June 30, 1986

TO: Members, Governor's Planning Council on Developmental Disabilities

FROM: Ronald E. Kaliszewski
Grant Administrator

REGARDING: Reports by Employment Related Activities Grant Recipients

On June 25, 1986, the Grant Review Committee scheduled a meeting to hear from the projects that were funded this year. Eleven of the twelve grant recipients attended and presented information on their project and on problems (challenges) that they encountered while implementing their project. In addition, some made recommendations that, if implemented, would make it easier to carry out employment in the community.

Kaposia--presentation by Jackie Mlynarczyk. See attached.

Rise--presentation by Don Lavin and Hans Swemle. Since October 1, 1985, 124 persons have been served as a result of the grant. Thirty-two who were placed last year were supported this year. Forty-eight have been placed this year, 26 work in enclave settings and 22 work in the community at scattered sites. Six are on the waiting list for placement. There are five enclaves at which the persons work an average of 30 hours per week and earn on the average $1.60 per hour. The scattered site placements average 28.8 hours per week and earn an average of $3.65 per hour. Since October 1, 1984 (the beginning date for the first grant to Rise), there has been a 23% reduction in the number of person in sheltered employment at Rise. As a result of the achievements made by persons who have been placed, some of the staff have changed their perceptions about what is possible. The "challenges" that have been encountered include the following:

- The area served by Rise has very limited public transportation. It has been difficult to get persons to the scattered site employment locations.
- Some employers are not interested in employing persons who are disabled.

- Students leaving the school system are not well prepared for the transition.

- Some parents are unwilling to allow their children to take a risk.

- Existing funding sources are too rigid.

- There is a lack of qualified staff. Also, there is a high burn out rate. It is also difficult to communicate with staff who are working at scattered sites and difficult to provide adequate back-up for vacations, sick leave etc.

Mankato Rehab Center--Presentation by Pamela Brower. The real issue is not that community placement is more costly, but that the persons coming into the facility, as a result of openings that have been created by placing persons into the community, are more disabled and therefore more costly. Since October 1, 1985, 28 persons have been referred to the project, 22 have been accepted into the project, and 16 have been placed. Those who are placed average 20 to 25 hours of work a week and earn an average of $3.35 to $3.50 per hour. All are earning at minimum wage or better. This summer there will be a summer youth program that will last seven weeks and involve 19 school age youth. Each day the youth will spend two hours learning a job skill and at least 3 hours working in an enclave using the skill. All will be paid minimum wage for the hours worked. Among the challenges that were encountered are the following:

- Working with a large number of funding sources and agencies has been trying. Keeping track of the sources and keeping the books straight has been more time consuming than anticipated.

- The counties do not always understand the nature of the follow-along services. One county suggested that the county case managers could take over this function.

- Transportation is difficult to coordinate.

- Parents have shown no interest in participating in an advisory capacity. However, parent support groups have been well attended.
Because of the way referrals are made to this project, there has been some difficulty finding persons who are severely disabled.

There are disincentives to working but they can be managed. The income doesn't always directly benefit the worker, but does save federal money.

Because of the many organizations involved in the project there is some overlapping. For example, there are four intake processes.

As employment needs are satisfied, social needs emerge.

Some employers who have participated in the program are calling and asking for more persons who are disabled to come to work.

The persons who are employed are very positive about their improved quality of life.

Interstate Rehab Center--presentation made by Dave Wooden. This project is being done with participation from the Goodhue County DAC. Since October 1, 1984, 29 persons have been placed in supported employment in the community. Twelve were placed the first year, and 17 the second year. The retention rate has been 90%. The following challenges were encountered:

There was some difficulty with the school district early in the program. A transitional model has been established and the situation is now better.

Unions have not been cooperative. Advocacy needs to be done at the state level with the unions.

It has not been possible to fade as soon as estimated with persons who are more severely disabled. Therefore, there has been more use made of crews.

There needs to be competency standards established for work trainers. In addition, the colleges are not into teaching supported work.

There is a great deal of confusion over Department of Labor regulations. Compliance officers are not consistent.
- It is difficult to communicate with staff who are working out of the facility. It is difficult to provide back-up for vacations and sick leave. There is a high rate of burnout.

- Transportation for clients has been difficult.

- The work is not always in an integrated setting. Some of the persons who are working have also moved to less restrictive settings. This has been both good and bad. In making the move they have lost some of their social contacts. This also occurs when working out of the facility.

The following recommendations were made:

- There is a need for cooperation from all agencies. Clear lines of responsibility need to be established as well as formal lines of communication.

- There should be an evaluation of what has happened. Some concern was expressed about the results of a resession and lay-offs of people who have been placed. If the facility has filled the slots behind the persons who were placed, where will they go if jobs in the community are no longer available?

Southwest Regional Development Commission--presentation made by Gloria Vande Brake. See attached.

ORC Industries--presentation made by Bill Harris and Wayne Peterson. Since October 1, 1985, 29 persons have been placed in community employment. A video-tape of some of the persons working in the community was shown. The challenges encountered included the following:

- There has been some difficulty finding work in the community at minimum wage. Efforts will now concentrate on sub-minimum positions. Many of the jobs are at less than 20 hours per week.

- Some of the persons placed have lost benefits. Some have taken jobs working fewer hours.

Freeborn County Alpha DAC--presentation made by Jeannie Snyder and Paula Durban. This project involves facilities in four different cities, Albert Lea, Owatonna, Austin, and Dodge Center. In order to serve the four facilities the person hired with the grant (Paula) spent a concentrated period of time in each location. As a result some sites are
farther along than others. In Albert Lea five persons are placed and average 7.6 hours of work each week. All persons earn minimum wage. In Owatonna two persons have been placed and two will be starting soon. The persons placed work six hours a week on a crew and earn sub-minimum wages. In Austin two persons work on a crew 21 hours per week and earn sub-minimum wages. In Dodge Center two persons work three hours a day, six days a week cleaning a cafe in Claremont and earn sub-minimum wages. An Employment Advisory Committee consisting of businessmen, newpersons, and employers has been established in each city and has proven very helpful. The challenges encountered include the following:

- The area is too large to serve well with one additional staff person.

- There has been friction with some of the group homes and families over schedules. ("Oh, what about Special Olympics?)

- Some of the jobs involve too few hours per week.

- There has been difficulty obtaining qualified job coaches.

- Some of the persons placed were not motivated.

Recommendations made by the presenters included:

- Create an Employment Advisory Committee in each area.

- There is a need for training of group home staff regarding supported employment. In small group homes there could be a problem of staffing if a person is placed in a job and works hours that would keep the person in the group home during the day.

CWDC Industries—presentation by Lorraine Bunn. See attached.

Stevens County DAC—presentation by Emmy Kvatum. See attached.

Clay County DAC—presentation by Susan Lake. Since October 1, 1984, 31 persons have been placed into supported employment. The average I.Q. for those placed is 54, the range is 38 to 70. Prior to community placement the average annual earnings was $160.08 for 630 hours of work. After placement the average annual earning was $2,907.27 for 855 hours of
work. All supported placements are at minimum wage or better. In addition to having jobs in the community, there was significant movement to less restrictive residential settings by these persons. Ten enclaves have been developed, 7 in Clay County that employ 57% of the Clay County DAC population and three in Becker County that employ 33% of the Becker County DAC population. The program has encountered the following challenges:

- There are more clients that could benefit from community placement than can be accommodated by the staff. The staff is already stretched with the current number of placements.
- There should be a position description for the position of job coach.

Metropolitan Council--presentation by Toni Lippert. See attached.

Region 5 Development Commission--not represented because of previous commitments.

