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2013 Resident Satisfaction

Findings of a March 2013 Resident Satisfaction Survey Conducted for the Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara

Introduction

The Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara (HACSC) began conducting annual Resident Satisfaction surveys in 2012 as part of a process to ensure that it stays in touch with its residents even as the agency transitions away from direct property management. Beginning in 2010, HACSC has transferred responsibility for managing its properties from an in-house affiliate company to third party management agents. The final properties were transferred to third party management in mid-2012. In order to gauge the ongoing success of this new way of operating, HACSC conducts an annual survey, asking residents about all aspects of the physical condition of their homes and the quality of the services they receive. The 2013 survey responses provide a snapshot of residents’ level of satisfaction, and highlight common issues and concerns across properties. The results also provide insight into particular strengths or weaknesses at individual properties. In addition to being a useful tool to help HACSC asset managers and leadership stay in touch with residents and their concerns, survey results are also incorporated in HACSC’s annual reporting to HUD.

HACSC, with the support of its property management and resident services partners, was able to engage even more residents in this year’s survey. As in 2012, residents generally gave their housing high ratings. Some issues, for instance smoking on the premises¹, were cited less often, while parking-related concerns continue to be prevalent.

¹ Smoking is not allowed at any site, except the Opportunity Center. Discussions are underway about changing some or all units at that site to non-smoking units.
Methodology

The survey questions were the same as in 2012, which allows HACSC to note changes and to flag emerging issues. The survey asks residents sixteen multiple choice questions: three about the physical condition of their apartment, interior common areas and exterior areas; three about the quality of management services; four about maintenance services; four about resident support services and three about overall indicators of satisfaction. The survey concludes with one open-ended request for comments or suggestions. A copy of the survey template is attached (Attachment 1.)

After notifying residents of the upcoming survey through resident meetings at the beginning of the year, surveys were mailed to all HACSC households in late February. With the addition of the Siefert shared housing site, this year’s survey included 2,721 households in 31 properties. Management companies were also informed about the process and provided with flyers to encourage residents to participate. Residents were given two weeks to mail back their completed surveys, though survey responses received after the deadline date were accepted and included in the results.

The surveys, along with pre-stamped return envelopes, were provided to all households in English, Spanish, Vietnamese and Chinese. The Chinese version was added in response to requests made by residents in last year’s survey. A local mail house distributed and collected the surveys and did the initial data entry of the responses. HACSC Asset Management staff compiled the open-ended comments with the assistance of translators.

Response Rate

Once again we are pleased that so many residents took the trouble to respond to the survey. A total of 1,195 out of 2,721 households responded to the Resident Satisfaction Survey, a response rate of 44%, up six percentage points from 2012. The response rate from HACSC’s senior properties was 54%, from family properties, 34%, and from its one special needs property the response rate was also 34%. Residents from all 31 properties responded.
This report will first examine the overall level of satisfaction of respondents across the portfolio as a whole. Next we will analyze the survey results specific to senior properties and to family properties. Within each of the subsets of properties we will highlight noteworthy differences – areas in which residents of particular properties expressed significantly higher or lower opinions about one or more aspects of their housing than average for that type of property. Charts summarizing the resident responses from each of the properties participating in the 2013 Resident Satisfaction Survey are shown in Attachment 2. The average level of resident satisfaction was about the same for properties managed by the two main property management agents.

Levels of Satisfaction: All Respondents

Overall, HACSC residents report a high level of satisfaction.

- 88% of respondents strongly agree or agree with the statement: “I am satisfied with the value of my apartment for the rent I pay.”
- 85% of respondents strongly agree or agree “This housing provides a safe, secure environment.”
- 89% of respondents strongly agree or agree “I would recommend this housing to a friend or family member.”

These results are one to four percentage points lower than last year’s survey. When questioned about satisfaction with the value of their apartment, residents of several properties responded with satisfaction only 60-80% of the time, thereby lowering the average.

Seventy-four percent (813 out of 1,098) of respondents reported that they had requested maintenance within the past year, and maintenance responsiveness, courtesy and quality of the repair were all rated highly, and slightly above last year’s rating. Looking

---

2 Blossom (67%), Huff (63%), Pinmore (69%) Rivertown (73%) and Willows (75%) among the family properties, and El Parador (78%) and Villa Hermosa (64%) among the senior properties.
at the detailed comparison between 2012 and 2013 (Attachment 3) reveals that the senior properties’ increased satisfaction with maintenance is the source of the overall improvement.

