

**Washington State Division of Developmental Disabilities  
Jobs by 21 Partnership Project Report for FY2008**

**December 1, 2008**

Document produced by: Institute for Community Inclusion  
University of Massachusetts Boston  
Jean Winsor  
John Butterworth  
Monica Cox  
Jennifer Bose  
[jean.winsor@umb.edu](mailto:jean.winsor@umb.edu)

Document produced for: Washington State Division of  
Developmental Disabilities,  
Aging and Disability Services  
Administration,  
Department of Social and Health Services

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	3
Introduction.....	6
Goals of the Jobs by 21 Partnership Project.....	9
Methodology.....	12
Findings	
Individual Employment Outcomes.....	13
Urgent Issues in the Transition from School to Employment.....	43
Best Practices to Facilitate Collaboration across Systems.....	48
Best Practices to Address Individual Expectations.....	56
Best Practices to Address Familial Expectations and Resources.....	60
Policy Implications.....	63
Conclusion.....	67
References.....	68
Appendix A.....	70
Appendix B.....	72
Appendix C.....	73
Appendix D.....	95

## **Executive Summary**

The Jobs by 21 Partnership Project was funded by the Washington State Legislature for the 2007-2009 biennium. The Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD) was authorized to identify and demonstrate best practices in sustainable partnerships among Washington State's school districts, counties, employers, families, students with developmental disabilities and adult service agencies. The focus of the collaborative relationships between Partnership Projects stakeholders was to obtain "Jobs by 21" for young adults with developmental disabilities.

### **Need for the Jobs by 21 Partnership Project**

The federal *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) and the Washington *Working Age Adult Policy* both place an emphasis on the importance of employment for young adults with developmental disabilities, but there is evidence that the goals of these policies have not been met for all young adults in Washington. Billing and reporting data collected by DDD in 2007 clearly indicates that 87% of young adults turning 21 who were eligible for DDD services were not employed in the three months after their graduation from high school.

### **Project Award Criteria**

Following the provision of funding in the 2007-2009 DDD budget, in January 2008 county DD offices were asked to respond to a DDD issued "Criteria for Award" to receive Jobs by 21 Partnership Project funds for fiscal year 2008. This was the first year that Jobs by 21 Partnership Project funds were available. Nine counties requested Project Awards and received funds for the project from February to June 2008, to serve students ages 20-21 who were clients of DDD to obtain employment.

### **Methodology**

The Institute for Community Inclusion (ICI) at the University of Massachusetts-Boston was contracted by DDD to conduct an evaluation of the Jobs by 21 Partnership Project. Working in conjunction with the DDD Project Manager, ICI researchers used several sources of data [including the Employment Security Department's Unemployment Insurance Employment Database and DDD's Case Management Information System (CMIS)] and methods of analysis to understand the impact of the Partnership Project on employment outcomes for young adults with developmental disabilities in Washington. Additionally, data was collected and analyzed on the impact that the Partnership Project had on the level and types of collaboration system stakeholders engaged in to support project outcomes.

### **Individual Employment Outcome Findings**

Quarterly job obtainment, quarterly wage, and quarterly hour data was compared across 9 Partnership Project Counties and the remaining Non-Partnership Project Counties, and across Partnership Project Participants and Non-Partnership Project Participants. Data for the fiscal quarter July 1-September 30, 2008 was not yet

available from the Employment Security Department. As a substitute, data reported for this fiscal quarter is from the DDD CMIS, and was extracted from the CMIS on November 25, 2008.

*Partnership Project Participants had better individual employment outcomes than Non-Participants.* Specifically, Partnership Project Participants were more likely to earn wages than Non-Participants prior to their graduation from high school. Forty-nine percent (49%) of individuals who participated in the Partnership Project had wage and hour data reported to the Employment Security Department for the fiscal quarter April 1- June 30, 2008, compared with individuals who lived in Partnership Project Counties but did not participate for whom 14% of individuals had data reported. Only 22% of young adults in Non-Partnership Project Counties had wage and hour data reported.

*Post-graduation Partnership Project Participants were more likely to earn wages after their graduation from high school than Non-Participants.* Forty-five percent (45%) of individuals who participated in the Partnership Project had wage and hour data reported to DDD in the fiscal quarter July 1 – September 30, 2008 , compared with individuals who lived in Partnership Project Counties but did not participate for whom 6% of individuals had data reported. Only 7% of young adults in Non-Partnership Project Counties had wage and hour data reported for the first quarter following their graduation from high school.

*Partnership Project Participants on average earned higher wages than Non-Participants.* In the three months after graduation from high school young adults with developmental disabilities who participated in the Partnership Project earned higher wages than Non-Participants who were employed.

*Partnership Project Participants on average worked more hours than Non-Participants.* In the three months after graduation from high school young adults with developmental disabilities who participated in the Partnership Project worked more hours than Non-Participants who were employed.

*Partnership Project Participants were more cost effective to serve than Non-Participants.* In the three months after graduation from high school young adults with developmental disabilities who participated in the Partnership Project earned \$80 for every \$100 DDD spent to initially support them in their first 3 months of county DD employment services. This was a greater return on investment than Non-Participants. Partnership County Non-Participants earned \$50 for every \$100 spent and Non-Partnership Project County Clients earned \$41 for every \$100.

### **Best Practices Identified to Facilitate Collaboration**

Data on the impact that the Partnership Project had on the level and types of collaboration system stakeholders engaged in to support project outcomes lead to the identification of Best Practices: for collaboration between schools and the adult

service system, to address the expectations of and resources available to individuals with developmental disabilities, and to address the expectations and resources available to families of young adults with developmental disabilities.

*Best Practices for collaboration between schools and the adult service system identified through the Partnership Project center around five themes.* The themes are: Working together to leverage dollars; Working together to leverage non-monetary resources; Working together: County DD and School Districts; Working together: Professional Development for Educators; and Working together: Collaboration with employment systems and employers.

*Best Practices to address individual expectations and resources identified through the Partnership Project center around four themes.* The themes are: Ensuring that young adults receive the message that employment is important; Ensuring young adults have the opportunity to explore employment while still in school; Supporting collaboration between individuals, DDD, and DVR; and Supporting young adults to identify and receive services from employment providers prior to graduation.

*Best Practices to address familial expectations and resources identified through the Partnership Project center around four themes.* The themes are: The differences between education services and adult services; The process of transition to employment; The differences between the school and work environments; and The supports available to assist young adults with developmental disabilities to obtain employment.

## **Conclusion**

Individual employment outcome data and the identification of a comprehensive list of best practices clearly demonstrate that the Jobs by 21 Partnership Project had a significant impact on both the school and adult service system in Washington. County DD offices, schools districts, DDD, DVR, employment providers, employers, individuals with developmental disabilities and their families all came together to demonstrate that collaborative relationships between stakeholders lead to “Jobs by 21” for young adults with developmental disabilities.

## Introduction

The Jobs by 21 Partnership Project was funded by the Washington State Legislature for the 2007-2009 biennium. The Division of Developmental Disabilities (DDD) was authorized to identify and demonstrate best practices in sustainable partnerships among Washington State's school districts, counties, employers, families, students with developmental disabilities and adult service agencies. The focus of the collaborative relationships between Partnership Projects stakeholder is to obtain "Jobs by 21" for students with developmental disabilities. As will be described in this report, successful employment outcomes are significantly improved when stakeholders collaborate prior to a student's graduation from high school to obtain employment. This is the first time funds have been added to the DDD budget specifically to capitalize on the supports available to young adults with developmental disabilities while in school and to leverage the support of adult services and stakeholder groups so that young adults with developmental disabilities exit school and enter the workforce at age 21.

In fiscal year 2008, \$709,000 was allocated to DDD for the implementation of the Jobs by 21 Partnership Project. Shortly after DDD hired a Project Manager in November of 2008, the Partnership Project Steering Committee (Appendix A) was assembled and developed the FY 2008 Partnership Project Award Criteria. The criteria were distributed statewide and all county DD offices were encouraged to apply for an award. This was the first year that Jobs by 21 Partnership Project funds were available. Nine counties were awarded Partnership Project funds during the first year of the project. Awards to counties ranged from \$8,000 (Island County) to \$180,000 (King County) to work with school districts and community partners to support students ages 20-21 who are clients of DDD to obtain employment.

### *Need for Jobs by 21 Partnership Project*

Beginning with the early research of Hasazi, Johnson, Hasazi, Gordon, & Hull (1989) on high school experience and its relationship to employment there has been evidence of a relationship between participating in paid employment while enrolled in high school and post-graduation individual employment outcomes. The federal *Individuals with Disabilities Education Act* (IDEA) and the Washington *Working Age Adult Policy* both place an emphasis on the importance of employment for young adults with developmental disabilities, but there is evidence that the goals of these policies have not been met for all young adults in Washington. Billing and reporting data collected by DDD in 2007 clearly indicates that most young adults (87%) who are eligible for DDD services were not employed in the three months after their graduation from high school.

### Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

Through the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), young people with developmental disabilities are entitled to educational programming through age 21. In Washington, funding for these students is forecast in the education budget. The IDEA requires that students between the ages of 16-21 years begin planning for their

transition from secondary education to adult services. This requirement is identified as Indicator 13 in Washington's *State Performance Plan* submitted by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). During these years, individualized education plans are designed to meet each student's desired post-secondary outcomes. One of the outcomes expected for students transitioning to adults services is employment. Achievement of post-school outcomes as required under Indicator 14 in the Washington *State Performance Plan* is measured by assessing whether upon matriculation students are admitted to a university, community college, or vocational/technical School; obtain a job; or are connected to an employment support agency. Washington State's Performance Plan illustrates a clear need for improvement on both Indicator 13 and Indicator 14.

### Working Age Adult Policy

In Washington once a student graduates from high school, support services are no longer provided by the local school district. The county DD agency is responsible for implementing state DDD policies, including the Working Age Adult Policy, related to the provision of day and employment services for individuals who are eligible and funded for DDD services. The Working Age Adult Policy "designates employment supports as the primary method of furnishing state-financed day services to adult participants." Emphasizing community employment as the primary service option, the policy further states that: "services for persons under the age of 62 that do not emphasize the pursuit or maintenance of employment in integrated settings can be authorized only by exception to policy" (Washington DSHS, DDD, "County Services for Working Age Adults" Policy 4.11). This policy was implemented by DDD in 2004 and went into full effect on July 1, 2006. The policy is a public statement of DDD's vision for young adults with developmental disabilities, that they will have equal access to the status, respect, relationships, wages and benefits achieved through gainful employment in the community.

Supporting DDD's focus on employment the Washington State's Workforce Training and Education Coordination Board's *Focus on People with Disabilities* (2007) asserts:

In the coming years, Washington will face an increasing shortage of skilled workers. People with a disability have been an underutilized human resource, and, in the past, have been underrepresented in the workforce at large. Part of the solution to this coming shortage should come from preparing people with disabilities for success in the workplace (p.1).

DDD administrators note that the fulfillment of the objectives of the Working Age Adult Policy is impacted by the success or failure of young adults with developmental disabilities to obtain employment while still enrolled in school. Recognizing the connection between OSPI's Indicators 13 and 14 and the Working Age Adult Policy, the Jobs by 21 Partnership Project, was conceived as a collaborative strategy to minimize these disconnects and support stakeholders to ensure that post-graduation young adults earn a living wage and have gainful employment throughout their work

lives. To this end, counties were targeted to receive pilot funds from the Jobs by 21 Partnership Project to develop and demonstrate innovative strategies to provide opportunities for young adults with developmental disabilities to exit school and enter directly into Washington's workforce with a job at age 21.

## Goals of the Jobs by 21 Partnership Project

The Jobs by 21 Partnership Project was created to support collaborative solutions to the problems facing stakeholders in the employment system, young adults transitioning to employment, and families of young adults transitioning to employment.

The intent of the Partnership Project is:

- To capitalize on the IDEA requirement that students have a post-school outcome plan and Washington Counties' responsibility to provide employment support by expanding and improving on the state's early models of collaboration.
- To establish a statewide connection between DDD, the counties and schools to enable students with developmental disabilities to make the most productive use of the supports available in schools to achieve employment or successful pathway to employment upon matriculation.
- To ensure that counties and school districts make use of currently available supports and information resources available from the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, the WorkForce Board, the Employment Security Department, the Center for Change in Transition Services and other stakeholder agencies to achieve post-school employment objectives for transition age students with developmental disabilities. Supports include statewide job training and job preparation opportunities. Information resources include: labor market guides, workforce development trends, and post-graduation outcome reports.

### *Project Award Criteria for the Jobs by 21 Partnership Project for Counties for FY 2008*

In January of 2008, county DD offices were asked to respond to a DDD issued "Criteria for Award" to receive Jobs by 21 Partnership Project funds for fiscal year 2008. Counties needed to demonstrate collaborative transition projects supporting young adults with developmental disabilities to secure employment by age 21 and obtain positive post-school outcomes. To be considered for funding, counties needed to email their application by January 25, 2008 to the Project Manager.

Counties were asked to prepare a brief (one to five page) overview describing their county's current and planned collaborative project activities towards gainful employment for young adults with developmental disabilities between the ages of 20-21. Counties were required to include descriptions and examples of their county's proposed involvement in the following elements:

- Memorandums of Understanding (MOUs) with collaborative community partners,
- Transition Councils or other interagency school district and adult service agency (ex. DVR, WorkSource, Transit) groups focused on young adult job seekers,

- School district and Educational Service District employment and career activities,
- Adult supported employment provider role in employment and career activities,
- Availability and provision of Social Security Benefits Training to job seekers,
- Resource Fairs, Transition Fairs, and/or Transition Conferences for young adult job seekers and their families,
- Dissemination of information about transition and post-secondary education resources and opportunities for young adult job seekers,
- Technical assistance & training for teachers, employment providers, families, students, and other stakeholders,
- Peer Mentor Groups or Job Clubs for young adults who are working or are working towards employment,
- Business Leadership Networks or other employer related initiatives targeting young adult job seekers,
- Use of labor market information (local workforce trend data, median wage information, top county employers, etc.) to assist in the employment of young adults, and
- Other information regarding the county's collaborative efforts to secure jobs and post-school outcomes for young adults.

Counties were also asked to identify:

- The names of each school district in their county
- The number of districts targeted to participate in the project
- The number of DDD clients turning 21 between September 1, 2007 and August 31, 2008. And of this group:
  - The total number expected to participate in the county's project,
  - The number participating who were expected to be employed in June of 2008 with jobs,
  - The number participating who were expected to have developed resumes,
  - The number participating who were expected to have developed portfolios of job experiences, and
  - The number participating who were expected to be enrolled in technical or community college.

Additionally counties were asked to:

- Describe the information, education, and/or assistance the county provides on Social Security Benefits Analysis to young adults and their families and other collaborative partners,
- Identify the funding and/or in-kind match collaborating stakeholders would be contributing to the project, and
- Request an award amount for FY2008 and identify the reasoning and logic used in requesting this award amount from DDD.

### Responses to request for Project Awards

Nine counties requested Project Awards and received funds for the project from February to June 2008. These 9 Counties partnered with 55 school districts (Appendix B) to support students' ages 20-21 who are clients of DDD to obtain employment.

### Determination of student participation in the Partnership Project

Nearly 35% of students with developmental disabilities who were eligible for DDD services participated in their counties' Partnership Projects in Spring 2008. However, the percentage of students varied by county and the range of participation by county ranged from 50% to 10%. The difference in the percentage of eligible students participating by county is most likely the result of the various methods used by counties to determine student participation in the Partnership Project. King, Kitsap, and Snohomish Counties each provide examples of some of the innovative strategies counties used to collaborate with stakeholders to determine student participation.

- King County used the Partnership Project to enhance employment services for students enrolled in their School-to-Work Project (S2W). Students entered the S2W through referrals from school districts, DDD, Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, family members, and advocacy groups such as the Arc. Staff members from each school district collaborated with a King County DD staff member to identify the students who were eligible for the program, students who were 21 or would turn 21 shortly. For the 2007-2008 school year these students birth date range was between 9/1/86 and 8/31/87. Students also must have qualified for or been willing to apply for DDD and DVR services. Students and their families also needed to complete an application packet.
- Kitsap County partnered with a local provider to increase opportunities for employment at Harrison Hospital. Students were targeted for the Partnership Project whose career goals matched the jobs that the employment provider had developed in conjunction with the hospital. Other factors that impacted the inclusion of these students were their date of graduation, the length of time they would need job support, and the availability of DVR funds. Kitsap County also targeted these students because they most likely would need long term employment supports compared with students who were more easily employable.
- Snohomish County targeted students for the Partnership Project who had previously expressed an interest in employment. Some students had previously been employed or had previously worked with DVR to find employment. Snohomish also identified students who had left school prior to the age of 21 but who were not yet receiving DDD services. To qualify for the program all participants had to agree to choose an employment provider during the course of their involvement in the project.



## Methodology

The Institute for Community Inclusion (ICI) at the University of Massachusetts-Boston was contracted by DDD to conduct an evaluation of the Jobs by 21 Partnership Project. Working in conjunction with the DDD Project Manager, ICI researchers developed and implemented several methods of data collection and analysis to understand the impact of the Partnership Project on employment outcomes for young adults with developmental disabilities in Washington. Additionally data was collected and analyzed on the impact that the Partnership Project had on the level and types of collaboration system stakeholders engaged in to support project outcomes.