Summary. All of the projects were able to place people in a wide variety of positions in the community. The retention rate was higher than expected. Community placement was typically accompanied by improvement in grooming, posture, and behavior. Movement to less restrictive residential settings also occurred.

Some of the problems were unique to specific projects because of the nature of the project. However, a number of themes did appear.

- There is a need to develop a description of the skills needed by the job trainer (coach). There is also a need to encourage post secondary educational institutions to include in their programs course work on supported employment.
- The counties need to be better informed about community placements and need to understand the funding implications.
- Some parents and group home staff are presenting obstacles to community placement. The staff of group homes need to be better informed about and more involved in the process.
- Transportation can be a problem in areas where there is no public transit and individual placements are made at scattered sites.

- There has been a lot of burn-out of job trainers. In addition it is difficult to communicate with and provide backup for staff that are not in the facility.

- When persons are placed in jobs in the community many good things happen, but there are new issues that arise. Sometimes a job results in a change of residence. This could mean the loss of friends and social contacts. It can also be a time of high stress for the individual. Unless the entire team of professionals is involved the benefits of the community placement could be negated.

- Some thought needs to be given to the future. If there were to be another period of high unemployment that resulted in large numbers of the persons placed in the community losing their jobs, how would the system accommodate this situation?

- While loss of benefits was not identified as a problem, probably because many of the jobs are part-time, it is an issue that must be resolved.

- In some cases, staff of the grant recipients did not think that community placements were possible. Some of these staff were surprised by the abilities shown by the persons who were placed. However, if this attitude exists in facilities that applied for and received a grant it must exist elsewhere, perhaps to a larger degree. Unfortunately, the staff in facilities that have not received grants will not have the personal experience of seeing persons grow as a result of community placements. Therefore, it is important to "spread the word" as widely as possible.
GOVERNOR'S PLANNING COUNCIL ON DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES
DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES GRANT

REVIEW OF PROJECT

PROJECT GOAL:

Enable over half of the persons attending Kaposia to be regularly working off-site on work crews, enclaves, and supported competitive employment by September 30, 1986.

OUTCOME:

As of June 25th, 42 persons out of 86 are employed through the use of work crews, enclaves, and supported competitive job sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK CREWS</th>
<th>24 persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housecleaning Service</td>
<td>13 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Maintenance</td>
<td>5 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitorial Service</td>
<td>6 persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENCLAVE</th>
<th>12 persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radisson/University</td>
<td>9 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beckman's Produce</td>
<td>3 persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORTED COMPETITIVE</th>
<th>9 persons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radisson/University</td>
<td>1 person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny's Restaurant</td>
<td>3 persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturn Systems</td>
<td>1 person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy's/Robert Street</td>
<td>1 person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy's/Dale Street</td>
<td>1 person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunham's Restaurant</td>
<td>1 person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days Inn</td>
<td>1 person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Three persons have two part-time jobs.

44 persons remain in our center-based work program.

USE OF STAFF: 20 staff

(5) Work Crews
(3) Enclaves
(1) Supported Competitive
(7) Center-Based
(1) Procurement/Placement Coordinator
(1) Services Coordinator
(1) Administrative Secretary
(1) Executive Director
PROJECT GOAL:
Enable Kaposia, Inc. to secure meaningful and paid employment for 15 persons.

OUTCOME:
These 22 jobs have been developed involving a total of 20 persons.

**Note:** Two persons have two part-time jobs.

ONE ENCLAVE AT THE RADISSON/UNIVERSITY

(5) Room Cleaners

Hours Per Week: 38
Average Hourly Rate: $2.20

ONE ENCLAVE / JANITORIAL CREW

(6) Janitors

Hours Per Week: 37.5
Average Hourly Rate: $2.25

(Mornings) Monday through Friday--J.C. Penney's/Sunray
(Afternoons) Monday/Wednesday-------Beckman's Produce
(Afternoons) Tuesday/Thursday-------Road Rescue, Inc.
(Afternoons) Fridays----------------Cherokee Park United Church

ONE ENCLAVE / BECKMAN'S PRODUCE

(3) Food Processors

Hours Per Week: 27.5
Average Hourly Rate: $2.10

SCATTERED SUPPORTED COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT

(8) Persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOB SITE</th>
<th>JOB TITLE</th>
<th>HOURS/WEEK</th>
<th>HOURLY WAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dunham's Restaurant</td>
<td>Janitor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy's Restaurant</td>
<td>Product Coord.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dale Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturn Systems</td>
<td>Clerical Aide</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy's Restaurant</td>
<td>Product Coord.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny's Restaurant</td>
<td>Janitor</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny's Restaurant</td>
<td>Dishwasher</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denny's Restaurant</td>
<td>Dishwasher</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponderosa Restaurant</td>
<td>Dishwasher</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$3.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT GOAL:
Enable Kaposia to shift client support systems that are appropriate to off-site supported employment with an overall job retention rate above 60%.

OUTCOME:
20 Persons have been placed, trained, and supported on their jobs.
17 Persons are still employed on their jobs.
3 Persons are no longer working at their initial jobs.

REASONS FOR TERMINATIONS
(1) Person was caught stealing on the job.
(1) Person did not meet production (speed) standard.
(1) Person did not like the initial job and chose to work at another.

85% Retention Rate

PERSONS INVOLVED IN THE PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DATES OF EMPLOYMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11/85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>*Chose Another Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2/86 &amp; 5/86 (2 Part-Time Jobs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>*Terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1/86 &amp; 3/86 (2 Part-Time Jobs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>6/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>6/86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6/86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT GOAL:
Enable Kaposia to develop the necessary arrangements with counties and the Division of Rehabilitation Services regarding the funding and provision of services to persons in supported employment.

OUTCOME:
--We have involved both the DVR counselor and the social worker in job placement decisions through the use of the interdisciplinary team process.

--Through this process, we have worked out "funding plans" on an individual by individual basis. (A How-Can-We-Make-It-Work Approach)

--We have also provided "job coaching" and "short-term" follow along services to DRS clients, using an hourly reimbursement rate. (This has been something new to us).

--For the most part, we have stayed within our "per diem" reimbursement system. We have used both Title XX and Title XIX funds. Our current per diem is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>$24.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>$3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Per Day</td>
<td>$27.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

--We have used income generated from contract work and board designated funds.

--We hosted two Forums on Supported Employment. Each involved persons from various counties, the Department of Human Services, the Division of Rehabilitation Services, Legal Advocacy, the ARC, and providers. The first Forum was held on November 7, 1985, and 16 persons were in attendance; the second Forum was held on March 18th and 23 persons were in attendance. We discussed everything from real to perceived barriers, to value systems, to risk-taking, to technical assistance, to retirement!

CHALLENGES:
**Rigid Funding
--Use of Title XIX Funds.
--Use of Title XX Funds/Ramsey County.

**Multiple Funding Sources (DRS, XX, XIX, JPTA, MEED, Etc.).

***"DAC" Image/Funding Regulations

**Follow-Along Services
PROJECT GOAL:
Enable Kaposia to have sufficient staff flexibility to continue its practice of providing off-site training.

OUTCOME:
Nine out of 16 trainers are working in crew situations, at enclaves, and supported competitive job sites.

CHALLENGES:
--Establishing internal network of communication, staff supervision, and staff training.
--Availability of "back-up" community trainers.
--Changing working conditions (place of employment, hours of work, type of work, and job duties).
--Changing job descriptions, personnel policies, and salary administration practices.
--Staff ratio's and support for center-based activities.

PROJECT GOAL:
Enable Kaposia to develop two supported employment video tapes.

OUTCOME:
Video taping has been completed at the Radisson Hotel and at Denny's Restaurant. Both tapes are now being edited before a final presentation is made.

