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Self employment
“Employment is a way for people with disabilities to give to the community and see what (we) have to offer.

We’re givers, not just takers.”

-Max Barrows, SABE
What is Employment First?

A commitment by states that all individuals:
• are capable of performing work in typical integrated employment settings,
• should receive employment related services and supports as opposed to facility-based and non-work day services, and
• be paid at minimum or prevailing wage rates.
States with Employment First Efforts

National policy influences

CMS Employment Guidance
CMS Settings Rule
Olmstead Decision
Department of Justice
WIOA
How many people are employed?

- No disability: 73.6%
- Any disability: 34.3%
- National Core Indicators 2015-16: 19.1%
- IDD Agency Survey 2015: 18.6%
Number in Employment and Day Services

Source: ICI National Survey of State IDD Agency Day and Employment Services
Participation in integrated employment services varies widely

Source: ICI National Survey of State IDD Agencies 2015
Only **14%** of all day and employment funding goes towards helping people work in the community.

That means that **86%** of the funding is spent on non-work or facility-based supports.
47% (or more) of individuals who don’t work want a job
Why should we value research?
RRTC on Advancing Employment

4 Organizing Themes

• Meaningful engagement & involvement of individuals and families in employment planning
• Provider transformation
• Capacity of employment consultants
• State policy and strategy that prioritizes employment
Meaningful engagement of individuals and families- What is the vision?

- Employment as a lifelong conversation.
- Information and support available on a “just in time” basis
- Types and pathways for information and support are: effective, accessible, simple
Background

Families can be the most influential part of successful employment and life planning, yet often lack the knowledge to move employment from an abstract thought to a real job.
Research questions

• What does the literature say about successful strategies in engaging families in employment?

• What kind of information is most useful for families?
The studies

• Scoping literature review
• In-person and online forums and focus groups
• Family engagement intervention (in process)
Key findings: Engagement strategies

Training
  • Explore, Prepare, Act
  • FEAT

Online resources
  • Let’s Get to Work (WI)

Planning tools
  • The Arc’s Build Your Plan
  • LifeCourse tools

Peer to peer outreach

Social media
Key findings

**Literature**

- Family modeling shapes employment experiences
- Engaging families supports employment focus
- Family/individual demographics are related to employment

**Forums**

- Confusing guidance and low systems expectations
- Navigation is hard: Misalignments & discontinuities
- System lacks capacity
- More success when rely on self and family
Feeling frustrated with the system

“I brought my daughter to an agency four times and nobody ever followed through. It was disappointing [and she never did get a job].”
Intervention with The Arc – ongoing

• Center for Future Planning Tool
• Goal is enrollment for 100 families (PwD age 14-24)

• 3 part strategy
  • Facebook reminders to log in/use the tool
  • Encouraging/inspiring messages about employment
  • Information and referral
Effective employment consultants-
What’s the vision?

- Clear yet flexible practice model.
- Efficient approach to providing implementation support.
Background

- Extensive literature on effective supports practices
- 35,000 employment consultants, nationally (estimated)
- Majority of employment consultants assisting up to 5 job seekers with IDD getting jobs per year
- Limited implementation of best practice
Research questions

• What strategies do effective employment consultants use?

• How do consultants make decisions about which support strategies to use when assisting individuals to find and maintain jobs?

• How do employment consultants actually spend their time?
The studies

• In-depth interviews with employment consultants, supervisors, families and individuals

• Employment consultant intervention (in process)
What is an Employment Consultant?

- assists job seekers with disabilities explore, find, & secure employment.

- activities: getting to know job seekers, finding job openings, engaging employers, & facilitating transition to a job.

- Other common titles:
  - Job Developer
  - Employment Specialist
  - Employment Navigator
  - Business Consultant
  - And MORE!
“…Regardless of the job seeker’s level of motivation, skill, experience, attitude, and support system, his or her ability to get a job will often depend on the effectiveness of employment specialists. Simply stated, if they are good, job seekers get jobs. If they are not, the barriers to employment for job seekers can become insurmountable…”

Quotes from the field

“...I’ve got to establish some ground rules from the beginning: number one ground rule is ‘I’m not here to find you a job. You and I together as a team are going to find a job’...”

Preparing the ground
Quotes from the field

“...So always listen to the individual first and make sure that their voice is heard because it's very easy for that voice to get lost amongst agencies, the family, the state, the employer, if they're employed, other various community members and team members... Their voice needs to be weighed more than any other.”
"... we've done a better job at matching people in their jobs, now the job coach’s role has really shifted to sort of connecting the person directly with the employer...they're there to make connections so that they can back out of the job pretty quickly..."
Key findings: What matters most?