### *Assessing employment outcomes for young adults with developmental disabilities*

Several methods were used to collect employment outcome data for young adults with developmental disabilities. Data was collected from the Washington Employment Security Department Unemployment Insurance Employment Database, Washington Division of Developmental Disabilities Case Management Information System (CMIS)<sup>1</sup>, and from individual employment outcomes forms developed by the ICI and completed by county DD project staff. County DD project staff were also asked to complete a form developed by the ICI to assess students' career development experiences during their involvement in the Partnership Project. The DDD Project Manager reviewed and provided feedback on the individual employment outcomes form and career development experiences form developed by the ICI.

Data collected from these sources is highlighted in the Individual Employment Outcomes section and in the Best Practices section of this report. Summaries of data for Partnership Project Counties can be found in the Appendix section (Appendix C).

### *Assessing collaboration between system stakeholders*

County DD project staff were asked to complete a structured interview questionnaire describing their county's Partnership Project activities. The DDD Project Manager reviewed the completed questionnaire with each county and in some cases solicited additional information from the counties. The Project Manager incorporated the additional information into the structured interview questionnaire and each county was given the opportunity to review and amend the questionnaire before labeling the document as final.

Information gathered from the structured interviews was enhanced by information gathered by the ICI through in-person interviews and focus groups with stakeholders from Kitsap, Thurston, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties. Stakeholders included: county DD staff, school administrators and teachers, employment providers, family members, and young adults who had obtained jobs.

---

<sup>1</sup> Prior to 2008 this system was known as the County Reporting and Information System (CRIS).

Data collected from these sources will be highlighted in the Urgent Issues in the Transition from School to Employment and the Best Practices section of this report.

## Individual Employment Outcomes

The examination of employment outcomes for project participants is one method to assess the success of the Partnership Project. *Employment outcomes will be examined for students who were 20-21 years of age and exited from high school during the 2007-2008 school year.* The outcomes of the young adults who were employed will be further examined based upon the individual's county or residence, DDD employment service billed for, score on the Employment Activities Supports Intensity Subscale and overall support need for employment (please see Appendix D for a description of the factors that influence acuity), place of residence, waiver status, and the ratio of dollars earned to cost of employment services.

Employment outcomes for students who graduated in June 2008 will be highlighted for the fiscal quarter April 1 - June 30, 2008 and for the fiscal quarter July 1 - September 30, 2008. Additionally the employment outcomes for students who graduated in June 2008 and participated in their counties Partnership Project will be compared to students who graduated in June 2008 and did not participate in the project and to students in Partnership and Non-Partnership Counties who graduated in June 2007.

Data from the fiscal quarter April 1-June 30, 2008 comes from the Employment Security Department. Data was not available from the Employment Security Department for the fiscal quarter July 1-September 30, 2008. As a substitute, data for the fiscal quarters July 1-September 30, 2008 and the same quarter in 2007 are from DDD<sup>2</sup>. DDD CMIS data for July 1-September 30, 2008 does not include data from every county for the entire time period<sup>3</sup>. It is expected that once data from the Employment Services Department becomes available there will be an increase in the number of wage earners for the period of July 1-September 30, 2008. Data presented as an average represents the average of the fiscal quarter.

The following terminology will be used to describe individual employment outcomes:

- *Partnership Project Counties* are counties that received Partnership Project funds,
- *Non-Partnership Project Counties* are counties that did not receive Partnership Project funds,

---

<sup>2</sup> DDD's data collection system includes variables that are not included in the Employment Security Department. These variables include: type of employment service, level of employment support need and overall support needs for daily living, place of residence, waiver status, and the ratio of dollars earned to cost of employment services for this time period.

<sup>3</sup> DDD data for this report was compiled only from counties that reported CMIS billing data for July, August, and/or September 2008. This data was extracted from the CMIS system on November 25, 2008. On that date Klickitat County had not submitted CMIS billing for the months of July and September 2008, and Ferry, Stevens, and Wahkiakum Counties had not submitted CMIS billing for the month of September 2008.

- *Partnership Project Participants* are students, who lived in counties that received Partnership Project funds and who participated in their county's project,
- *Partnership County Non-Participants* are students who lived in counties that received Partnership Project funds but did not participate in their county's project, and
- *Non-Partnership Project County Clients* are students who did not live in counties that received Partnership Project funds.

**Partnership Project Counties and Partnership Project Participant Outcomes for the Fiscal Quarter April 1, 2008 - June 30, 2008**

Wage Earners

During the fiscal quarter beginning April 1, 2008 and ending June 30, 2008, 9 of 39 Washington counties participated in the Jobs by 21 Partnership Project program. The Partnership Project Counties reported a total of 79 wage earners among program participants based upon data from the Employment Security Department. Wage earning participants worked an average of 151 hours and earned an average of \$1,613 in wages during the fiscal quarter. King County reported the highest frequency of wage earners with 39 jobs (49% of total wage earners), followed by Thurston County with 13 jobs (16% of total wage earners), Spokane County with 9 jobs (11% of total wage earners), Snohomish with 7 jobs (9% of total wage earners), Clark with 5 jobs (6% of wage earners), and Kitsap, Mason, and Pierce counties each reporting 2 jobs (3% each of total wage earners).

*Partnership Project Participant Total Wage Earners for the Fiscal Quarter April – June, 2008*

<b>County</b>	<b>Number of Individuals age 21 Participating</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Clark	22	5	142	\$1,206
Island	2	0	NA	NA
King	69	39	189	\$2,312
Kitsap	3	2	275	\$2,635
Mason	3	2	95	\$774
Pierce	8	2	310	\$1,890
Snohomish	19	7	95	\$889
Spokane	10	9	57	\$534
Thurston	24	13	97	\$741
<b>Total</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>151</b>	<b>\$1,613</b>

Data was not available for the following variables for this time period: type of employment service, level of employment support need and overall support needs for

daily living, place of residence, waiver status, and the ratio of dollars earned to cost of employment services.

**Partnership Project Counties and Partnership Participant Outcomes for the Fiscal Quarter July1, 2008- September 30, 2008**

Wage Earners

The Partnership Project Counties reported a total of 72 wage earners among participants in the 3 months after students’ graduation from high school based upon data reported to DDD. Wage earning participants worked an average of 140 hours and earned an average of \$1,185 during the fiscal quarter. King County reported the highest frequency with 37 jobs (51% of total wage earners), followed by Thurston County with 10 jobs (14% of total wage earners), Snohomish County with 9 jobs (13% of total wage earners), Spokane County with 8 jobs (11% of total wage earners), Pierce with 4 jobs (6% of total wage earners), Kitsap with 2 jobs (3% of total wage earners), and Mason and Clark counties each reporting 1 job (1% each of total wage earners).

*Partnership Project Participant Total Wage Earners for July – September, 2008*

<b>County</b>	<b>Number of Individuals age 21 Participating</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Clark	22	1	112	\$904
Island	2	0	NA	NA
King	69	37	144	\$1,215
Kitsap	3	2	164	\$1,776
Mason	3	1	107	\$859
Pierce	8	4	145	\$923
Snohomish	19	9	151	\$1,336
Spokane	10	8	138	\$1,136
Thurston	24	10	120	\$1,022
<b>Total</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>\$1,185</b>

Type of DDD Employment Service

Employment services were billed for 72 participants. Sixty-two participants (86%) billed for individual employment services, 3 participants (4%) billed for group supported employment services, and 7 participants (10%) billed for person-to-person services. Participants who received services for individual employment worked an average of 149 hours and earned an average of \$1,291. Participants who received group employment supported services worked an average of 156 hours and earned an average of \$826. Those receiving person-to-person services worked an average of 50 hours and earned an average of \$394.

*Partnership Project Participant Employment Services Billed for July – September, 2008*

<b>Employment Service</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Group Supported Employment	3	156	\$826
Individual Employment	62	149	\$1,291
Person-to-Person Services	7	50	\$394
Pre-Vocational Employment	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>\$1,185</b>

Employment Activities Supports Intensity Subscale Score

Fifty-six of the 72 wage earning participants in the Partnership Project counties were assessed using the Employment Activities Supports Intensity Subscale. Among the 6 participants (11%) assessed as needing a high level of support, the average hours worked was 84 and the average wages earned was \$753. For the 35 participants (62%) requiring a medium level of support, the average hours worked was 122 and the average earnings were \$1,006. The 15 participants (27%) who required a low level of support worked an average of 166 hours and earned an average of \$1,385.

*Partnership Project Participant Employment Activities Supports Intensity Subscale Score for July- September, 2008*

<b>Subscale Score</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
High	6	84	\$753
Medium	35	122	\$1,006
Low	15	166	\$1,385
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>\$1,080</b>

Level of Overall Support Need for Employment

Fifty-six of the 72 wage earning participants in the Partnership Project counties were assessed for overall support needs for employment. Among the 9 participants (16%) who required a high level of overall employment support, the average hours worked were 81 and the average wages earned was \$688. For the 26 participants (38%) who required a medium level of overall employment support, the average hours worked was 104 hours and the average wages earned was \$883. The 21 participants (46%) who required a low level of overall employment support worked an average of 181 hours and earned an average of \$1,523.