PROJECT GOAL:
Enable Kaposia to establish and maintain a networking relationship with local businesses.

OUTCOME:
We have developed linkages with 65+ customers and local businesses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Customers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housecleaning</td>
<td>23 Customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yard Service</td>
<td>15 Customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitorial</td>
<td>5 Customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Sites</td>
<td>22 Business Persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We have also developed and used our "Business Development Task Force" and have become actively involved in the following organizations:

* St. Paul Chamber of Commerce
* Riverview Community Council
* 5 Corner Co-op Board of Directors
* West Side Development Council
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>I.Q.</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>SEC.</th>
<th>HRS.</th>
<th>INCOME SETTING</th>
<th>HRS.</th>
<th>INCOME SETTING</th>
<th>CONTACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>314.5</td>
<td>853.82</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>50.25</td>
<td>81.97</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>235.0</td>
<td>471.89</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Mo</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>250.00</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>176.98</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>195.0</td>
<td>653.25</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Mo</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Mo</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>150.0</td>
<td>502.50</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>240.0</td>
<td>840.00</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Mo</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td>140.17</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Mo</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>230.0</td>
<td>482.25</td>
<td>I,G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>220.0</td>
<td>389.94</td>
<td>I,G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Mo</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>205.0</td>
<td>404.25</td>
<td>I,G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>227.0</td>
<td>419.30</td>
<td>I,G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>333.0</td>
<td>1115.55</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>131.0</td>
<td>438.85</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S,H,B</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>76.50</td>
<td>I,G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>124.0</td>
<td>309.93</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>48.99</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>27.86</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DATA SUMMARY ON WORKERS INVESTMENT IN JOBS PROJECT**
DATA SUMMARY - CHARACTERISTICS

L = LEVEL OF FUNCTIONING
M = Mild
Mo = Moderate
S = Severe
P = Profound

SETTING
A = Hotel
B = Sheltered Workshop
C = DAC/Sheltered
D = Public School
E = Restaurant
F = Office Complex
G = DAC/Mobile Work Crew
H = No Services
I = Department Store
J = Produce Processing

SEC.DIS. = SECONDARY DISABILITY
B = Challenging Behavior
E = Ehler-Danlos Syndrome
V = Vision Impairment
C = Cerebral Palsy
H = Hearing Impairment
S = Seizure Disorder

NATURE OF CONTACT
1) Good contact during the work day -- having much contact with other employees.
2) Moderate contact during the work day -- having some contact with the general public and other employees.
3) Good contact during break/lunch -- having much contact with other employees.
4) Excellent contact during travel to and from work -- having a great amount of contact with the driver.
5) Good contact during travel to and from work -- having much contact with other persons while using public transportation.

I.Q. CLASSIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
<th>PROJECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mild Mental Retardation</td>
<td>10 Persons</td>
<td>5 Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Mental Retardation</td>
<td>6 Persons</td>
<td>5 Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Mental Retardation</td>
<td>4 Persons</td>
<td>5 Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20 Persons</td>
<td>15 Persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECONDARY DISABILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISABILITY</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenging Behaviors</td>
<td>5 Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebral Palsy</td>
<td>2 Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehler-Danlos Syndrome</td>
<td>1 Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision/Hearing Impair.</td>
<td>3 Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seizure Disorder</td>
<td>1 Person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORK SETTINGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC/Sheltered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC/Mobile Work Crews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving No Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LIVING ENVIRONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own Home/Foster Home</td>
<td>7 Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICF/MR Facility</td>
<td>13 Persons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for the opportunity to present you with a summary on the Southwest Developmental Disabilities Program and the importance of supported employment for persons with developmental disabilities. I am Gloria Vande Brake from the Southwest Regional Development Commission and we have received federal funding from the Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities for the past six years. We serve a nine county area of southwestern Minnesota although the developmental disabilities program also works with one DAC in Region Six West.

During the last three years the Southwest Developmental Disabilities Program has concentrated its activities on supported work activities for adults with developmental disabilities in developmental achievement centers and sheltered workshops. The Southwest Developmental Disabilities Program provided training and one-to-one assistance to the agency staff in such areas as matching client's skills with job possibilities in the community, placing clients in the community, identifying federal and state resources, accurately using the labor regulations, and providing follow-up and other supportive services.
Through this intensive effort, the developmental achievement centers and sheltered workshops which had done little or no community employment now integrate community employment as an important activity of their daily programming. That long-term result alone is worth every penny of the federal funds spent in Southwestern Minnesota.

During this current year the Southwest Developmental Disabilities Program planned to place 15 adults with severe developmental disabilities in part-time or full-time jobs in the community averaging eight hours per week at $1.00 per hour. These 15 adults are now clients in community jobs or in a few cases, clients in new jobs. During the first three quarters ___ new placements were conducted averaging ____ hours per week at an average wage of $$____ per hour. Five developmental achievement centers and one sheltered workshop are participating in the program and will receive $300 for supported work funds such as training on the job, transportation, client fringe benefits and follow along services. Clients are referred to Vocational Rehabilitation Services. A complete breakdown of the client characteristics by participating agencies is included in Appendix A.

The second activity of the Southwest Developmental Disabilities Program was to provide one-to-one training and supported work funds to six schools for special education students working in part-time jobs in the community. The Southwest Developmental Disabilities Program projected six students working an average of six hours per week at an average wage of $1.50. Unfortunately, this activity is not progressing as we would like. To date only one special education youth was placed at a restaurant four hours per week at minimum wage.
Many of the schools interested in supported work, however, are developing interagency agreements to facilitate the supported services once a youth is working.

Regarding major problems affecting the progress of the Southwest Developmental Disabilities Program, there are several items for your review and information. First, the Southwest Developmental Disabilities Program has been unable to place as many special education students in community jobs as we had hoped to: only one student. Second, the Developmental Disabilities Planner which was hired last August resigned suddenly in May. Because of these two issues the Southwest Regional Development Commission will formally request that the Southwest Developmental Disabilities Program be extended until December 31, 1986 with an evaluation done in November, 1986 to determine if another quarterly extension is needed to complete the project goals. During this extension, the staff will close out the adult activities and concentrate their efforts on the supported work for special education students. A third minor drawback to the Southwest Developmental Disabilities Program is that only five participating agencies serving adults with developmental disabilities are participating in the program -- rather than the eleven agencies projected. This, however, will not have any long term impact since the number of adults with severe disabilities will still be placed in community jobs.
Finally, you have requested ideas regarding the continuation of supported employment. First, I believe that the Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities should fund multi-year projects in order to promote long term system change. One year grants while helpful in the short term can not stimulate long term change until the project becomes an integral part of its daily program. Second, while the federal programs including social security and medical assistance have made advances, they still have a long way to go in removing disincentives for disabled persons to work in the community. Third, the Department of Human Services and the Department of Jobs and Training should provide financial incentives to developmental achievement centers and sheltered workshops for supported work such as providing more days for DAC's to operate year-round employment activities. DAC's and workshops need to be reimbursed for their follow-along services and retraining for the adults with severe disabilities in community employment. Additionally, vocational rehabilitation needs to have more latitude in working with severely developmentally disabled adults -- including long-term assistance. Finally, training for job coaches should be conducted in rural areas as well as creating a roster of local job coaches.

