change before making contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Other (detail):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If client Indicated NO follow-up with the question below:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7c. I am sorry to hear that. Could you tell me what happened?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The referral provided didn’t offer the services I needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The agency information was inaccurate/outdated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Waiting list (which client either chose to join or did not)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Organization did not feel welcoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Transportation issues prevented access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Hours of operation were a barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Language barrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Agency did not return call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Application process too complicated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Cost proved too expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Service no longer available (e.g. funds exhausted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Not eligible for service after more detailed assessment (e.g. client had already used them)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Other (detail):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Do you believe you would have known about those referrals if you had not contacted 2-1-1?
   a. Yes – through other means
   b. Yes – but it may have taken me longer
   c. No – I wouldn’t have known where to find what I was looking for
   d. Unknown

9. Overall, how satisfied were you with the service you received?
   The following answers should be offered.
   a. Very Satisfied
   b. Satisfied
   c. Dissatisfied
   d. Very Dissatisfied
   e. Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied

In the final text box, please provide any additional details about the client’s experience that provide insight into 1) the way that Nevada 2-1-1 provides services and/or 2) attributes of the community service system should be recorded. This is an opportunity to record "client testimonials" of both the strengths and the weaknesses of the referral process. Positive experiences could be leveraged to support Nevada 2-1-1’s communication efforts in the future.

- Thank the client for his or her participation.
**SPANISH SCRIPT AND SURVEY**

Buenos días/Buenas tardes. Mi nombre es________________. Hace unos días usted llamó a Nevada 2-1-1, el servicio que proporciona información y referencias a las organizaciones de salud y de servicios sociales. Durante su llamada, usted mencionó estar interesado en darnos su opinión y/o comentarios sobre su experiencia con Nevada 2-1-1 para ayudarnos a mejorar el sistema. ¿Es este un buen momento para conversar con usted? Sólo nos tomará unos cuantos minutos.

Si no, ¿prefiere que llamemos en otro momento? ¿Cuándo sería un buen momento para volver a llamarlo?

Hora/día preferido: __________________________

Durante esta llamada le haré nueve preguntas sobre su experiencia con Nevada 2-1-1, lo cual le tomará en responder alrededor de unos cinco minutos. Sus respuestas son confidenciales y anónimas. Tenga presente que no soy una especialista con 2-1-1 así que no tengo acceso a cierta información. Si Ud. necesita referencias o servicios adicionales, le pido que llame al 2-1-1 después de nuestra conversación.

Primero le hare preguntas sobre su experiencia con el servicio de 2-1-1 y después podemos hablar de las referencias que Ud. recibió.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ¿Cómo supo del 2-1-1?/ ¿Cómo se enteró del servicio?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Un amigo o un pariente</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Una agencia comunitaria o una agencia del gobierno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Un anuncio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Una búsqueda por internet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Otro: favor de explicar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Durante la llamada, sentía que lo/la trataron con respeto?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sin respuesta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cuándo llamó al 2-1-1, ¿cree Ud. que el especialista de llamadas (la persona que lo atendió) entendió las razones de su llamada?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. No sé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. parcialmente</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Sin respuesta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. En su opinión, ¿Hizo el especialista de llamadas lo mejor que pudo para conectarlo/la con los servicios que buscaba?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Sí</td>
<td>5a. ¿Está a gusto con el servicio que recibió al llamar a 2-1-1?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sin respuesta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6a. ¿Recomendaría el servicio de 2-1-1 a un amigo o un pariente?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Sí</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sin respuesta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up Question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

La última parte de la encuesta nos ayudará a entender si Ud. tuvo éxito en contactar a las referencias que recibió durante su llamada con 2-1-1.

Cuando Ud. llamó, buscaba ayuda con _____, ____ y ____; y recibió referencias para ____, ____ y ____.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7a. ¿Tuvo éxito en contactar a la referencia para ayuda con _________ durante su llamada?</strong></td>
<td>(Follow-up Question)</td>
<td>(Follow-up Question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sin respuesta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7b. Al llamar a la referencia, ¿recibió la ayuda que buscaba?</strong></td>
<td>(Follow-up Question)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Sí</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Sin respuesta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>7c. Lamento que no, ¿Podría decirme que fue lo pasó?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. La referencia no ofrecía los servicios que necesitaba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. La información de contacto para la agencia estuvo equivocada / desactualizada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Había una lista de espera (la cual el cliente decidió inscribirse o no)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. La organización no me hizo sentir que realmente querían ayudarme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Problemas con el transporte para acceder a los servicios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Las horas de atención impidieron el acceso a servicios</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Una barrera lingüística (o barrera con el idioma)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. La agencia no devolvió la llamada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. El proceso de la solicitud fue demasiado difícil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. El costo del programa fue demasiado caro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. El servicio/organización ya no estaba disponible (por ej.: no tenían fondos suficientes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. El cliente no cumplía con los requisitos para recibir el servicio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Otra razón: favor de explicar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7c. Lamento que no, ¿Podría decirme que fue lo pasado?
   a. La referencia no ofrecía los servicios que necesitaba
   b. La información de contacto para la agencia estuvo equivocada / desactualizada
   c. Había una lista de espera (la cual el cliente decidió inscribirse o no)
   d. La organización no me hizo sentir que realmente querían ayudarme.
   e. Problemas con el transporte para acceder a los servicios
   f. Las horas de atención impidieron el acceso a servicios
   g. Una barrera lingüística (o barrera con el idioma)
   h. La agencia no devolvió la llamada
   i. El proceso de la solicitud fue demasiado difícil
   j. El costo del programa fue demasiado caro
   k. El servicio/organización ya no estaba disponible (por ej.: no tenían fondos suficientes)
   l. El cliente no cumplía con los requisitos para recibir el servicio
   m. Otra razón: favor de explicar

8. ¿Cree usted que sin la información que le dio 2-1-1, hubiera sabido donde llamar para encontrar lo que necesitaba?
   a. Sí – de una manera distinta
   b. Sí – pero quizá tardara más
   c. No – No, hubiera sabido por donde buscar
   d. No sé.