*Partnership Project Participant Overall Level of Support Need for Employment Assessed for July-September, 2008*

<b>Level of Support</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
High	9	81	\$688
Medium	26	104	\$883
Low	21	181	\$1,523
<b>Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>\$1,080</b>

Type of Residence

Forty-nine participants (68%) resided in their parent's home and worked an average of 155 hours and earned an average of \$1,308 in wages compared to an average 83 hours worked and \$678 earned among the 6 individuals (8%) living in adult family homes; an average 119 hours worked and \$1,115 earned among the 5 individuals (7%) living in their own home; 270 hours worked and \$2,188 earned for the 2 individuals (3%) living alone in their own homes; an average 84 hours worked and \$662 earned among the 4 individuals (5.5%) who are supported-living residents; an average 92 hours worked and \$804 earned among the 4 individuals (5.5%) living with relatives; and an average of 79 hours worked and \$680 earned for the 2 individuals (3%) living in an otherwise non-specified residence.

*Partnership Project Participant Residential Type for July-September, 2008*

<b>Residence</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Adult Family Home	6	83	\$678
Child Foster Home	0	NA	NA
Parents Home	49	155	\$1,308
Relatives Home	4	92	\$804
Own Home	5	119	\$1,115
Own (Alone)	2	270	\$2,188
Own (Supported Living)	4	84	\$662
Other	2	79	\$680
Unknown	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>\$1,185</b>

Waiver Status

Partnership Project counties reported a total of 22 participants who received Basic, Basic Plus, or Core waiver funded services. The 14 participants (64%) who received Basic waiver services worked an average of 149 hours and earned an average of \$1,132. Four participants (18%) received Basic Plus waiver services and worked an average of 194 hours and earned an average of \$1,955. The 4 participants (18%) who received Core waiver services worked on average 84 hours and earned an average \$662.

*Partnership Project Participant Waiver Status for July-September, 2008*

<b>Waiver</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Basic	14	149	\$1,132
Basic Plus	4	194	\$1,955
Community Protection	0	NA	NA
Core	4	84	\$662
<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>\$1,196</b>

Ratio of Total Wages Earned to Total Cost of Employment Service

In the three months after graduation from high school young adults with developmental disabilities who participated in the Partnership Project earned \$80 for every \$100 DDD spent to support them.

**Partnership County Non-Participant Outcomes for the Fiscal Quarter April 1, 2008 - June 30, 2008**

Wage Earners

During the fiscal quarter beginning April 1, 2008 and ending June 30, 2008, 9 of 39 Washington counties participated in the Jobs by 21 Partnership Project program. The Partnership Project Counties reported a total of 44 wage earners among project non-participants based upon data reported to the Employment Security Department. Wage earning non-participants worked an average of 217 hours and earned an average of \$2,242 during the fiscal quarter. King and Spokane Counties reported the highest frequency of wage earners with 12 jobs each (27% each of total wage earners), followed by Pierce County with 7 jobs (15% of total wage earners), Snohomish County with 5 jobs (11% of total wage earners), Kitsap and Thurston Counties with 7 jobs each (6% each of total wage earners), Thurston County with 3 jobs (6% of total wage earners), and Clark and Island Counties each reporting 1 jobs (1% each of total wage earners).

*Partnership County Non-Participants Total Wage Earners for April- June, 2008*

<b>County</b>	<b>Number of Individuals age 21 not Participating</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Clark	18	1	330	\$2,673
Island	5	1	484	\$4,130
King	73	12	230	\$1,977
Kitsap	24	3	40	\$332
Mason	1	0	NA	NA
Pierce	64	7	226	\$3,023
Snohomish	42	5	253	\$3,717
Spokane	77	12	216	\$2,003
Thurston	11	3	142	\$1,109
<b>Total</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>\$2,242</b>

Data was not available for the following variables for this time period: type of employment service, level of employment support need and overall support needs for daily living, place of residence, waiver status, and the ratio of dollars earned to cost of employment services.

**Partnership County Non-Participant Outcomes for the Fiscal Quarter July 1, 2008 – September 30, 2008**

Wage Earners

The Partnership Project Counties reported a total of 18 wage earners among non-participants in the three months after students' graduation from high school based upon data reported to DDD. Non-participants worked an average of 113 hours and earned an average of \$901 during the fiscal quarter. King County reported the highest frequency of wage earners among non-participants with 9 jobs (50% of total wage earners), followed by Spokane County with 5 jobs (28% of total wage earners), Kitsap County with 3 jobs (17% of total wage earners) and Snohomish County with 1 job (5% of total wage earners).

*Partnership County Non-Participants Total Wage Earners for July-September, 2008*

<b>County</b>	<b>Number of Individuals age 21 not Participating</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Clark	18	0	NA	NA
Island	5	0	NA	NA
King	73	9	157	\$1,254
Kitsap	24	3	96	\$775
Mason	1	0	NA	NA
Pierce	64	0	NA	NA
Snohomish	42	1	27	\$153
Spokane	77	5	62	\$489
Thurston	11	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>315</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>\$901</b>

Type of DDD Employment Service

Employment services were billed for 18 non-participants. Fourteen individuals (78%) billed for individual employment services, 3 individuals (17%) billed for group supported employment services, and 1 individual billed (5%) for person-to-person services. Non-participants who received individual employment services worked an average of 110 hours and earned an average of \$925; those who received group supported employment services worked an average of 99 hours and earned an average of \$431 in wages, and the individual who received person-to-person services worked 191 hours and earned \$1,969.

*Partnership County Non-Participants Employment Services Billed for July-September, 2008*

<b>Employment Service</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Group Supported Employment	3	99	\$431
Individual Employment	14	110	\$925
Person-to-Person Services	1	191	\$1,969
Pre-Vocational Employment	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>\$901</b>

Employment Activities Supports Intensity Subscale

Sixteen of the 18 wage earning non-participants were assessed using the Employment Activities Supports Intensity Subscale. Two non-participants (12%) were assessed as needing a high level of support and worked 57 hours, earning \$426. For the 7 non-

participants (44%) who were assessed as needing a medium level of support, the average hours worked was 131 hours and the average wages earned was \$915. The 7 non-participants (44%) who were assessed as needing a low level of support worked an average of 81 hours and earned an average of \$712.

*Partnership County Non-Participants Employment Activities Supports Intensity Subscale Score for July-September, 2008*

<b>Subscale Score</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
High	2	57	\$426
Medium	7	131	\$915
Low	7	81	\$712
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>\$765</b>

Level of Overall Support Need for Employment

Partnership Project Counties reported that a total of 16 of the 18 wage earning non-participants were assessed for level of overall support needs for employment. Among the 4 non-participants (25%) were assessed as needing a high level of overall employment support, the average hours worked was 47 hours with an average of \$347 in wages earned. For the 10 non-participants (62.5%) who were assessed as needing a medium level of overall employment support, the average hours worked was 120 hours and the average wages earned was \$922. The 2 non-participants (12.5%) who were assessed as needing a low level of overall employment support worked an average of 101 hours and earned an average of \$813 in wages.

*Partnership County Non-Participants Overall Level of Support Need for Employment Assessed for July- September, 2008*

<b>Level of Support</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
High	4	47	\$347
Medium	10	120	\$922
Low	2	101	\$813
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>\$765</b>

Type of Residence

Partnership Project Counties reported that 11 non-participants (61.5%) resided in their parent's home, worked an average of 113 hours, and earned an average of \$977. This is in comparison to the 1 individual (5.5%) who lived in an adult family home and worked 108 hours and earned \$872, the 1 individual (5.5%) who lived in a child foster home and worked 269 hours and earned \$1,204, the 1 individual (5.5%) who lived in their own home and worked 127 hours and earned \$1,023, the 2 individuals (11%) who resided in supported living and worked 25 hours and earned \$170, and the 2 individuals (11%) who resided in a relatives home and worked on average 123 hours and earned on average \$1,012.

*Partnership County Non-Participants Residential Type for July-September, 2008*

<b>Residence</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Adult Family Home	1	108	\$872
Child Foster Home	1	269	\$1,204
Parents Home	11	113	\$977
Relatives Home	2	123	\$1,012
Own Home	1	127	\$1,023
Own (Alone)	0	NA	NA
Own (Supported Living)	2	25	\$170
Other	0	NA	NA
Unknown	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>\$901</b>

Waiver Status

Partnership Project Counties reported a total of 8 non-participants who received Basic, Basic Plus, community Protection, or Core waiver funded services. The 3 non-participants (37.5%) who received Basic waiver services worked an average of 18 hours and earned an average of \$98 in wages. Basic Plus waiver services were received by 2 non-participants (25%) and they worked an average of 212 hours, earning an average of \$1,967. One non-participant (12.5%) received Community Protection waiver services, worked 27 hours and earned \$153. Two non-participants (25%) received Core waiver services and worked an average of 146 hours and earned an average of \$695 in wages.