Thank you again for your support of the Southwest Developmental Disabilities Program. I hope you will feel free to ask me any questions you may have.
CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS

BY

PARTICIPATING AGENCIES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client #</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Secondary Disability</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Hours Year Prior</th>
<th>Income Year Prior</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st 1</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Speech Impairment</td>
<td>23-65</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>H 5</td>
<td>H 2000</td>
<td>H 3000</td>
<td>Hotel Housekeeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Behavior Problem</td>
<td>23-65</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45.30</td>
<td>H 2000</td>
<td>H 2800</td>
<td>Laundry</td>
<td>School Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 3</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6-22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.50</td>
<td>H 1800</td>
<td>H 5112</td>
<td>Aide-School Cafe</td>
<td>Student, Customers &amp; co-workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 4</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23-65</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.50</td>
<td>H 2040</td>
<td>H 3876</td>
<td>Super Market</td>
<td>Customers &amp; Super Market Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 5</td>
<td>Seizure Disorder</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6-22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.50</td>
<td>H 2000</td>
<td>H 2800</td>
<td>Super Market</td>
<td>Customers &amp; Super Market Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd 6</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6-22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.50</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Customers &amp; Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd 7</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23-65</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>60.3/ wk</td>
<td>H 24</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>Staff at businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd 8</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23-65</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>75/ wk</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>Customers &amp; Hotel Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd 9</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23-65</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30/ wk</td>
<td>H 10</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>Customers &amp; Hotel Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client #</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Secondary Disability</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Income Year Prior</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd D.L.</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14 hours</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>7 hrs. 15 min.</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>Health Club</td>
<td>Empirs. &amp; Customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd C.J.</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Down's Syndrome</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15 hr. 30 min</td>
<td>21.94</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Health Club</td>
<td>Empirs. &amp; Customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd M.A.</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1 hr. 30 min</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>8 hrs. 15 min.</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>Health Club</td>
<td>Empirs. &amp; Customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd D.O.</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Down's Syndrome/Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16 hr. 30 min</td>
<td>23.65</td>
<td>22 hr. 45 min.</td>
<td>57.37</td>
<td>Health Club</td>
<td>Empirs. &amp; Customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yard Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd D.L.</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30 hr. 45 min</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>30 hrs. 45 min.</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>In House</td>
<td>Clients &amp; Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd C.J.</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Down's Syndrome</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39 hr. 30 min</td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>30 hrs. 15 min.</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>In House</td>
<td>Clients &amp; Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd M.A.</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39 hr. 45 min</td>
<td>15.89</td>
<td>26 hrs. 30 min.</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>In House</td>
<td>Clients &amp; Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd D.O.</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Down's Syndrome/Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33 hr. 30 min</td>
<td>18.77</td>
<td>40 hrs. 30 min.</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>In House</td>
<td>Clients &amp; Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client #</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Secondary Disability</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Hours/quarter</td>
<td>Income/quarter</td>
<td>Income Year Prior</td>
<td>Income Year Prior</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23-65</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>h 87.26</td>
<td>$27.31</td>
<td>h 22.92</td>
<td>$7.49</td>
<td>Janitorial</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>Epileptic</td>
<td>23-65</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>h 43.85</td>
<td>21.21</td>
<td>h 88.48</td>
<td>36.90</td>
<td>Janitorial</td>
<td>Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6-22</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>h 65.67</td>
<td>59.07</td>
<td>h 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Raking</td>
<td>DAC Staff/Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23-65</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>h 102.92</td>
<td>51.41</td>
<td>h 44.84</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>Janitorial</td>
<td>DAC Staff/Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Epileptic</td>
<td>6-22</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>h 89.75</td>
<td>68.84</td>
<td>h 19.75</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>Janitorial</td>
<td>DAC Staff/Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>M.I.</td>
<td>23-65</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>h 98.00</td>
<td>41.03</td>
<td>h 27.58</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>Janitorial</td>
<td>DAC Staff/Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6-22</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>h 48.76</td>
<td>64.73</td>
<td>h 0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Raking</td>
<td>DAC Staff/Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23-65</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>h 104.25</td>
<td>31.52</td>
<td>h 19.92</td>
<td>13.13</td>
<td>Janitorial</td>
<td>DAC Staff/Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23-65</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>h 102.50</td>
<td>35.01</td>
<td>h 13.07</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>New Dawn Cleaning</td>
<td>DAC Staff/Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23-65</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>h 113.25</td>
<td>45.52</td>
<td>h 20.59</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>New Dawn Cleaning</td>
<td>DAC Staff/Employees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 3rd Quarter

* new job for this chart - same # client as last quarter.
Agency: Redwood Co. DAC
Address: Box 3
Redwood Falls, MN 56283

CLIENT DATA SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client #</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Secondary Disability</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Hours Year Prior</th>
<th>Income Year Prior</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st JW</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3 hr.</td>
<td>$1.50/hr.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Redwood Co. Landfill</td>
<td>Landfill, Lawn Raking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st GM</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>13 hr.</td>
<td>1.75/hr.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Redwood Falls Home</td>
<td>Landfill, Lawn Raking, Sweeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd VD</td>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>67 hr. 46 m.</td>
<td>3.35/hr.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Redwood Co. Fairgrounds</td>
<td>Lawn Mowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd QR</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2 hr. 40 m.</td>
<td>3.00/hr.</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Red. Med. Center</td>
<td>Lawn Mowing, Landfill, REA-Clements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quarter: 1st 2nd Q 3rd 4th
April 1-June 20, 1986
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client #</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Secondary Disability</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Hours/Qtr.</th>
<th>Income/Qtr. Year Prior</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd EE</td>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23-65</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$16.86</td>
<td>$48.20</td>
<td>Community Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd LB</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Down Syndrome</td>
<td>23-65</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>37.85</td>
<td>42.20</td>
<td>Custodian, Lawn Crew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd ED</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Vision Impaired</td>
<td>23-65</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>35.40</td>
<td>64.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd PB</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>23-65</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>23.65</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd RR</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Down Syndrome</td>
<td>23-65</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>37.30</td>
<td>41.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd EH</td>
<td>Borderline</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.55</td>
<td>117.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client #</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Secondary Disability</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Income Year Prior</td>
<td>Income Year Prior</td>
<td>Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 1</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>80/Qtr.</td>
<td>$150/Qtr.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st 2</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>98/Qtr.</td>
<td>157/Qtr.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2nd & 3rd Quarter Still Placed
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Client #</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Hours Year Prior</th>
<th>Income Year Prior</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.35/hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurant -</td>
<td>dish washing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACHIEVEMENTS

45 Clients working 15 or more hours per week in the community in the following areas: Yard work, Janitorial, Car Wash, Busing Dishes, Cleaning Churches, Doing Laundry, Shoveling snow.

Personal Client Victories: Earnings as high as $3.35 per hour, new skills, such as running power equipment for the first time, significant pay checks for the first time, Pride and self confidence to take on new challenges, such as a placement in the community.

4 Working Community work programs, the start up of two more this Fall

PROBLEMS

Finding the funding of $8-10,000 per year to keep the programs operational.

In House verses Community work.

Predjudice: Staff, Administrative, Board, Social Service Agencies.

Staff-Client ratios.

Benefit Problems ie. SSDI

Fundamental Shifts in how a DAC does Business.

STRATEGIES

Retired Vets and Part Time non Rehab Degreed Supervisors.

Equipment Funds from: .ARC, Kiwanis, Sons of Norway, Lions.

Donated Vehicles---Retired Vehicles.

Articles in Newspapers, signs on Vehicles.

Churches-training sites, equipment, cleaning jobs.

County Social Services--Lawn mowing, Snow Shoveling, Laundry Jobs, referrals to those who need work done.
Project Summary

Description and purpose of our project:

The purpose of our project was to develop a community based supported work project which would provide employment opportunities for the clients at the Stevens County Developmental Achievement Center. It was also our purpose to have the program, if successful, become independent of grant funding.

Job placements which have occurred in the last 20 months.

