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OBJECTIVES

• Background of the Outcome Tracking System
• Importance of tracking data
• Demonstration of the Outcome Tracking System
• Initial data report results
Taskforce Recommendation

• Ohio Employment First Taskforce recommended a Web-based outcome tracking system for employment outcomes.
Advisory Committee Workgroup

- Workgroup convened to develop a list of questions they wanted the system to answer

- County Board Superintendents
- Providers
- VR Agency
- Family Members
- Internal DODD Staff
Design and Build

• DODD issued an RFP and awarded contract to Dr. Robert Cimera
• Dr. Cimera is an Associate Professor at Kent State University (Ohio), and a leading national expert in researching vocational programs and outcomes
• System built by DODD IT Staff to take advantage of DODD-maintained Individual Data System (IDS)
Individual Data System (IDS)

• DODD maintains an extensive database of 90,000 individuals with a wealth of demographic information.

• Data elements include:
  – Demographics: age, gender, race, ethnicity
  – Diagnosis; ID level
  – Funding range and Acuity
  – Living arrangement
  – Waiver type
What we wanted to know...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job types</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Causes for job loss</th>
<th>Transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What types of jobs do individuals keep the longest?</td>
<td>How long do workers keep their jobs?</td>
<td>Why do workers leave employment?</td>
<td>Are workers moving from sheltered work to community employment?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Obtaining a job</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Tax Incentives</th>
<th>Job development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How do workers obtain employment?</td>
<td>What characteristics of service providers lead to better outcomes (certifications, education level, etc.)?</td>
<td>Do tax incentives impact employment outcomes?</td>
<td>How do people get to work?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrative Rule

• Participation in the Outcome Tracking System is a requirement in the Employment First Rule 5123:2-2-05:

Providers of employment services shall collect and submit to the department individual-specific data regarding employment services and employment outcomes including but not limited to, type of services provided, how individuals obtained employment, hours worked, wages earned, and occupations. The data shall be submitted through a web-based data collection system developed and maintained by the department.
Demonstration

• Employment First Outcome Tracking System, website:  
  – https://uatportal.dodd.ohio.gov/Pages/default.aspx
Enhancements since launch

- Expanded page view
- Return user to last page visited
Initial Report Results

- Dr. Robert Cimera compiled a report in June 2014 of the initial data collected.
- Initial report contains data for 476 individuals receiving vocational services.
Second Draft Report

• In the process of compiling second report from data collection system

• Secondary report will contain data for 7,716 individuals receiving vocational services
Demographics of Entire Sample

Level of Intellectual Disability
- Mild
- Moderate
- Severe
- Profound
- None

Age Ranges
- <20 years
- 20 to 25
- 26 to 30
- 31 to 35
- 36 to 40
- 41 to 45
- 46 to 50
- 50+ years

Waiver Status
- Individual Options
- Level 1
- Transitions Developmental Disability
- Unknown/None

Ethnicity/Race
- White
- African American
- Hispanic
- Asian American
- Native American
- Other
- Multiple Ethnicities

Gender
- Male
- Female
Outcomes Achieved by Entire Sample

Living Arrangements
- Community Living
- Lives with Parents
- Boarding Home
- HUD Project Facility
- ICFIID
- Non-ICFIID Facility
- Nursing Home
- Adult Foster

Level of Education
- None/No Formal Education
- Some Formal Education, No Diploma
- SPED/HS Diploma/GED
- Some Post Secondar, No Degree

Employment
- Individualized Community
- Enclave/Mobile Work Crew
- Sheltered Workshop
Outcomes Achieved by Individual Community Subgroup

**WAGES**
- 3.2% Earn below minimum wage
- 63.4% Earn minimum wage
- 33.4% Earn above minimum wage

**HOURS WORKED**
- 34.4% Work 1 to 12 hours/week
- 46.3% Work 13 to 20 hours/week
- 19.4% Work 21 to 40 hours/week

**TOP 3 TYPES OF JOBS**
- 29.5% Food Service
- 23.2% Manufacturing
- 22.1% Janitorial

**WHO OBTAINED JOB**
- 92.5% Agency Providing Support
- 3.2% Bridges to Transition
- 2.2% Individual/Family
- 2.2% Other

**TRANSPORTATION**
- 36.8% Agency/Independent
- 22.1% Public Transportation
- 14.7% Family/Friend/Coworker
- 11.6% Drives Self
- 14.8% Other

**Level of Intellectual Disability**
- 53.8% Mild
- 24.7% Moderate
- 21.5% None

Average Length of Employment: 6 years
Outcomes Achieved by Enclave/Mobile Work Crew Subgroup

**WAGES**
- 9.7% Earn below minimum wage
- 88.9% Earn minimum wage
- 1.4% Earn above minimum wage

**HOURS WORKED**
- 72.2% Work 1 to 12 hours/week
- 18.0% Work 13 to 20 hours/week
- 9.7% Work 21 to 40 hours/week

**TOP 3 TYPES OF JOBS**
- 36.3% Manufacturing
- 28.2% Janitorial
- 18.8% Clerical

**WHO OBTAINED JOB**
- 100% Agency Providing Support

**TRANSPORTATION**
- 76.4% Agency/Independent
- 8.3% Public Transportation
- 4.2% Family/Friend/Coworker
- 2.8% Drives Self
- 8.4% Other

**Level of Intellectual Disability**
- 59.7% Mild
- 22.2% Moderate
- 2.8% Severe
- 15.3% None

Average Length of Employment: 4.9 years
Outcomes Achieved by Sheltered Work Subgroup

WAGES
- 93.9% Earn below minimum wage
- 5.4% Earn minimum wage
- 0.8% Earn above minimum wage

Average Length of Employment: 7.6 years

HOURS WORKED
- 42.8% Work 1 to 12 hours/week
- 32.5% Work 13 to 20 hours/week
- 24.7% Work 21 to 40 hours/week

TRANSPORTATION
- 88.8% Agency/Independent
- 5.4% Public Transportation
- 4.2% Family/Friend/Coworker
- 0.8% Drives Self
- 0.8% Other

Level of Intellectual Disability
- 22.8% Mild
- 39.4% Moderate
- 15.4% Severe
- 4.2% Profound
- 18.1% None
Summary of Findings

• More people are served in sheltered workshops than in the community or enclaves combined.

• Sheltered workshops are more culturally diverse.

• Sheltered employees tend to be older than individuals in community or enclaves.

• Individuals in the community tend to have milder disabilities.

• People with developmental disabilities earned significantly more in the community.

• Individuals in sheltered workshops tended to keep their positions longer.

• Sheltered employees tended to have more expensive funding ranges.

• Most of the individuals in the I/O and Level 1 waiver subgroups were employed in sheltered workshops.

• Individuals in the unknown/no waiver subgroup were more likely employed individually in the community.
Challenges and Future Enhancements

- Limitations with ranges for hours worked and wages
- How can we capture meaningful data to measure integration for individuals no working or participating in sheltered work?
- How can we capture local dollars spent on supported employment services on an individual level?
What Happens Next?

- All county boards have access to the outcome tracking system and have entered records for 9,000 unique individuals.

- Second data report will be available in early January.

- Data will be used to inform the Funding System Re-design process:
  - How many are working
  - How many hours
  - Wages
  - Duration of job placement
  - Intensity of support compared to hours worked

- In the process of rolling out tracking system to private providers this month.
Questions?