*Partnership County Non-Participants Waiver Status for July-September, 2008*

<b>Waiver</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Basic	3	18	\$98
Basic Plus	2	212	\$1,967
Community Protection	1	27	\$153
Core	2	146	\$695
<b>Total</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>\$721</b>

Ratio of Total Wages Earned to Total Cost of Employment Service

In the three months after graduation from high school young adults with developmental disabilities who received services from Partnership Project Counties but did not participate in project activities earned \$50 for every \$100 DDD spent to support them.

## **Non-Partnership County Client Outcomes for the Fiscal Quarter April 1-June 30, 2008**

### Wage Earners

The Non-Partnership Counties reported a total of 46 wage earners among the individuals they served between April 1 and June 30, 2008 based upon data reported to the Employment Security Department. The wage earners worked an average of 214 hours and earned an average of \$1,713 during the fiscal quarter. Yakima County reported the highest frequency of wage earners with 7 jobs (15% of total wage earners), followed by Skagit County with 6 jobs (13% of total wage earners), Walla Walla and Grant counties with 5 jobs each (11% each of total wage earners), Whatcom and Lewis counties with 4 jobs each (9% each of total wage earners), Benton and Grays Harbor counties with 3 jobs each (7% each of total wage earners), Chelan and Clallam counties with 2 jobs each (4% each of total wage earners), and Asotin, Columbia, Jefferson, Lincoln and Whitman counties each reporting 1 job (2% each of total wage earners).

*Non-Partnership County Clients Total Wage Earners for April-June, 2008*

<b>County</b>	<b>Number of Individuals age 21</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Adams	1	0	NA	NA
Asotin	4	1	1	\$14
Benton	29	3	285	\$2,872
Chelan	6	2	40	\$323
Clallam	6	2	13	\$106
Columbia	2	1	187	\$756
Cowlitz	11	0	NA	NA
Douglas	1	0	NA	NA
Ferry	1	0	NA	NA
Franklin	0	NA	NA	NA
Garfield	0	NA	NA	NA
Grant	19	5	445	\$2,263
Grays Harbor	9	3	272	\$3,217
Jefferson	2	1	510	\$5,321
Kittitas	5	0	NA	NA
Klickitat	2	0	NA	NA
Lewis	13	4	94	\$47
Lincoln	1	1	259	\$2,107
Okanogan	6	0	NA	NA
Pacific	2	0	NA	NA
Pend Oreille	1	0	NA	NA
San Juan	1	0	NA	NA
Skagit	13	6	144	\$1,320
Skamania	1	0	NA	NA
Stevens	7	0	NA	NA
Walla Walla	8	5	235	\$1,873
Wahkiakum	0	NA	NA	NA
Whatcom	17	4	353	\$3,262
Whitman	3	1	289	\$2,397
Yakima	33	7	112	\$1,036
<b>Total</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>\$1,713</b>

Data was not available for the following variables for this time period: type of employment service, level of employment support need and overall support needs for daily living, place of residence, waiver status, and the ratio of dollars earned to cost of employment services.

**Non-Partnership County Client Outcomes for the Fiscal Quarter July 1-September 30, 2008**

Employment Wage earners

Non-Partnership Project counties reported a total of 14 employment wage earners for the individuals they served in the 3 months after the students graduated from high school based upon data reported to DDD. Employed individuals worked an average of 110 hours and earned an average of \$560 during the fiscal quarter. Skagit County reported the highest frequency of employment wage earners with 4 jobs (29% of total wage earners), followed by Kittitas, Walla Walla and Yakima counties reporting 2 jobs each (14% each of total wage earners). Asotin, Clallam, Grant, and Whitman counties each reported 1 job (7.25% each of total wage earners).

*Non-Partnership County Clients Total Placement for July-September, 2008*

<b>County</b>	<b>Number of Individuals age 21</b>	<b>Wage earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Adams	1	0	NA	NA
Asotin	4	1	63	\$576
Benton	29	0	NA	NA
Chelan	6	0	NA	NA
Clallam	6	1	68	\$186
Columbia	2	0	NA	NA
Cowlitz	11	0	NA	NA
Douglas	1	0	NA	NA
Ferry	1	0	NA	NA
Franklin	0	NA	NA	NA
Garfield	0	NA	NA	NA
Grant	19	1	262	\$2,063
Grays Harbor	9	0	NA	NA
Jefferson	2	0	NA	NA
Kittitas	5	2	169	\$753
Klickitat	2	0	NA	NA
Lewis	13	0	NA	NA
Lincoln	1	0	NA	NA
Okanogan	6	0	NA	NA
Pacific	2	0	NA	NA
Pend Oreille	1	0	NA	NA
San Juan	1	0	NA	NA
Skagit	13	4	36	\$294
Skamania	1	0	NA	NA
Stevens	7	0	NA	NA
Wahkiakum	0	NA	NA	NA
Walla Walla	8	2	170	\$305
Whatcom	17	0	NA	NA
Whitman	3	1	204	\$559
Yakima	33	2	62	\$580
<b>Total</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>\$560</b>

Type of DDD Employment Service

Employment services were billed for 14 individuals. Four clients (28.5%) billed for individual employment services, 4 clients (28.5%) billed for group supported employment services, 4 clients (28.5%) billed for person-to-person services, and 2 clients (14.5%) billed for pre-vocational employment services. Individuals who received individual employment services worked an average of 119 hours and earned an average of \$919. Individuals who received group supported employment services worked an average of 143 hours and earned an average of \$554. Those receiving person-to-person services worked an average of 39 hours and earned an average of \$333 in wages and individuals who received pre-employment vocational services worked an average of 170 hours and earned an average of \$305.

*Non-Partnership County Clients Employment Services Billed for July-September, 2008*

<b>Employment Service</b>	<b>Wage earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Group Supported Employment	4	143	\$545
Individual Employment	4	119	\$919
Person-to-Person Services	4	39	\$333
Pre-Vocational Employment	2	170	\$305
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>\$560</b>

Employment Activities Supports Intensity Subscale

Each of the 14 wage earners in Non-Partnership Project counties were assessed using the Employment Activities Supports Intensity Scale. Among the 4 individuals (28.5%) requiring a high level of support, the average hours worked was 59 hours and the average wage earned was \$153. For the 10 individuals (71.5%) who required a medium level of support, the average hours worked was 131 hours and the average wages earned was \$722.

*Non-Partnership County Clients Employment Activities Supports Intensity Subscale Score for July-September, 2008*

<b>Subscale Score</b>	<b>Wage earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
High	4	59	\$153
Medium	10	153	\$689
Low	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>\$560</b>

Level of Overall Support Need for Employment

Non-Partnership Project counties reported that each of the 14 wage earners were assessed for their overall support needs for employment. Among the 2 individuals

(14%) who required a high level of overall employment support, the average hours worked were 147 with an average wage of \$1,107. For the 9 individuals (64.5%) who required a medium level of overall employment support, the average hours worked were 89 and the wages earned was \$340. The 3 individuals (21.5%) who required a low level of overall employment support worked an average of 151 hours and earned an average of \$852.

*Non-Partnership County Clients Overall Level of Support Need for Employment Assessed for July-September, 2008*

<b>Level of Support</b>	<b>Wage earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
High	2	147	\$1,107
Medium	9	89	\$340
Low	3	151	\$852
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>\$560</b>

Type of Residence

The 8 individuals (57%) who resided in their parent's home worked an average of 96 hours and earned an average of \$446, compared to the 2 individuals (14%) residing in their own home who worked an average of 78 hours and earned an average of \$792 and the 4 individuals (29%) who are supported living residents who worked an average of 155 hours and earned an average of \$672.

*Non-Partnership County Clients Residential Type for July-September, 2008*

<b>Residence</b>	<b>Wage earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Adult Family Home	0	NA	NA
Child Foster Home	0	NA	NA
Parents Home	8	92	\$446
Relatives Home	0	NA	NA
Own Home	2	78	\$792
Own (Alone)	0	NA	NA
Own (Supported Living)	4	201	\$672
Other	0	NA	NA
Unknown	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>\$560</b>

Waiver Status

Non-Partnership Project Counties reported a total of 5 individuals who received Basic, Community Protection or Core waiver funded services. The 1 individual (20%) who received Basic waiver services worked 68 hours and earned \$186. The 1 individual (20%) who received Community Protection waiver services worked 262 hours and earned \$2,063. The 3 individuals (60%) who received Core waiver services worked an average of 119 hours and earned an average of \$208.