1. Clean movie theatre - crew (current)
2. Clean law offices - crew (current)
3. Commercial laundry worker - individual (current)
4. Greenhouse and nursery worker - individual (current)
5. Apartment complex janitorial - crew (current)
6. Beauty shop janitorial - individual (current)
7. Lawn and yard maintenance - crew (current)
8. Laundromat janitorial - crew (no current placement)
9. Car detailing - crew (current)
10. Gas station attendant - individual (no current placement)
11. D.A.C. janitorial - crew (current)
12. Nursery school aide - individual (current)

What we've accomplished in the past 20 months:

We have:

1. Employed all but 1 of our clients in community based jobs.
2. Placed clients who are severely and profoundly retarded, who have multiple handicaps, and have severe behavior problems.
3. Increased clients earnings by over 600%.
4. Reduced problem behaviors - only one person was removed from the program during the grant period and this was due to change in medication.
5. Operated two summer vocational programs for 70% of our clients - increasing their days of service from 195 to 230.
6. Involved our local county in the funding of a vocational training supervision position.
7. Non-grant D.A.C. staff as job trainers.
8. Changed our traditionally 8-4 M-F D.A.C. into one which operates a supported work program on weekends and evening hours when necessary.
9. Placed several workers earning minimum wage and some earn more.
10. Placed five clients who spend more than half of their D.A.C. day each day in supported work.

What we have not accomplished:
1. No one has moved into full time competitive employment.
2. Our per diem rate has not been lowered due to supported work. It appears to be cheaper for the facility to have clients in sheltered work.

What we have learned:
1. When a person fails at a job it is generally due to social problems rather than lack of job skills.
2. Co-workers can be threatened by a handicapped worker who performs a job as well as they. They can sabotage a situation and cause a client to fail. They can also back a client and cause him to succeed.
3. Some clients just aren't enthusiastic about work. (Just like the "normal" population.)
4. Many clients have developed a feeling of self worth and pride through their job even though their pay check appears to be meager.
5. Government regulations and paperwork are real deterrents to supported work.
6. In our agency there appears to be no pre determined minimum skill level that a client must have in order to succeed in supported work; i.e., toilet trained, speech, feed themselves, Etc.
7. Even severely and profoundly retarded clients can learn a sophisticated sequence of skills and perform them satisfactorily and independently if given proper training and enough training time.
8. A job coach does not need to be a highly degreed individual. They must have common sense, concern, patience, a sense of humor, knowledge of the job, knowledge of the client(s), ability to speak to supervisors and co-workers, and the ability to spot problems before they become major. They should have basic record keeping skills and a basic knowledge of DOL regulations in addition to knowledge of facility policies.

9. Job placements should be made with caution and be well thought out. Many needless frustrating hours can be spent by a job coach due to a poor placement. A job failure is much worse than no placement to begin with.

10. Parents and residential providers can make or break a job placement.

11. Development of a work program takes time. Some employers are extremely reluctant to get involved with our clients.


Recommendation

I would recommend that the Developmental Disabilities Council continue to encourage and assist in any way possible the development of supported work projects.
METROPOLITAN COUNCIL'S

DD COMMUNITY WORK TRAINING PROJECT

REPORT TO: Governor's Planning Council on Developmental Disabilities

June 25, 1986
I. PROJECT GOAL: Supported Employment - 40

Competitive Employment - 10

Progress as of June 20, 1986

- 48 adults were employed (37 in SE; 11 in CE).
- 44 adults are still employed.
- 4 jobs were terminated due to 1 employee not meeting employer's performance requirement, 1 employee did not want to work any longer, 2 employees' jobs were temporary and ended.
- 21 different employers/business sites are involved.
- Employees come from 5 DACs, 1 workshop and 1 student from a Metropolitan Area school.

- Average hours of work per week - 23
- Average wage per hour - $2.99
- Wage range - $1.68 - $4.25

- Employers:
  Hotel Budgetel
  Radisson University
  Children's Home Society
  Stewart Park
  Dundee Garden Center
  Scott County Government Ctr.
  Merrick Lawn Service
  Thimbles
  Presbyterian Homes
  Copper Kettle
  Davanni's
  Mama Lu's
  G's
  Wendy's
  Direct Marketing Systems
  Suds Cellar
  Rainbow Foods
  McDonalds
  Como Bike Shop
  Briggs and Morgan
  ChiChi's, Richfield
ADDITIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS: METROPOLITAN COUNCIL

1. Developed course curriculum featuring a new instructional technology for teaching severely limited learners how to improve generalization skills (transfer of learning) while in supported employment. Highlights of this course and an orientation to supported employment for persons with developmental disabilities were videotaped and cassettes have been made available for loan to Metro Area groups.

2. Developed core cluster of skills needed by job coaches during the first and second year of this project. This information was further developed by Dr. Terry Kayser, project staff, into a 3 credit course (graduate and undergraduate) offered by the University of Minnesota's Department of Vocational Education. The course was given twice in 1986 with 37 students in attendance. It will be offered twice in 1987.

3. Developed and implemented a unique funding agreement for 359 hours of on-the-job training of 16 DAC clients in food preparation work. The parties to this innovative fiscal package are both "special service" and generic entities. They include a private sector restaurant corporation, a vocational technical institute, two DACs and the Division of Rehabilitation Services. Each contributed some of the resources (such as tuition fees, staff, equipment, supplies, transportation, uniforms, etc.) needed by persons with severe handicaps. The long-term, intensive nature of the training required for these individuals could not be met by any single agency. Commingling their funds resulted in adequate financing for the training period. Eight persons are now employed permanently. The remaining eight are waiting for vacancies at these restaurants or other restaurants. This is believed to be the first such combination of private and public resources for supported employment in the country.

This model is being replicated in Willmar and Pine City, Minnesota. Based on this success, the State Board of Vocational Technical Education has just offered $225,000 in grants for other vocational technical institutes to serve students who are developmentally disabled using this model or other innovative approaches.

4. Another major achievement has been the significant degree to which the Division of Rehabilitation Services (formerly DVR) has become involved in supported employment based on its interaction with this project. Consider these factors:

- FY85: $72,000 direct grant; FY86: $45,000 grant to the Metropolitan Council's project.

- FY85 & FY86: DRS client services funds were made available to our project DAC clients. This policy has since been instituted in other parts of the state.

- FY85: Four workshops on supported employment were presented by leading national and state experts on supported employment to over 320 DRS supervisors and vocational counselors.

- FY85 & FY86: Top administrative staff of the DRS state office directly participated in development of the multi-agency finance package and follow-along service model.
As a result of the above participation, we believe this project was a prime catalyst in DRS's pursuit of the federal OSERS grant awarded to Minnesota.

5. In addition to the barriers to employment listed in the remainder of this report, job retention is still a sleeping giant. To address this problem, project staff wrote or phoned the six directors of major federal projects in supported employment from other states requesting information or materials on follow-along services. Not one individual had information on a conceptual or operational model. So the Council project, this year, has designed a flexible and comprehensive, long-term follow-along service model. It will be reviewed by the Council's DD Advisory Committee and included in the final evaluation report in September, 1986.
ADDITIONAL ISSUES/RECOMMENDATIONS ON SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT

1. AGENCIES

- Selection of job specialist - should be based only on competencies of staff for these new types of responsibilities rather than on staff seniority or other less appropriate reasons.

- Specialist should only be responsible for off-site employment as this is a demanding, full-time responsibility since it requires development of new skills and takes much more time than the usual job responsibilities assigned to DAC, WAC, SWS personnel.

- Competition for agency resources (staff, clients, money, transport vehicles, etc.) usually surfaces when SE is introduced as a service. On-site contract, therapeutic, academic and community orientation personnel see SE as threatening to the importance of their responsibilities.