9. En general, ¿cómo evalúa su grado de satisfacción con el servicio?
   a. Muy satisfecho/a
   b. Satisfecho/a
   c. Insatisfecho/a
   d. Muy insatisfecho/a
   e. Ni satisfecho/a ni insatisfecho/a

Gracias por participar en esta encuesta. La información que nos dio nos será muy útil para mejorar el servicio.
APPENDIX B: PRIMARY CATEGORIES OF NEED

For each presenting need, a more inclusive problem or needs category was selected to help better understand the services system’s ability to meet client needs. The following categories and their descriptions are adapted from the Nevada 2-1-1 website and were used by researchers to classify needs into larger categories.

**ACA Health Insurance**

This category consists of presenting needs related to Medicaid, Medicare or other health insurance.

**Long-term Support**

This category consists of presenting needs related to supporting individuals who require ongoing care due to age, physical or intellectual disability or chronic illness or assistance for an individual or their caregiver, to live as independently as possible in the home and community. Examples include: chore services, personal care, counseling, respite for caretakers, adult day health care, benefits counseling, home modifications, assistive technology, etc.

**Holiday Events**

This category consists of presenting needs specifically related to a holiday. Examples include: Easter events, Christmas gifts, Thanksgiving baskets, etc.

**Children’s Services**

This category consists of presenting needs related to children. These needs include licensed supervised care for children, assistance with child care expenses, clothing for children, diapers, guidance for expectant parents or new mothers, infant formula and/or baby food, social services for families, and early education for young children.

**Disability Services**

This category consists of presenting needs related to services for people with disabilities, excluding transportation and long-term services and supports. These include income lost because of a physical or mental impairment severe enough to prevent a previously employed person from working; disability resources including application assistance, case management, socialization opportunities, and other support; vocational assessment, job development, job training, job placement, specialized job situations and other supportive services to people with disabilities; emotional support, information and guidance for individuals with disabilities; and support groups for people who have specific disabilities, illnesses or other health conditions, as well as their families and friends.
Utility Assistance

This category consists of presenting needs related to payment of utilities. These include assistance needed to pay all or a portion of gas utility services, electricity utility services, heating fuel, sewer, trash, and water services.

Senior Services

This category consists of presenting needs related to services for seniors, excluding transportation, food services, and long-term services and supports. These include support groups for family and friends who are caring for someone who is elderly and unable to provide for his or her own care; and care and supervision for dependent adults living in the community during some portion of the day, as well as senior advocacy groups.

Mental Health

This category consists of presenting needs related to mental health treatment and diagnosis. These include immediate assistance for individuals who are in emotional distress, are suicidal, or are a danger to themselves or to others; inpatient treatment for adults who have emotional disturbances; treatment of children and adolescents who have adjustment problems, behavior problems, emotional disturbance, a personality disorder or mental illness; individual, family and group therapy; and psychological assessment or testing.

Food Services

This category consists of presenting needs related to food assistance programs that distribute food to children and adults who are in emergency situations; food voucher coupons and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits can be exchanged for food in grocery stores and farmers markets; hot meals for children and adults who are in need of food assistance; senior meals at community centers or senior centers; meals home delivered to seniors and people with disabilities; groceries that include basic food necessities; brown bag food programs; liquid nutrition supplements; grocery ordering/delivery; after school meal programs; and summer food service programs.

Health Care

This category consists of presenting needs related to health care. These include immediate short-term health care assistance for accident victims, ill or injured individuals who are in pain, or whose health or lives may be at risk; Medicaid approved hospitals with doctors, internists, pediatricians, family medicine specialists, gynecologists, obstetricians, nurse practitioners, midwives or other health care providers; basic health care including physical examinations, immunizations, family planning, nutrition assistance and treatment of illnesses for people who are uninsured, cannot afford treatment, or homeless; alternative pregnancy options and medical care for expectant mothers, including pregnancy tests, maternal shelters, and breastfeeding support; walk-in medical treatment for illness and injuries to children and teens; information, counseling, and assistance on senior healthcare; inoculations to prevent specific diseases.
Substance Abuse

This category consists of presenting needs related to substance abuse and prevention. These include services and support for people living with alcohol and/or drug addiction; community-based, residential addiction recovery programs, with 24-hour, supervised treatment; services and treatment to help prevent excessive alcohol and drug use for people of all ages who are at risk; approaches to prevent and stop cigarette smoking addiction; services for children, adolescents and teens who have a drug use disorder, an alcohol addiction or are at-risk of an substance use disorder; support for individuals who are physically dependent on alcohol and/or substances during the withdrawal period; emotional support, information and guidance for people who have difficulty controlling their need to gamble, and for their families; individual, group, or family therapy for individuals living with alcohol and/or drug addiction; residential facilities with food, shelter and recovery services in a supportive, non-drinking, drug-free environment; and support for people who have substance or behavioral addictions; court-ordered assessment, educational and treatment of individuals who have been convicted of driving under the influence of drugs and/or alcohol.

Domestic Violence

Although this category was included in the database, no clients with presenting needs related to this category were interviewed. See the methods and limitations for further explanation.

Other

When this category was selected, the researcher may have not have been clear where a presenting need was categorized or the category was unavailable in the existing list. If the category was unavailable, the researcher was able to include a category. Common categories specified include “Education,” “Legal,” or other.