*Non-Partnership County Clients Waiver Status for July-September, 2008*

<b>Waiver</b>	<b>Wage earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Basic	1	68	\$186
Basic Plus	0	NA	NA
Community Protection	1	262	\$2,063
Core	3	119	\$208
<b>Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>\$574</b>

Ratio of Total Wages Earned to Total Cost of Employment Service

In the three months after graduation from high school young adults with developmental disabilities who were Non-Partnership Project County Clients earned \$41 for every \$100 DDD spent to support them.

**Partnership Counties Pre-Partnership Project Client Outcomes for July 1-September 30, 2007<sup>4</sup>**

Wage earners

During the Pre-Partnership Project fiscal quarter beginning July 1, 2007 and ending September 30, 2007 the nine Washington counties that participated in the Jobs by 21 Partnership Project program reported 82 wage earners for students who turned 21 years of age during the 2006-2007 school year based upon data reported to DDD. The wage earners worked an average of 119 hours and earned an average of \$980 during the fiscal quarter. King County reported the highest frequency of employment wage earners with 44 jobs (54% of total wage earners), followed by Thurston County with 10 jobs (12% of total wage earners), Spokane County with 8 jobs (10% of total wage earners), Pierce County with 7 jobs (9% of total wage earners), Snohomish County with 4 jobs (5% of total wage earners), Clark and Kitsap counties each with 3 jobs (4% each of total wage earners), and Island County reporting 1 job (2% of total wage earners).

---

<sup>4</sup> Data for this time only represents employment outcomes for clients who were 21 years of age.

*Partnership Counties Total Wage Earners for July -September, 2007*

<b>County</b>	<b>Number of Individuals age 21 FY2007</b>	<b>Wage earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Clark	51	3	63	\$509
Island	5	1	79	\$624
King	141	44	115	\$974
Kitsap	35	3	128	\$1,026
Mason	11	2	56	\$491
Pierce	77	7	103	\$749
Snohomish	66	4	121	\$1,341
Spokane	72	8	131	\$973
Thurston	28	10	163	\$1,288
<b>Total</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>\$980</b>

Type of DDD Employment Service

Employment services were billed for 82 individuals. Sixty-three 63 individuals (77%) billed for individual employment services, 7 individuals (9%) billed for group supported employment services, 11 individuals (13%) billed for person-to-person services and 1 individual (1%) billed for pre-vocational employment services. Individuals who received individual employment services worked an average of 137 hours and earned an average of \$1,191. Individuals who received group employment support services worked an average of 91 hours and earned an average of \$268. Those receiving person-to-person services worked an average of 41 hours and earned an average of \$307 and the individual who received pre-employment vocational services worked 20 hours and earned \$36.

*Partnership Counties Employment Service Billed for July-September, 2007*

<b>Employment Service</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Group Supported Employment	7	91	\$268
Individual Employment	63	137	\$1,191
Person-to-Person Services	11	41	\$307
Pre-Vocational Employment	1	20	\$36
<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>\$980</b>

Type of Residence

During the Pre-Partnership Project fiscal quarter July 1-September 30, 2007, there were 60 individuals (73%) residing in Partnership Project Counties who lived in their

parent's home. These individuals worked an average of 115 hours and earned an average of \$950 in wages compared to the 7 individuals (8.5%) living in adult family homes who worked an average of 120 hours and earned an average of \$965, the 3 individuals (4%) who lived in their own home and worked an average of 227 hours and earned an average of \$2,191, the 8 individuals (10%) who were supported living residents and worked an average of 77 hours and earned an average of \$588, the 2 individuals (2.5%) living in a relative's home who worked an average of 254 hours and earned an average of \$2,050, the 1 individuals (1%) who lived in an un-specified residence and worked 64 hours and earned \$488, and the 1 individuals (1%) whose residential status was unknown who worked 142 hours and earned \$706.

*Partnership Counties Residence Type for July-September, 2007*

<b>Residence</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Adult Family Home	7	120	\$965
Child Foster Home	0	NA	NA
Parents Home	60	115	\$950
Relatives Home	2	254	\$2,050
Own Home	3	227	\$2,191
Own (Alone)	0	NA	NA
Own (Supported Living)	8	77	\$588
Other	1	64	\$488
Unknown	1	142	\$706
<b>Total</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>\$980</b>

Waiver Status

During the Pre-Partnership fiscal quarter July 1-September 30, 2007, Partnership Project counties reported a total of 29 individuals who received Basic, Basic Plus, Community Protection or Core waiver services. The 11 individuals (38%) who received Basic waiver services worked an average of 90 hours and earned an average of \$792 in wages. The 10 individuals (34%) who received Basic Plus waiver services worked 135 hours and earned \$1,078 in wages. The 3 individuals (10%) who received Community Protection waiver services worked an average of 7 hours and earned an average of \$39 in wages. The 5 individuals (17%) who received Core waiver services worked an average of 119 hours and earned an average of \$918 in wages.

*Partnership Counties Waiver Status for July-September, 2007*

<b>Waiver</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Basic	11	90	\$793
Basic Plus	10	135	\$1,078
Community Protection	3	7	\$39
Core	5	119	\$918
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>\$835</b>

Ratio of Total Wages Earned to Total Cost of Employment Service

In 2007 during the three months after graduation from high school young adults with developmental disabilities who received DDD services in Partnership Project Counties earned \$70 for every \$100 DDD spent to support them.

**Non-Partnership Counties Pre-Partnership Project Client Outcomes for July 1-September 30, 2007<sup>5</sup>**

Wage Earners

During the Pre-Partnership Project fiscal quarter beginning July 1, 2007 and ending September 30, 2007 Non-Partnership Project Counties reported a total of 11 wage earners based upon data reported to DDD. Wage earning individuals worked an average of 139 hours and earned an average of \$538 during the fiscal quarter. Benton County reported the highest frequency of wage earners with 5 jobs (45.5% of total wage earners), followed by Yakima County with 2 jobs (18.5% of total wage earners), and Chelan, Clallam, Kittitas, and Walla Walla Counties each reporting 1 job (9% each of total wage earners).

---

<sup>5</sup> Date for this time only represents employment outcomes for clients who were 21 years of age.

*Non-Partnership Counties Total Wage Earners for July-September, 2007*

<b>County</b>	<b>Number of Individuals age 21 FY2007</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Adams	1	0	NA	NA
Asotin	4	0	NA	NA
Benton	31	5	95	\$210
Chelan	8	1	275	\$548
Clallam	11	1	47	\$369
Columbia	0	NA	NA	NA
Cowlitz	9	0	NA	NA
Douglas	3	0	NA	NA
Ferry	3	0	NA	NA
Franklin	0	NA	NA	NA
Garfield	0	NA	NA	NA
Grant	10	0	NA	NA
Grays Harbor	12	0	NA	NA
Jefferson	4	0	NA	NA
Kittitas	3	1	200	\$909
Klickitat	2	0	NA	NA
Lewis	10	0	NA	NA
Lincoln	0	NA	NA	NA
Okanogan	2	0	NA	NA
Pacific	2	0	NA	NA
Pend Oreille	1	0	NA	NA
San Juan	0	NA	NA	NA
Skagit	13	0	NA	NA
Skamania	2	0	NA	NA
Stevens	8	0	NA	NA
Wahkiakum	0	NA	NA	NA
Walla Walla	13	1	38	\$174
Whatcom	24	0	NA	NA
Whitman	1	0	NA	NA
Yakima	34	2	248	\$1,437
<b>Total</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>\$538</b>

Type of DDD Employment Service

Employment services were billed for 11 individuals. Three individuals (27%) billed for individual employment services, 2 individuals (18%) billed for group supported employment services, and 6 individuals (55%) billed for pre-vocational employment services. Individuals who received individual employment services worked an

average of 219 hours and earned an average of \$1,199. Individuals who received group supported employment services worked an average of 181 hours and earned an average of \$552 and individuals who received pre-vocational employment services worked an average of 85 hours and earned an average of \$204 in wages.

*Non-Partnership Counties Employment Services Billed for July-September, 2007*

<b>Employment Service</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Group Supported Employment	2	181	\$552
Individual Employment	3	219	\$1,199
Person-to-Person Services	0	NA	NA
Pre-Vocational Employment	6	85	\$204
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>\$538</b>

Type of Residence

During the Pre-Partnership Project fiscal quarter, 8 Non-Partnership Project county clients (73%) resided in their parent’s home, worked an average of 126 hours, and earned an average of \$375 in wages. The 2 individuals (18%) residing in their own homes worked an average of 248 hours and earned an average of \$1437 in wages and the 1 individual (9%) who was a supported living resident worked 28 hours and earned \$51.