The Metropolitan Council's project attempted to address this by providing new, instructional techniques for the severely limited learner to the whole teaching staff of the agencies. By using examples of teaching job-training skills, the whole staff learned about the rationale for supported employment as well as a technology that could be used for community-based teaching, academics, etc.

- Teaching community-based daily-living activities, (outside the facility and preferably in the consumers' own neighborhood) must be seen as important supplemental aspects of SE. These activities must be provided not only to those consumers who are employed or being selected for employment, but to all who are served by an agency.

- More opportunities for career exploration must also be provided to all clients so that the interests of each client for different types of jobs can be better determined and job failures can be reduced.

- Other means must be developed to instill in all agency clients an understanding of the concept of "work." This could begin with providing more meaningful experiences to individual clients about what it means to be a "consumer," then assisting clients to understand the connection between the "power of consumerism" with earning wages and work. That is, to obtain what one wants, one must have buying power and this comes with employment.

- The full service needs of employers, who agree to hire persons with developmental disabilities, must be met by agencies. Beyond negotiating a placement and providing on-the-job training, long-term follow-along services must be available to retain jobs.

- More comprehensive, in-depth and accurate knowledge must be acquired by agencies engaged in SE regarding areas such as liability, confidentiality requirements, federal and state regulations governing employment of persons with handicaps, Social Security and Title 19 regulations, business world standards, etc.

- Changes must be made in traditional human service agency program schedules to accommodate the requirements of businesses (working evenings, weekends and holidays).
The majority of VAC, VAC and SWS staff, vocational counselors, consumers/families, county commissioners, state legislators, employers, the media and general public are unaware of this "best practice." Some agency personnel are passively or actively resisting this change. Administrators of the involved human service agencies, and purchasers of their services must more vigorously pursue strategies, incentives, or in some cases, sanctions to assure that persons with severe handicaps have equal opportunities to become employed.

There must be clear recognition and early intervention by those in decision-making/management roles to neutralize further and more invasive competition for DRS funds between persons with mildly handicapping conditions and those with severe handicaps. One strategy, suggested in the Congressional discussions reauthorizing the Rehabilitation Act, was a specific set-aside of funds targeted to persons with more limited abilities. Strict accountability for this targeted use of DRS and other funds should be demanded and monitored in Minnesota.
2. JOB COACHES

- Formal and comprehensive training is necessary for developing skills to motivate and train employees on the job, to monitor progress and adapt training procedures/work-site if needed, to advocate with direct supervisors and co-workers, to appropriately transfer supervision to employer or co-workers whenever possible. Performance of JC must be continually monitored by agency to assure accountability.

- More stable working conditions and wages will become more important to recruit and maintain skilled job coaches.

- Improved techniques for recruiting, training, and scheduling of job coaches are needed. A county or region should consider establishing a central and single point for this activity which could serve many agencies in a service area.

3. INTERAGENCY

- Agencies that serve adults must learn about each other's responsibilities for adults who are developmentally disabled.

- Involvement of DACs/WACs/SWS with vocational counselors, social workers, consumers/families, residential staff, teachers, etc., must begin early in planning for future employment.

- Counties need to develop "purchase of service" procedures to pay for long-term follow-along services once a person is employed. Hennepin County has such a mechanism. Usually the employee, who has never been placed in a post-school service agency, is assigned to a DAC/WAC/SWS who then performs the follow-along for a set fee.

- Various human services agencies serving persons with developmental disabilities should vigorously explore means of combining their resources to assure supported employment since this can be a more expensive, intensive and extended service than the traditional day program services.

4. SYSTEM

- Alternative funding to replace Title 19 should be provided to DACs for vocational training. Federal audits could pose significant penalties for inappropriate use of these funds.

- Recognition that SE requires additional local funding streams due to the assignment of some staff and clients to off-site locations while others remain on-site in the facilities. Moratoriums should be established to prohibit new capital expenditures to build adult day program facilities. This might be one new source of funds.
SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Submitted by

The Metropolitan Council
DD Community Work Training Project

This information was compiled from a survey sent to DACs, WACs, SWSs, residential facilities, parents, county social workers in FY85. Additional issues identified in FY86 have been added.

June 25, 1986
BARRIERS/PROBLEMS

I. AGENCIES (DACs, WACs, SWs)

A. POLICIES AND ADMINISTRATION:

1. Sheltered workshops in the project saw the type and level of their current funding as a substantial barrier to providing long-term supported employment. Services purchased from a sheltered workshop by a DRS counselor are typically on a short-term, time-limited basis. Agency directors felt that additional or supplemental funds appear to be necessary in order to provide long-term supported employment.

For the DACs, funding for the basic costs of community-based training and employment services will require extra expenditures but was not viewed as a significant problem. Community-based programming was viewed by the DAC directors as an extension of the current day program offering.

2. For sheltered workshops, there was an inherent conflict between rehabilitation program policy and production requirements. A number of clients placed in the community jobs by the sheltered workshops were the highest producers. In essence, this meant that production line staff were losing some of their best workers to community placement.

RECOMMENDATIONS/CHANGES REQUIRED

CHANGES IN POLICY AND PROCEDURES REQUIRED:

1. The sheltered workshop directors reported that the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation was soon making available funds to encourage community-based employment. These funds, however, are guaranteed for only a two-year period.

The DAC directors viewed the problem of funding community-based training as an ongoing problem and thought that alternative funding sources such as county governments should be examined.

2. It was suggested that production quotas could be met by hiring some non-handicapped employees. This would require, however, a possible change in agency mission and policy. By bringing in non-handicapped workers, additional costs would have to be assumed by the agency in terms of higher employment benefits, higher turnover and the related personnel costs of retraining new workers, thus increasing bid prices on contracts. A second concern was that if non-handicapped workers were hired to supplement production quotas, that these individuals would be the first ones laid off if a production slowdown occurs.
3. Sheltered workers presently receive insurance and related benefits from sheltered workshops. Concern was expressed regarding whether or not these clients would lose existing benefits if employed at community sites in part-time jobs that do not include these same benefits.

b. Traditionally, DRS counselors leave a client's case open/active for up to a 90-day period following placement in a job or rehabilitation agency. As more severely handicapped clients are being served, there was a belief among agency directors that this timeframe needs to be more flexible.

B. CONCERNS OF GOVERNING BOARDS OF DIRECTORS

1. It was reported that overall agency boards of directors and advisory councils were supportive of the community-based programming. Sheltered workshop governing boards were concerned about the impact of this type of client placement on in-house production.

2. Concerns from DAC boards included:
   a. How would the community placement impact the client's current program?
   b. Would this type of programming be as safe and secure as the current program?
   c. How would these community placements affect the programs of those clients who would remain back at the agency?
   d. How would staff to client ratios be affected?
   e. What additional costs would be incurred by such programming?

C. IMPACT ON AGENCY BUDGET

1. DAC programs individually negotiate the number of total days of service they will provide services during the year. The total number of days of service varies across agencies; however, most operate about 220 days of the year. This differs from the total number of days a client might actually be employed. An average working year, for example, may include up to 250 working days. As clients are placed in community training sites where ongoing continued support is necessary, the question becomes one of what funding would be made available to pay for agency costs associated with the client's training and employment needs on a work year calendar. It was reported that the state licensing division for DACs is reluctant to provide extension or additional days of per diem billing for these agencies. In other words, if a DAC has been licensed to operate for 220 service days, there is presently little or no opportunity to extend beyond that point. Hence, funding
to support administrative and on-line staff costs during 3-6 week vacation periods is unavailable.