• Build trust with the job seeker and their family

• Find out what the job seeker wants out of life and seek out employment that fits their vision

• Make decisions about support strategies based on the individual preferences and support needs

• Be creative in the job search. Look for tasks, not jobs

• Network with employers and community businesses

• Involve the job seeker in every step of the process
Comprehensive model of employment support

Get to know job seeker
- Job search criteria

Build trust
- Engage job seeker/family

Supports planning
- Smooth job entry

Job MATCH

Find jobs/tasks
- Job offer

HIRE

Support after hire
- Retain/advance
“Without data, you are just another person with an opinion” Sir Ken Robinson

“A first step toward effectiveness is to record actual time use...” Peter Drucker

“If you don’t know where you are going, you’ll end up somewhere else” Yogi Berra
• **What?** How do employment consultants invest their time across support activities?

• **Who?** How much time do employment consultants spend interacting with job seekers and others, before hire?

• **Where?** How much time do employment consultants spend in office vs. other settings, when supporting job seekers before hire?
Source of the data

• Data are from 71 employment consultants from 38 providers in 19 states

• Selected because they supported job seekers with IDD in finding paid individual jobs

• Submitted data daily, from June 1st, 2016 to February 28, 2017 (Ongoing through June 2017)
How do employment consultants invest their time?

- Not-employment: 14% Jun, 15% Jul, 14% Aug, 14% Sep, 16% Oct, 17% Nov, 14% Dec
- Administrative activities: 29% Jun, 29% Jul, 27% Aug, 30% Sep, 28% Oct, 27% Nov, 28% Dec
- Support after hire: 26% Jun, 23% Jul, 25% Aug, 25% Sep, 25% Oct, 26% Nov, 25% Dec
- Other before hire: 11% Jun, 12% Jul, 13% Aug, 12% Sep, 12% Oct, 10% Nov, 12% Dec
- Finding jobs: 13% Jun, 14% Jul, 13% Aug, 12% Sep, 14% Oct, 14% Nov, 12% Dec
- Getting to know: 7% Jun, 8% Jul, 8% Aug, 7% Sep, 6% Oct, 6% Nov, 8% Dec
How much time do employment consultants spend interacting with job seekers and others?

![Graph showing time spent interacting]

- **Job seekers:** 71% in June, 75% in July, 78% in August, 76% in September, 73% in October, 66% in November, 68% in December, 7% in January, 10% in February

- **Family members:** 15% in June, 7% in July, 9% in August, 11% in September, 12% in October, 13% in November, 10% in December, 7% in January, 5% in February

- **Business personnel:** 7% in June, 10% in July, 5% in August, 8% in September, 10% in October, 12% in November, 13% in December, 12% in January, 13% in February

- **Other:** 10% in June, 7% in July, 7% in August, 12% in September, 7% in October, 10% in November, 10% in December, 5% in January, 8% in February

- **None:**
How much time do employment consultants spend in office vs. other settings?

The diagram shows the percentage of time spent in different settings each month. For example, in June, 41% is spent in the office, 9% in other settings, 26% in community settings, and 21% in businesses. The percentage distribution varies by month, with some months showing a higher percentage in the office and others showing a higher percentage in other settings. The data indicates a significant variation in how much time is spent in different settings across the months.
Where are we going?
Candy break
Provider capacity - what is the vision?

Organizational restructuring for providers that promotes community employment
Background

Organizational transformation = alignment between values, vision and goals but:

- 89% of providers said facility-based programs necessary
- Staff experience confusion about roles, feel unprepared to support employers, lack training

Change driven internally and not by state goals and policy
Supporting providers to evolve how they deliver services

Through:
• a framework for building capacity
• a toolkit to guide organizations
• an efficient scalable strategy (a facilitated, peer-to-peer learning community) for supporting change across networks of providers
Research Activities

- Delphi panel to identify critical elements
- Case studies research to show those elements on the ground
- Development and refinement of toolkit
- Pilot test toolkit and peer to peer intervention strategy
Purpose of the Delphi Panel

• Getting a group of experts to agree on a topic
• “What is most important for providers during transformation?”
• 2 rounds (identify, rank)
• What does the feedback tell us?
Purpose of the Case Studies

• examples of what Delphi characteristics look like on the ground
• provide depth as to how the characteristics can be implemented
• Identify examples and resources to populate toolkit
• provide state systems context as related provider experience
Audience Participation Time!