For many sites, this was first full year that the property has had on-site resident services. Lifesteps is the services provider at all sites except for the Opportunity Center, where InnVision Shelter Network provides resident services. Both service providers received high marks from residents. Almost one thousand residents answered the question about whether they had used resident services this year; a quarter of them had. Over five hundred residents went on to rate the services, and ratings were at the 90-93% satisfaction level³.

The diversity of the population that HACSC serves is evident in the survey comments.⁴ Within properties, management must cope with multiple languages and habits. One resident reported that she could not read a memo about new parking rules, and as a result her visiting family member’s car got towed. At another property an English-speaker suggested additional signage to explain rules about garbage and recycling. Some residents ask for more ethnic and cultural-specific events while others say they feel unwelcome at community activities dominated by another group. Generational issues also arise, whether it is about teens congregating in public areas at night, or elderly residents concerned that young management staff does not understand their needs.

All the instances of "outliers" - properties that exceed or fall short of the average response by 10 percentage points or more within property type categories - have been reviewed by staff to see what is causing that property to stand out from its peers. Certain problems are more intractable than others, however, outlier ratings combined

³ We ask respondents if they have used Resident Services and allow even those who say they have not used services to rate the ease of access, courtesy and effectiveness of services.
⁴ We added Chinese language surveys this year because of a high demand last year. HACSC is required to survey in English, Spanish and Vietnamese. HACSC must provide translation services for key conversations, when requested at federally subsidized sites.
with resident comments are a good indicator of an exceptionally well-run property, or a property in which a personnel or policy issue needs to be addressed.

Some of the intractable issues raised in the survey include parking limitations for residents and/or for their guests. Most properties have relatively few spaces per unit, and that can cause widespread dissatisfaction. On the bright side, several survey respondents mentioned that they were using discount transit passes, or asked if their property could obtain discount passes, which may help residents become less car-dependent. This year residents of some properties also reported more concerns about parking security - car break-ins and thefts. The fact that this is a growing concern may indicate that the problem is related to the poor economy or to neighborhood issues.

Management should certainly follow up to make sure they understand the situation, but it may be not fully within their control to resolve. One other difficult issue to resolve is the complaints and anxiety about rent increases at several properties that do not have project-based rent subsidies. Residents, especially seniors, spoke about how hard it is to pay rent increases and asked for relief. HACSC has a delicate balancing act, to ensure the properties have adequate operating funds and replacement reserves while recognizing that some residents have a very limited ability to pay increased rent.

On issues where management has greater control, managers seem to be making progress in enforcing the no-smoking rules at HACSC properties. While some violations were cited by this year’s survey respondents, complaints were much fewer. On the other hand, there were more complaints about residents not picking up after their animals. While HACSC has tightened its policies about allowing pets, HACSC is required to allow disabled residents to have service or companion animals as a reasonable accommodation of their disability.

Lastly, there is a persistent issue about long-tenured residents asking for new carpet, painting or other upgrades. Unless a property is slated for major renovations, rehabbing occupied units presents both budgeting and logistical challenges. Perhaps during the upcoming annual budgeting process HACSC and management agents can review the unit rehab history at each property and determine what can be done to address this issue. Incidentally, when residents complained about either common area carpet or the
carpet in their own units, they often referred to health problems that could be caused by old, dirty carpets. There is growing awareness about respiratory issues that can be exasperated by carpeting, and combined with some of the pet-related issues people mention in common areas, it may be time for HACSC to consider alternative flooring options.

HACSC and site staff made a special effort to improve the response rate at the Opportunity Center this year. Last year only eleven of the 89 residents of this special need property responded; this year that number grew to 30, and the level of satisfaction
was generally higher than reported last year (see the Opportunity Center chart in Attachment 2 for more details.)

**Senior Properties**

The survey response rate from HACSC’s senior properties improved from 50% to 54% in this year’s survey. Seven hundred twenty five seniors in HACSC’s twelve senior properties responded to the survey. Respondents rated their housing equally high or within a percentage point or two from the prior year. The generally high level of satisfaction of HACSC’s senior housing residents made it harder for exceedingly high performers to stand out, but it is worth noting that:

- Cypress and Sunset residents are especially satisfied with the value of their housing
- Lenzen residents are especially satisfied with the safety of their housing
- Residents at El Parador and Lenzen are especially satisfied with their grounds and parking areas.