*Non-Partnership Counties Residence Type for July-September, 2007*

<b>Residence</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Adult Family Home	0	NA	NA
Child Foster Home	0	NA	NA
Parents Home	8	126	\$375
Relatives Home	0	NA	NA
Own Home	2	248	\$1,437
Own (Alone)	0	NA	NA
Own (Supported Living)	1	28	\$51
Other	0	NA	NA
Unknown	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>\$538</b>

Waiver Status

During the Pre-Partnership Project fiscal quarter July 1 - September 30, 2007, Non-Partnership Project Counties reported a total of 4 individuals who received Basic, Basic Plus, or Community Protection waiver services. The 2 individuals (50%) who

received Basic waiver services worked an average of 166 hours and earned an average of \$303 in wages. The individual (25%) who received Basic Plus waiver services worked 204 hours and earned \$618 and the individual (25%) who received Community Protection waiver services worked 28 hours and earned \$51.

*Non-Partnership Counties Waiver Status for July-September, 2007*

<b>Waiver</b>	<b>Wage Earners</b>	<b>Average Hours</b>	<b>Average Wages</b>
Basic	2	166	\$303
Basic Plus	1	204	\$618
Community Protection	1	28	\$51
Core	0	NA	NA
<b>Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>\$319</b>

Ratio of Total Wages Earned to Total Cost of Employment Service

In 2007 during the three months after graduation from high school young adults with developmental disabilities who received DDD services in Non-Partnership Project Counties earned \$57 for every \$100 DDD spent to support them.

**Comparison of Individual Employment Outcomes**

Quarterly job obtainment, quarterly wage, and quarterly hour data will be compared across Partnership Project Counties and Non-Partnership Project Counties, and across Partnership Project Participants and Non-Partnership Project Participants. Overall findings for this section:

- Pre-graduation Partnership Project Participants were more likely to earn wages than Non-Participants,
- Post-graduation Partnership Project Participants were more likely to earn wages than Non-Participants,
- Partnership Project Participants on average earned higher wages than Non-Participants,
- Partnership Project Participants on average worked more hours than Non-Participants, and
- Partnership Project Participants were more cost effective to serve than Non-Participants.

Number of young adults earning wages<sup>6</sup>

The number of young adults employed during the fiscal quarters: April 1-June 30, 2008; July 1- September 30, 2008; and July 1- September 30, 2007, will be compared. Once data from the Employment Services Department becomes available it is

---

<sup>6</sup> Seventy-seven percent (77%) of jobs for the fiscal quarter July 1-September 30, 2008 were billed to DDD as Individual Employment. The remaining jobs were billed as Group Supported Employment, Person-to-Person, or Pre-Vocational Employment.

expected that there will be an increased in the number of wage earners for the period of July 1-September 30, 2008.

***Pre-graduation Partnership Project Participants were more likely to earn wages***  
Partnership Project Counties had a slightly higher rate of individuals earning wages in the quarter prior to school exit than Non-Partnership Counties across all graduates. The percentage of young adults for whom wage and hour data was reported to the Employment Security Department between April 1 and June 30, 2008 in Partnership Project Counties was 26%. Twenty-two percent (22%) of young adults in Non-Partnership Project Counties had wage and hour data reported.

*Comparing young adults who participated in their county's Partnership Project and those that did not suggests that students who participated in the Partnership Project were more likely to earn wages prior to their graduation from high school. Forty-nine percent (49%) of individuals who participated in the Partnership Project had wage and hour data reported to the Employment Security Division, compared with individuals who lived in Partnership Project Counties but did not participate for whom 14% of individuals had data reported.*

***Post-graduation Partnership Project Participants were more likely to be earn wages***  
*Partnership Project Counties had a higher rate of individuals earning wages post-graduation than Non-Partnership Counties across all graduates. The percentage of young adults for whom wage and hour data was reported to DDD between July 1 and September 30, 2008 in Partnership Project Counties was 19%. Seven percent (7%) of young adults in Non-Partnership Project Counties had wage and hour data reported. These percentages closely mirrored the employment outcomes of Partnership Counties (17%) and Non-Partnership Counties (5%) during the same fiscal quarter in 2007.*

*Comparing young adults who participated in their county's Partnership Project and those that did not suggests that students who participated in the Partnership Project were more likely to earn wages after their graduation from high school. Forty-five percent (45%) of individuals who participated in the Partnership Project had wage and hour data reported to DDD, compared with individuals who lived in Partnership Project Counties but did not participate for whom 6% of individuals had wage and hour data reported.*

### Wages Earned

Wages earned during the fiscal quarters: July 1- September 30, 2008 will be compared. Wages will be looked at from 3 perspectives: overall wages earned, wages earned by employment support need<sup>7</sup>, and wages earned for individuals who lived in their parents home<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>7</sup> Employment support need was not assessed by DDD for 2007 clients.

<sup>8</sup> Sixty-five percent (65%) of individuals who earned wages resided with their parents. The remaining 34% of individuals lived in: adult family homes, other living situations, their own home (alone, alternative living, supported living, or unspecified), or a relatives home.

***Partnership Project Participants on average earned higher wages than Non-Participants***

*In the three months after graduation from high school young adults with developmental disabilities who participated in the Partnership Project earned higher wages than Non-Participants. This trend held true regardless of whether the individual lived in a county with a Partnership Project.<sup>9</sup>*

<b>Participant Group</b>	<b>Average Wages Earned Post-Graduation 2008</b>
Partnership Project Participant	\$1,488
Partnership County Non-Participant	\$901
Non-Partnership Project County Client	\$560

***Employment support need impacted the average wage earned***

*Individuals who had a lower level of employment support need as assessed by DDD typically earned more money in the three months after they graduated from high school than individuals who had medium and high levels of support need. Individuals who participated in the Partnership Project and had low employment support needs on average earned higher wages than individuals who had the same employment support need but did not participate. Data was inconclusive for individuals who had medium or high levels of employment support needs.*

---

<sup>9</sup> Overall average wages increased for Partnership Project and Non-Partnership Project counties between 2007 and 2008. It is believed that this increase is a result of the increase in Washington's minimum wage on January 1, 2008.

<b>Participant Group</b>	<b>Employment Support Need</b>	<b>Average Wages Earned Post-Graduation 2008</b>
Partnership Project Participant	Low	\$1,523 (n=21)
Partnership County Non-Participant	Low	\$813 (n=2)
Non-Partnership Project County Client	Low	\$852 (n=3)
Partnership Project Participant	Medium	\$883 (n=26)
Partnership County Non-Participant	Medium	\$922 (n=10)
Non-Partnership Project County Client	Medium	\$340 (n=9)
Partnership Project Participant	High	\$688 (n=9)
Partnership County Non-Participant	High	\$347 (n=4)
Non-Partnership Project County Client	High	\$1,107 (n=2)

***Individuals residing with their parents and participating in the Partnership Project on average earned higher wages than Non-Participants***

Across Partnership Project Participants, Partnership County Non-Participants, and Non-Partnership Project County Clients, the most common place of residence was the parents' home. *In the three months after graduation from high school young adults with developmental disabilities who resided in their parents' home and participated in the Partnership Project earned higher wages than Non-Participants who resided in their parents' home.* This trend held true regardless of whether the individual lived in a county with a Partnership Project.

<b>Participant Group</b>	<b>Average Wages Earned Post-Graduation 2008</b>
Partnership Project Participant	\$1,308 (n=49)
Partnership County Non-Participant	\$977 (n=11)
Non-Partnership Project County Client	\$446 (n=8)

Hours worked

Hours worked during the fiscal quarters: July 1- September 30, 2008 and July 1- September 30, 2007, will be compared. Hours will be looked at from 3 perspectives: overall hours worked, hours worked by employment support need<sup>10</sup>, and hours worked for individuals who lived in their parents' home<sup>11</sup>.

***Partnership Project Participants on average worked more hours than Non-Participants***

*In the three months after graduation from high school young adults with developmental disabilities who participated in the Partnership Project worked more hours than Non-Participants. This trend held true regardless of whether the individual lived in a county with a Partnership Project. Compared with the average hours worked in 2007, individuals in Non-Partnership Project Counties worked fewer hours in 2008, while overall individuals in Partnership Project Counties worked more hours on average in 2008 than in 2007.*

<b>Participant Group</b>	<b>Average Hours Worked Post-Graduation 2008</b>
Partnership Project Participant	140
Partnership County Non-Participant	113
Non-Partnership Project County Client	110

***Employment support need impacted the average hours worked***

*Individuals who participated in the Partnership Project and had low employment support needs on average worked more hours than individuals who had the same employment support need but did not participate. Data was inconclusive for individuals who had medium or high levels of employment support needs.*

---

<sup>10</sup> Employment support need was not assessed by DDD for 2007 clients.

<sup>11</sup> Sixty-five percent of individuals who were employed resided with their parents. The remaining 34% of individuals lived in: adult family homes, other living situations, their own home (alone, alternative living, supported living, or unspecified), or a relatives home.