2. The agencies experienced additional costs during the course of directly providing community-based services to clients. Some of these additional costs were in the following areas:

a. Increased transportation costs associated with moving client to and from several different job sites.

b. Additional clerical time was often required to process additional paperwork, i.e., revising IPP plans, communicating with and completing forms for DRS, communicating with employers, etc.

c. In providing community independence skills training in the community, additional costs are borne, i.e., grooming and hygiene supplies, gardening equipment, etc.

d. Some increase in expenditure was experienced in xeroxing client-related information for other agencies such as DRS, businesses, etc.

3. Placing clients into employment caused some disruptions in staff to client ratios, when community training staff left the agency to supervise only 2-4 clients at the workplace. This resulted in requiring agency staff to maintain adequate client-to-staff ratios at the facility.

D. TRANSPORTATION OF CLIENTS TO COMMUNITY SITES

1. All of the agencies provide van service for some program participants. Competition within the agency for use of the van to transfer clients to and from community-based training programs was experienced. In-house facility program staff were often requested to reduce community recreational and social activities.

2. Agency staff were sometimes requested to use their personal vehicles to transport clients. This resulted in additional agency cost for mileage reimbursement and additional insurance premiums for personal liability coverage.

3. One agency reported that it participated in a work site that was a 90-mile roundtrip from the facility. This resulted in additional agency cost for transportation, time loss in client services, and a requirement to sometimes hire substitute to transport the clients to and from the work site.

2. The agencies reported that these costs simply had to be assumed by the agency. Transportation costs were reported to have the most impact on agency budgets. To offset some of these costs, some agencies required clients to pay a portion of their transportation to and from work sites. This is a legitimate procedure as transportation is an impairment-related work expense that can be deducted from gross earnings before determining SSA and SSI.

3. While the Metropolitan Council (MC) community work training project provided supplemental funds for some substitutes, these funds were temporary and time-limited. One agency reported a 6% budget increase for substitute staff. Another agency reported that as turnover in professional staff occurred, they opted for hiring lower cost para-professionals instead of replacing the available position with a professional staff person. The agency directors commented that in order to continue with community work training, additional funds would have to be made available to provide for additional staff. The directors viewed this as an ongoing problem that would have to be resolved at a higher level of administrative power to influence state and county funders.

1. Providing more extensive mobility training in the use of public transportation might offset the extensive use of facility vans for work-related transportation. It was also suggested that families and volunteers be encouraged to accept the responsibility of assisting clients to travel to and from community training sites.

2. See 1 above.

3. Develop work sites that are in closer proximity to the day program facility or client's place of residence. Seek employment on scheduled bus routes and provide transportation training.
E. IMPACT ON DAILY AND ANNUAL OPERATING SCHEDULE

1. Substantial deviations from traditional daily program schedules (8 a.m. - 4 p.m.) were experienced by the agencies. Changes to accommodate the client's work schedules during early morning and evening shifts and weekends created difficulties for the agencies. Some of the difficulties included the following:

a. Staff experienced stress and some inflexibility in responding to agency requests to cover early morning, evening and weekend client work schedules.

b. Some confusion was experienced in scheduling staff, e.g. a staff member who might be requested to begin work at 5 a.m. at a client work site would return to the facility and sometimes be requested to extend their working day to cover clients at the facility until the end of the program day. Staff who cover clients during weekend periods would then be absent from the facility during the middle of the week.

c. Staff experienced difficulty in completing paperwork, attending meetings on behalf of their clients, and returning phone calls. When staff were required to be at a work training site for 6-8 hours a day, they were still expected to complete their case management responsibilities. This resulted in some staff having to take work home or extending their work day at the facility.

d. In-house facility staff would lose assistance at critical times of the day, particularly at lunch and during bathroom breaks when one-to-one client assistance is required at an outside work site.

e. It was reported that some staff at community work sites would lose their lunch break due to requirements to provide continuous supervision of client.

II. PERSONNEL

A. ATTITUDES OF STAFF TOWARD COMMUNITY-BASED TRAINING

1. Some agency staff have definite reservations about their clients' ability to work "in the real world." As a result, some staff showed little or no interest and did not attend any of the training sessions. Significant staff turnover was experienced by two of the agencies once the community-based training was initiated.

Those staff who became involved in working with clients in community sites experienced some frustration.

I. The agency directors reported that requesting staff to work with clients during early morning, evening and weekend shifts was a very difficult matter. Additional staff meetings had to be conducted for the purposes of discussing and clarifying problems related to irregular staff schedules. There was also a requirement to plan further ahead than usual in order to schedule for client coverage over holidays and vacation periods. Agencies suggested that when interviewing new staff it should be made clear that employment would or might include some irregular hours.
III. STAFF SELECTION

1. In utilizing existing agency staff, some difficulties were noted. The common criteria reported in assigning staff to community training were generally based on willingness, interest and motivation expressed. Even when interest was expressed and the staff agreed to participate in a community training program, frustration sometimes set in once staff were actively engaged with a client in the community training site. This resulted in numerous changes of the staff selected for the community training sites. A significant problem related to this is that a number of the staff who had originally received the training were no longer involved and others who had received no training at all were now conducting community training.

2. Recruiting staff who possess the specific qualifications for community work training is a significant problem. This problem was exacerbated by the dilemma of directors not knowing what skills and competencies were required for community work training.

C. IMPACT ON CLIENT TO STAFF RATIOS

1. The transition to community-based training programs caused disruptions in client-to-staff ratios when community training staff left the facility to supervise only 2-4 clients at the workplace. Staff left at the facility often had to take on 3-5 additional clients. In some instances, this also meant that the staff at the facility would also be working with more severely handicapped clients than were out in the community.

D. CHANGES IN AGENCY STAFFING PATTERNS

1. As a result of community-based training becoming part of an agency's overall delivery of services, new staff roles evolve and existing staff responsibilities change. The movement toward community programming resulted in some confusion and uncertainty regarding staff responsibility areas.

III. DD CLIENTS

A. ATTITUDES/WILLINGNESS/INTEREST/RISKS IN PARTICIPATING

1. Overall the agency administrators indicated that clients were enthusiastic about participating in the community-based training programs. Some concerns were raised regarding whether or not the clients really understood
how their lives would be changed. In some instances, it was reported that clients were reluctant to participate because they were concerned about leaving their peer relationships back at the facility.

2. Some sheltered workshop clients experienced a decrease in total weekly earnings when placed in a job in the community. One client, for example, was earning over $100 per week at the sheltered workshop and earning only $70 from the community-based job.

B. CLIENT SELECTION

1. This was consistently reported as an area of ongoing difficulty for the agencies. Current assessment methods to determine job readiness for severely handicapped adults are not well known or understood.

2. The relationship between DRS counselors and agency staff needs to be clarified. It was reported that some DRS counselors felt that they did not have a role in selecting which clients would be involved in community based training and employment.

C. MAJOR PROBLEMS/BARRIERS AT THE COMMUNITY TRAINING SITE

1. In several of the work training sites, turnover of non-handicapped workers and supervisors created confusion. Part of the role of the community job trainer was to establish positive relationships with non-handicapped co-workers at the work site. When service industries such as hotel and restaurants experience high turnover, this creates a continuous situation in which agency staff and clients must establish new relationships. This takes time away from direct client training in job skills.

2. There were some difficulties reported in establishing client wage rates at some employment sites. In some instances, when a client was placed at a subminimum wage rate, employers would expect that all subsequent placements of handicapped workers would also be at that parallel rate regardless of the capabilities and productivity level of the client.

2. The agency directors indicated that while clients may experience a decrease in wages in moving from the sheltered workshop to community-based employment, that this may be a temporary loss. The rationale expressed by the agency directors for permitting a client to experience a wage loss was that the client had a strong interest in a community-based job and wanted to make the transition to the community

1. Some agencies used field visitations to several selected job sites for career exploration. Others based client selection on criteria such as degree of client interest and motivation, previous work experiences, functional skills, parent or residential facility staff, interest, client behaviors and others. Agencies indicated that a more formal client-job matching system should be used.