One senior property had generally less favorable satisfaction ratings than the others: Avenida residents rated their housing at least 10 percentage points lower than average on eight questions. In addition, DeRose residents gave lower ratings in several areas related to the physical condition of apartment and lobby, which spills over into residents’ opinion of management and maintenance responsiveness. Lack of visitor parking at Corde Terra Village is a big issue.
Family Properties

While residents were positive overall about their housing, the rating levels have dipped on HACSC’s family housing properties. Residents rated the quality of their apartment, lobby area, and grounds at least six percentage points lower than last year. And nine percentage points fewer residents agreed with the statement that "My housing is safe and secure"; satisfaction with safety dropped from 90% to 81% at the family properties this year. Three properties had markedly lower levels of satisfaction with safety - Blossom Way (56%) Huff (60%) and Lucretia (63%) - and Corde Terra Apartments, whose 140 responses represents a large proportion of the family surveys, dropped from 99% satisfaction with safety down to 91% satisfaction. Comments indicate that the
source of dissatisfaction at Corde Terra is related to lack of secure parking areas. Almost two dozen residents commented on this, and two residents reported that their cars had been broken into multiple times.

Most other satisfactions levels were also lower than in 2012 at the family properties, though the change was less significant. On the positive side, residents of family properties rated resident services more highly than in 2012.

As with the senior properties, long-tenured residents ask for their units to be refurbished (“Carpet has not been replaced since 1999.”) A few long time residents reported that their units had been renovated and thanked management and HACSC for these improvements.

Property-specific observations include:

- Corde Terra Apartments is the largest property, and has a relatively high response rate. The 120 responses from Corde Terra represent 28% of all the responses from family sites. Therefore the fact that Corde Terra residents are very satisfied with property conditions and overall measures tends to mask lower levels of satisfaction at other properties, specifically:
- Blossom River: Was within ±10 percentage points of average on the Quality, Management and Maintenance questions but rated Services and Overall Measures greater than 10 points below average.
- Huff Gardens: A majority of respondents are dissatisfied on almost all measures.
- Villa San Pedro: Less than average level of satisfaction with Conditions, and with Maintenance.
- Lucretia Gardens: All respondents were satisfied on all measures with the exception of Safety, where only 63% were satisfied.
- Pinmore: Lower than average level of satisfaction with Apartment Quality, Quality of Repairs, and Value.
Follow Up Action Plan

As noted above, HACSC Asset Management staff and the property management agents review the survey results, and follow up with individual residents about individual requests.

In addition to responding to residents one-on-one, HACSC and the management companies will collaborate to produce an article reporting on survey results for upcoming resident newsletters. We believe that the continued high response rate to the annual survey reflects residents’ trust that they are being heard and that HACSC and its
property management and resident services partners are trying to respond to the issues that residents are concerned about.

HACSC asset managers and the regional property managers will address the broader site-specific issues identified by residents to see what can be done about improved security in parking areas, multilingual communications, etcetera. At a portfolio level, the top priority issues and opportunities emerging from the 2013 survey include:

- To explore resident interest and feasibility of transit passes. What would it cost, how much of a discount can HACSC provide, what would be the system for distributing passes? Along these same lines, is it feasible to obtain a CarShare vehicle at one or more of the sites?
- To develop portfolio level goals and guidelines about unit rehabs for long-tenured residents. Review unit rehab history and evaluate the feasibility of addressing unit rehab needs in the annual budgeting process.
- To examine trends in pet and service animal ownership among residents. Are there more animals at the properties, or are there other reasons for the growing number of complaints? Review related policies and procedures.
- To look into green alternatives to common area carpeting and carpeting within units.
- To examine the outlier properties and to monitor property management services and rehab needs at these sites throughout the year.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Survey Template

Attachment 2: Property Profiles

Attachment 3: Comparison Between 2012 and 2013 Results
# 2013 Tenant Satisfaction Survey