• multiple and diverse community partnerships
• active, person-centered job placement process
• agency culture that values inclusion
• holistic approach to supports
• strong internal and external communications plan
• reallocated and restructured resources
• clear and consistent goals
• effective performance measurement, quality assurance, & program oversight
• focus on customer engagement
• ongoing investment in staff professional development
1. Clear and consistent goals

2. An agency culture that values inclusion

3. An active, person-centered job placement process
Development of peer to peer intervention - Provider Employment Leadership Network
Aligning policy and practice across agencies – what is the vision?

Systems intentionally align practices (what we do) with a priority for employment (what we want) and bring components to scale (availability for all)
“just calling your state an ‘Employment First’ state is not enough; it’s when everyone who wants a job, actually has a job.” (SABE, 2017).
Research questions

• What are the characteristics of “higher performing” employment systems?

• What is the relationship between systems’ characteristics and employment outcomes?
The studies

• Development of state rankings across 3 systems (education, VR, IDD)
• Case study research of the “highest performers”
• National Core Indicator data analysis
• Digging deeper: policy analysis with state examples
Actualizing Employment First: Higher Performing States Model

- Catalysts
  - Leadership
  - Values

- Strategy
  - Policy & Goals
  - Financing
  - Training & TA
  - Service Innovation
  - Outcome Data

- Integrated Jobs

- Interagency Collaboration

Hall et al (2007)
Employment system composite indicator

Holistic view of overall performance based on IDD, VR, and Education data

Questions

• What is the relationship between state employment system characteristics and employment outcomes?
• How do specific Employment First efforts intersect?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDD Agency</td>
<td>• Percent receives integrated employment services</td>
<td>ICI Survey of State IDD Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 points</td>
<td>• Ratio: Participates in IE to state population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VR Agency</td>
<td>• Percent exited with employment of those who received services</td>
<td>RSA 911. Individuals with intellectual disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 points</td>
<td>• Ratio: Exited into employment to state population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Percent exited with employment of those determined eligible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Percent exited into employment at SGA or above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Change in number reporting own income as largest source of support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>• Percent competitively employed or in some other employment</td>
<td>American Community Survey: Age 22-28 with cognitive disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 points</td>
<td>• Ratio of the number employed to state population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Percent enrolled in higher education or other postsecondary education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Percent of income that was from work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Key findings: composite indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Overall CI Score</th>
<th>IDD Score</th>
<th>VR Score</th>
<th>Education Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>47.38</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td>10.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH</td>
<td>47.26</td>
<td>22.76</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>14.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VT</td>
<td>46.88</td>
<td>22.76</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>10.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>44.77</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>10.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>44.26</td>
<td>22.84</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>10.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA</td>
<td>42.48</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>13.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>41.98</td>
<td>21.67</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>40.51</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>11.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>39.78</td>
<td>14.47</td>
<td>13.92</td>
<td>11.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>39.60</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>6.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Top Performers Across Systems and States

#### Top 10 states based on CI Scores (ranked descending order)

- Maryland
- New Hampshire
- Vermont
- Oregon
- Washington
- Iowa
- Oklahoma
- South Dakota
- Colorado
- Delaware

#### Top IDD System Performers

- Maryland
- New Hampshire
- Vermont
- Oregon
- Washington
- Oklahoma

#### Top VR System Performers

- Maryland
- South Dakota
- Colorado
- Delaware

#### Top Education System Performers

- New Hampshire
- Iowa
- South Dakota
- Colorado
"No, you back off! I was here before you!"
Key findings: case study research

• Success over the long-term depends on a cadre of stakeholders
• Leadership is most effective when distributed across multiple levels of responsibility
• Consistent allocation of funds for long-term services for youth exiting schools is critical. Cements expectation for collaboration between school and adult service systems.
Key findings: NCI data analysis

Employment Setting and Guardianship

- No paid job
- Facility-based work
- Group employment in community
- Individual employment in community

Guardian vs. No guardian
Key findings: NCI data analysis

Gender and Employment Setting

- No paid job
- Facility-based work
- Group employment in community
- Individual employment in community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No paid job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility-based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group employment in community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual employment in community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key findings: state level policy analyses

• Leadership through setting values, direction and creating the infrastructure for change
• Support coordination/case management to increase prioritization of employment
• Managing the employment process including sequencing funding with VR
Where are we going?
Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Advancing Employment for Individuals with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities

A project of ThinkWork!

at the Institute for Community Inclusion, UMass Boston

www.ThinkWork.org

Allison.hall@umb.edu