2. The adult day program movement towards supported employment represents a new service within the overall system of service delivery. There needs to be a clarification in the roles DRS counselors and DAC staff will have in the selection of clients to participate in community training when DRS agrees to pay for training of DAC clients. Some administrative assistance would be beneficial in delineating the role responsibilities of DRS and DAC personnel in their joint ventures.

1. Some agency directors felt this was a potentially positive learning experience for the client. When a manager of a particular business or their other employees left, this necessitated developing a completely new relationship to assure continued support for the client's placement. The strategy is one of maintaining ongoing communication and continuing to negotiate and make management and coworkers aware of the client's capabilities.

2. A suggested strategy to overcome this problem is to thoroughly explain at the point of procuring the placement that all wage rates are to be established based on an individual client's productivity level. Agencies should be expected to use time study procedures to determine wage rates. Ongoing and continuous monitoring of client performance and productivity is critical to clarifying wage rates.
IV. RELATIONSHIPS/COOPERATION WITH OTHER PARTICIPATING AND SUPPORTING AGENCY PERSONNEL

A. PARENTS

1. Overall, parents were supportive of community-based training. There were some reports, however, from agency directors that parents’ expectations were too high and were not realistic about the type of work at which their son/daughter could succeed. Some parents also expressed concern regarding the possible loss of SSI benefits as their offspring participate in employment programs. Other parents expressed concerns regarding the safety and vulnerability of their child to participate in activities outside the facility.

B. DRS COUNSELORS

1. The clarification of roles between DRS counselors and questions such as who has the responsibility for calling client planning meetings, what criteria should be used for selecting clients for community-based employment, what involvement DRS counselors have once the placement is made and other concerns have been expressed. For example, some DRS counselors wanted extensive, frequent and formal communication; others were satisfied with minimal contacts.

C. COUNTY SOCIAL WORKERS

1. Some county social workers were hesitant to see clients move from secure DAC environment to a community-based setting. Concerns were reported regarding what they felt was an interruption in an already successful program plan. According to the agency directors, some social workers were concerned that employment would mean a loss of SSI and medical assistance benefits for the client. This is particularly true for clients residing in group homes. In some instances, the agencies indicated that social workers were assuming too much authority in making decisions regarding whether or not a client should experience a change in IPP goals. Sometimes client placements had to be held back for several days until a meeting was convened between the social worker, agency staff, DRS

1. In working with some types of industries the problem of maintaining consistent client schedules may be unavoidable. It may be advisable to develop a written letter of agreement regarding client work schedules.

1. The strategies used most often by agency staff are to involve parents at all levels of decision-making regarding community-based placements. It was also suggested that parents should have an opportunity to have information presented to them prior to their son/daughter getting involved in a community experience. This might include making presentation to small groups of parents.

1. There appears to be mixed views and understandings amongst the agency directors regarding what role DRS counselors should play. It was suggested that meetings should be conducted between DRS counselors and agency staff to discuss areas of mutual responsibility.

1. Some agency directors felt that the county social workers need to be made more knowledgeable of the new supported employment program offerings. Workshops, informational handouts, and meetings between agency staff and social workers would help to build the social worker's awareness and understanding of community-based training services.
counselor and other responsible agency staff. A meeting such as this is clearly legitimate. However, employers often have immediate employment needs and expect quick turn-around if a job is to be secured.

D. RESIDENTIAL PROVIDERS

1. Clients who reside in group homes typically participate in day programs between the hours of 8 a.m. - 3:30 p.m. Due to this, group homes schedule less staff during these day hours. In addition, residents follow a routine schedule for meals, recreational activities and instruction. Clients who are required to work early mornings, evenings and/or weekends pose difficulties for some group homes. Some group homes for example find it difficult to accommodate to a client who works weekends and has days off during the middle of the week. There are some residences that prohibit clients from participating unless the hours of employment match the current day program schedule. Some group homes are also reluctant to permit a client to work due to restrictions on SSI and SSDI. Their concern is that these clients will lose eligibility for MA and MSA which pay for residential care and personal needs.

V. DIVISION OF REHABILITATION SERVICES (VOCATIONAL COUNSELORS)

A. BARRIERS/PROBLEMS

1. Inadequate and insufficient availability of competent job coaches.
   a. The competencies for community work training are not well understood.
   b. Lack of university training programs for community trainers.
   c. Who will assume financial responsibility for hiring job coaches if universities are not assuming the responsibilities for training work trainers? Who will provide such training?

2. Traditional work evaluation methods as presently used by sheltered workshops and other rehabilitation facilities do not appear to meet the needs of the more severely handicapped when considering community-based employment opportunities.

3. Presently the provision of long-term followup for those clients who require continuous support throughout their employment is not available in any consistent fashion.

1. Some agency directors felt that there are few incentives for group homes to cooperate in community-based employment for severely handicapped adults. Concerns regarding SSI and SSDI benefits notch problems make these providers anxious about letting a client engage in gainful activity. The agency directors indicated that this matter would have to be examined by a higher authority than their individual agencies.

1. Utilize and train persons such as retired workers, JTPA employees, employees of the employer, recent high school graduates, and others. There is a need to create a para-professional role to provide community work training. Community colleges might be encouraged to develop an AA degree training program to prepare persons for community work training. It would be more cost-effective to use para-professionals than highly skilled and trained professionals.

2. Consideration should be given to the development of community-based employment evaluation strategies to assure that clients are matched appropriately with available job stations. These community-based, on-the-job evaluation procedures might include methods for systematic behavioral observations, assessment procedures related to client functionality and problem behaviors, extensive diagnostic interviewing with persons who know the client best, and continuous and ongoing assessment as the client continues to work on the job site. Information obtained from this type of an evaluation process should also be thoroughly shared with the client's DRS counselor.

3. Personnel from day activity centers, work activity centers, and sheltered workshops should be more involved with followup. Some effort should also be encouraged with businesses to provide training to first-line supervisors to enable them to provide ongoing support and assistance to the client. Consideration should also be given to formulating a case management role to
4. Employers need to be more directly involved in the process of community-based employment.

5. Procedures for selecting clients for community-based training and employment services need to be developed.

6. There appears to be some confusion regarding the impact of community-based employment on the client's SSI and medical assistance payments.

7. Strategy for working more effectively and cooperatively with unions needs to be considered.

8. Involves business people (employers) in workshops and training sessions. Form an advisory council of employers for the purposes of determining what employers are looking for in a good employee, identifying job leads, discussing community-based training, employment-related problems and wage and hour concerns.

5. While community-based procedures may help in the selection of clients for specific types of employment, parents, school professionals, DVR counselors, adult day program staff, and social workers and the client should be directly involved in the decision-making. Client choice needs to be considered. The role of the DVR counselor in working with DAC and WAC staff in community-based employment programs needs to be examined.

6. While community-based procedures may help in the selection of clients for specific types of employment, parents, school professionals, DVR counselors, adult day program staff, and social workers and the client should be directly involved in the decision-making. Client choice needs to be considered. The role of the DVR counselor in working with DAC and WAC staff in community-based employment programs needs to be examined.

7. Union officials need to be familiarized with the recent policy initiatives regarding community-based employment for developmentally disabled adults. Union officials could be involved in an advisory council to facilitate communication and dialogue on specific problems and strategies regarding union rules and regulations which restrict client placement.

provide for long-term followup. Some formula for cost sharing long term followup could possibly be negotiated with individual county governments.