The goal of the Housing Authority of Santa Clara County (HACSC) is to provide exceptional housing to our tenants. Your comments and suggestions are helpful to us. Please assist us by completing the following brief questionnaire and returning it to us in the stamped envelope provided. A private research company is conducting this survey and your answers will be completely confidential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How satisfied are you with the following:</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Not At All Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The quality and condition of your apartment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The quality and condition of the lobby and other indoor areas?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The quality and condition of the outside grounds and parking lot?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How satisfied are you with the following:</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Not At All Satisfied</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Ease of contacting the site manager?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Site manager’s responsiveness to your questions and concerns?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Adequate written communication from management?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Have you requested any repairs to your apartment in the past year?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you requested repair(s), how satisfied were you with the following:</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Response time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Courtesy of staff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Quality of the repair?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. Have you made use of optional resident services in the past year (e.g. afterschool program, referral to education or health services)?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you used resident services, how satisfied were you with the following:</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Response time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Courtesy of staff?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Ability to help your situation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do you agree with the following statements:</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I am satisfied with the value of my apartment for the rent I pay.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. This housing provides a safe, secure environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I would recommend this housing to a friend or family member.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments and Suggestions:

As noted above, this survey is being conducted by a private research company and your responses are completely confidential. However, if you would like a personal follow up, please provide the following information:

Yes, I want a Housing Authority representative to contact me regarding unsatisfactory conditions in my apartment or at my property.

Name ________________________
Address_______________________

Please return your survey by **March 10th**. Thank you for your assistance!

To contact the Housing Authority about this survey, please call 408-361-4675
ATTACHMENT 2: Property Profiles

(Alphabetical order)
Bracher Senior Apts  
Senior Property Managed by FPI  
Response Rate: 65% (47/72)

**Physical Conditions**
- Apartment
- Lobby & Common Area
- Grounds & Parking

**Maintenance Quality**
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Quality of Repair

**Services Quality**
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Ability to Help

**Overall Assessment**
- Good Value
- Safe Environment
- Would Recommend

---

**Graphs**

- Physical Conditions
- Maintenance Quality
- Services Quality
- Overall Assessment
DeRose Gardens  
Senior Property Managed by FPI  
Response Rate: 46% (35/76)

Physical Conditions
- Apartment
- Lobby & Common Area
- Grounds & Parking

Maintenance Quality
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Quality of Repair

Services Quality
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Ability to Help

Management Quality
- Ease of Contacting
- Responsiveness
- Written Communication

Overall Assessment
- Good Value
- Safe Environment
- Would Recommend
Lucretia Gardens
Family Property Managed by JSCo
Response Rate: 50% (8/16)

Physical Conditions

- Apartment
- Lobby & Common Area
- Grounds & Parking

Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Needs Imp | Not At All Satisfied | N/A

5
4
3
2
1
0

Maintenance Quality

- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Quality of Repair

Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Needs Imp | Not At All Satisfied | N/A

3.5
3
2.5
2
1.5
1
0.5
0

Services Quality

- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Ability to Help

Very Satisfied | Satisfied | Needs Imp | Not At All Satisfied | N/A

2.5
2
1.5
1
0.5
0

Overall Assessment

- Good Value
- Safe Environment
- Would Recommend

Strongly Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly Disagree | N/A

7
6
5
4
3
2
1
0
Opportunity Center  Sp Needs Property Managed by CHDC  Response Rate: 34% (30/89)

Physical Conditions
- Apartment
- Lobby & Common Area
- Grounds & Parking

Management Quality
- Ease of Contacting
- Responsiveness
- Written Communication

Maintenance Quality
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Quality of Repair

Services Quality
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Ability to Help

Overall Assessment
- Good Value
- Safe Environment
- Would Recommend

Response Rate: 34% (30/89)
Pinmore Gardens
Family Property Managed by FPI
Response Rate: 27% (14/51)

Physical Conditions
- Apartment
- Lobby & Common Area
- Grounds & Parking

Maintenance Quality
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Quality of Repair

Services Quality
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Ability to Help

Management Quality
- Ease of Contacting
- Responsiveness
- Written Communication

Overall Assessment
- Good Value
- Safe Environment
- Would Recommend
Rincon Gardens
Senior Property Managed by JSCo
Response Rate: 58% (116/200)

Physical Conditions
- Apartment
- Lobby & Common Area
- Grounds & Parking

Maintenance Quality
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Quality of Repair

Management Quality
- Ease of Contacting
- Responsiveness
- Written Communication

Services Quality
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Ability to Help

Overall Assessment
- Good Value
- Safe Environment
- Would Recommend
Villa Hermosa Senior Property Managed by JSCo Response Rate: 53% (53/100)

Physical Conditions
- Apartment
- Lobby & Common Area
- Grounds & Parking

Maintenance Quality
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Quality of Repair

Management Quality
- Ease of Contacting
- Responsiveness
- Written Communication

Services Quality
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Ability to Help

Overall Assessment
- Good Value
- Safe Environment
- Would Recommend
The Willows  
Family Property Managed by FPI  
Response Rate: 28% (13/47)

**Physical Conditions**
- Apartment
- Lobby & Common Area
- Grounds & Parking

**Maintenance Quality**
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Quality of Repair

**Management Quality**
- Ease of Contacting
- Responsiveness
- Written Communication

**Services Quality**
- Response Time
- Courtesy
- Ability to Help

**Overall Assessment**
- Good Value
- Safe Environment
- Would Recommend
## ATTACHMENT 3: Comparison Between 2012 and 2013 Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Q1 Quality of Apt</th>
<th>Q2 Quality of Lobby</th>
<th>Q3 Quality of Grounds/Parking</th>
<th>Q4 Ease of Contact</th>
<th>Q5 Mgmt Response</th>
<th>Q6 Written Communications</th>
<th>Q8 Maint Response</th>
<th>Q9 MaintCourtesy</th>
<th>Q10 Quality of Repair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL SITES</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>891 87%</td>
<td>848 86%</td>
<td>782 78%</td>
<td>899 89%</td>
<td>869 87%</td>
<td>863 88%</td>
<td>616 83%</td>
<td>693 92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1008 85%</td>
<td>970 85%</td>
<td>872 77%</td>
<td>1025 88%</td>
<td>988 85%</td>
<td>986 88%</td>
<td>815 86%</td>
<td>879 93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>268 85%</td>
<td>269 88%</td>
<td>237 76%</td>
<td>272 86%</td>
<td>266 86%</td>
<td>266 88%</td>
<td>190 78%</td>
<td>226 89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>318 76%</td>
<td>310 79%</td>
<td>285 70%</td>
<td>355 85%</td>
<td>342 82%</td>
<td>341 84%</td>
<td>269 78%</td>
<td>299 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>615 89%</td>
<td>570 85%</td>
<td>539 79%</td>
<td>619 90%</td>
<td>598 88%</td>
<td>589 89%</td>
<td>422 86%</td>
<td>462 94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>657 91%</td>
<td>626 89%</td>
<td>562 82%</td>
<td>637 89%</td>
<td>616 88%</td>
<td>615 90%</td>
<td>518 91%</td>
<td>551 96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL NEEDS</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>8 73%</td>
<td>9 82%</td>
<td>6 75%</td>
<td>8 80%</td>
<td>5 50%</td>
<td>8 73%</td>
<td>4 67%</td>
<td>5 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>24 80%</td>
<td>24 80%</td>
<td>18 64%</td>
<td>26 90%</td>
<td>22 79%</td>
<td>21 78%</td>
<td>32 94%</td>
<td>21 88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Q12 Services Response</th>
<th>Q13 Services Courtesy</th>
<th>Q14 Services Ability to Help</th>
<th>Q15 Satisfied with Value</th>
<th>Q16 Satisfied with Safety</th>
<th>Q17 Would Recommend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL SITES</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>300 90%</td>
<td>309 90%</td>
<td>281 85%</td>
<td>880 90%</td>
<td>869 89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>366 92%</td>
<td>386 93%</td>
<td>355 89%</td>
<td>1008 88%</td>
<td>968 85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>92 89%</td>
<td>99 88%</td>
<td>87 82%</td>
<td>275 90%</td>
<td>269 90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>127 89%</td>
<td>133 92%</td>
<td>125 87%</td>
<td>352 87%</td>
<td>326 81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENIOR</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>199 90%</td>
<td>202 91%</td>
<td>187 88%</td>
<td>597 90%</td>
<td>593 89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>222 93%</td>
<td>237 94%</td>
<td>215 90%</td>
<td>626 90%</td>
<td>609 87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL NEEDS</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>9 90%</td>
<td>8 80%</td>
<td>7 70%</td>
<td>8 80%</td>
<td>7 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>14 93%</td>
<td>14 93%</td>
<td>13 87%</td>
<td>21 75%</td>
<td>24 86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>