<b>Participant Group</b>	<b>Employment Support Need</b>	<b>Average Hours Worked Post-Graduation 2008</b>
Partnership Project Participant	Low	181 (n=21)
Partnership County Non-Participant	Low	101 (n=2)
Non-Partnership Project County Client	Low	151 (n=3)
Partnership Project Participant	Medium	104 (n=26)
Partnership County Non-Participant	Medium	120 (n=10)
Non-Partnership Project County Client	Medium	89 (n=9)
Partnership Project Participant	High	84 (n=9)
Partnership County Non-Participant	High	47 (n=4)
Non-Partnership Project County Client	High	147 (n=2)

***Individuals residing with their parents and participating in the Partnership Project on average worked more hours than Non-Participants***

*In the three months after graduation from high school young adults with developmental disabilities who resided in their parents' home and participated in the Partnership Project worked more hours than Non-Participants who resided in their parents' home. This trend held true regardless of whether the individual lived in a county with a Partnership Project. When compared with the hours worked for 2007 Non-Partnership Project Counties on average actually saw a decreased in average hours worked (126 hours on average in 2007).*

<b>Participant Group</b>	<b>Average Wages Earned Post-Graduation 2008</b>
Partnership Project Participant	155
Partnership County Non-Participant	113
Non-Partnership Project County Client	96

Cost Effectiveness of Service

The ratio of total wages earned to total services paid by DDD was compared for July 1- September 30, 2008.

***Partnership Project Participants were more cost effective to serve than Non-Participants***

*In the three months after graduation from high school young adults with developmental disabilities who participated in the Partnership Project earned \$80 for every \$100 DDD spent to initially support them in their first 3 months of county employment services. This was a greater return on investment than Non-Participants. Partnership County Non-Participants earned \$50 for every \$100 spent and Non-Partnership Project County Clients earned \$41 for every \$100.*

<b>Participant Group</b>	<b>Wages Earned/DDD Dollars Spent 2008</b>
Partnership Project Participant	80/100
Partnership County Non-Participant	50/100
Non-Partnership Project County Client	41/100

**Comparison of Partnership Project Employment Outcomes Compared to National Employment Outcomes**

The National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2) was commissioned to begin in 2001 by the U.S. Department of Education, and is a follow-up of the original National Longitudinal Transition Study. NLTS2 includes 12,000 youth nationwide who were ages 13 through 16 at the start of the study (2000). Information for the study will be collected over 10 years from parents, youth, and schools and will provide a national picture of the experiences and achievements of young people as they transition into early adulthood.

*Overall, young adults in Washington reported a higher percentage of individuals employed outside of their home than the NLTS-2; however young adults participating in the Partnership Project during their final 3 months of high school were employed at a significantly higher rate (44%). According to the NLTS2 for youth with mental retardation, only 15.4% had a job outside of their home in their last year of secondary school.*

The most closely comparable data for post-graduation outcomes between the Partnership Project and the NLTS2 is the data available from the NLTS2 for youth with mental retardation out of secondary school a year or more. Based upon data reported in the NLTS2 for individuals with mental retardation, nationally 33.3% of youth *out of secondary school a year or more* currently have a paid job outside the home. This percent is actually lower than the percentage of students in the Partnership Project (45%) who were employed in the *three months after they graduated from high school*. This suggests that one year post graduation individuals who participated in the Partnership Project will likely be employed at rate greater

than the national percentage. However, for individuals who did not participate in the Partnership Project significant resources will most likely be needed to increase their rate of employment to the national level.

## **Urgent Issues in the Transition from School to Employment**

During interviews and observations project stakeholders stressed two urgent issues they faced regarding the transition of young adults with developmental disabilities from secondary education to employment. The first was the need to embed the expectation of employment for all young adults with developmental disabilities in Washington in the policies and practices of stakeholder groups such as: county DD staff, state DDD staff, school personnel, individuals and their families, the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR), employment providers, and employers. The second major issue was the need for increased collaboration between each of these stakeholder groups at the local as well as the state level. In fact local level project stakeholders in several counties expressed their desire for the directors of state agencies (specifically DDD, DVR, and OSPI) to collaborate and clearly link the outcome of employment to the responsibilities of local level frontline staff.

These issues can be better understood through an examination of the specific challenges stakeholder groups involved in the Jobs by 21 Partnership Project reported they face as they work to transition young adults from secondary education to employment. These challenges center on: system level collaboration, young adults transitioning to employment, families of young adults transitioning to employment, and the labor market.

### **Systems Level Collaboration**

Across stakeholder groups it was noted that greater systems level collaboration is necessary to fully support young adults with developmental disabilities and their families to transition from educational services to employment.

#### *Collaboration with Schools*

The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) is responsible for administering and monitoring public education in Washington State. The 247 school districts that have high schools in Washington work in conjunction with OSPI to administer education programs and implement education reform for all students, including students with developmental disabilities (OSPI, <http://www.k12.wa.us/AboutUs/default.aspx>). Students with developmental disabilities are entitled to specific services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Transition age students are entitled to receive services to address the change from secondary education to adulthood. Section 602 of IDEA 2004 defined transition services as:

#### Section 602: DEFINITIONS

(34) TRANSITION SERVICES: The term “transition services” means a coordinated set of activities for a child with a disability that—

(A) is designed to be within a results-oriented process, that is focused on improving the academic and functional achievement of the child with a disability to facilitate the child's movement from school to post-school activities, including post-secondary education, vocational education, integrated employment (including supported employment), continuing and adult education, adult services, independent living, or community participation;

(B) is based on the individual child's needs, taking into account the child's strengths, preferences, and interests; and

(C) includes instruction, related services, community experiences, the development of employment and other post-school adult living objectives, and when appropriate, acquisition of daily living skills and functional vocational evaluation. (National Center on Secondary Education and Transition, 2007).

The specific focus on vocational education and integrated employment means that OSPI and local school districts play a significant role in supporting employment outcomes for students with developmental disabilities. However, education stakeholders face barriers to fully implementing the transition from education to employment services.

Frontline education staff (Special Education Directors, Teachers, and Educational Support Staff) working with transition age students are working under two distinct service paradigms, the educational service paradigm and the adult services paradigm. Within the educational service paradigm educators are expected to assist young adults with the attainment of their academic objectives, and under the adult services paradigm educators are expected to assist young adults to obtain employment related objectives. While the activities that fall under these paradigms are not mutually exclusive there is no specific requirement that academic objectives be written so that they lead to employment outcomes. Special educators who collaborated with the Partnership Project noted that they felt that their pre-service education lacked instruction on the skills needed to support young adults transitioning to adult services. Overall, Partnership Project participants noted the importance of building special education teachers' capacity to support the transition of young adults to employment.

Several educators participating in the Partnership Project shared that they experienced a steep learning curve when they began working with transition age students and that prior to their involvement with the project did not fully understand the expectations related to the participation of young adults with developmental disabilities in the labor force. The expectation that individuals with developmental disabilities can be employed in the general labor market is lacking to an even greater scale for young adults with significant disabilities in Washington. One adult service provider noted that while they have had contracts for many years with local schools to provide transition services, these schools only contract with the adult service provider for

students with mild to moderate support needs. These districts did not offer transition services to support employment outcomes for young adults with significant developmental disabilities.

Some schools participating in the Partnership Project expected their students with developmental disabilities to transition to employment but felt they lacked the resources necessary to do so. One school district administrator noted in the past school year that they had to cut nearly \$3 million from their budget and that this impacted their ability to support education goals outside of their core academic mission.

#### *Collaboration with Employers and Employment Systems*

Respondents noted that overall businesses do not expect people with developmental disabilities to be employed and do recognize people with developmental disabilities as an un-tapped source of labor. This is a sentiment echoed in the Workforce Training and Education Coordination Board's *Focus on People with Disabilities*. Greater outreach to potential employers is needed to expand employment opportunities for young adults with developmental disabilities.

The Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board and the WorkSource Centers statewide are resources available to provide information to job seekers and outreach to employers about the employment potential of young adults with developmental disabilities. DDD administrators noted that there is a desire for increased collaboration with employment systems to improve employment outcomes for individuals with developmental disabilities. Prior to the Partnership Project there was little evidence that WorkSource Centers were being widely used by individuals with developmental disabilities.

#### *Collaboration with DVR*

The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR) is noted for its expertise in the transition from school to employment for students with developmental disabilities and can provide resources to support students to obtain employment before they graduate from high school. Washington's DVR has identified a DVR liaison for each school in the state to encourage the transition of young adult with disabilities to employment. Respondents also noted that there is evidence in Washington that counties and school districts are collaborating with DVR to support transition age students obtain employment; however efforts were not reported to be consistently practiced across the state.

#### **Young Adults Transitioning from Secondary Education**

Young adults transitioning from secondary education face unique issues related to their move to employment. Issues that impact these young adults include their expectations related to employment and the ability of the system to work together to support students to obtain jobs before they graduate from high school.

### *Inconsistent message about employment prior to graduation*

Young adults with developmental disabilities have not always received a consistent message that work is an important component of adulthood. Further, many students are not encouraged to explore potential careers or develop a career plan until their final year in high school, if at all. Adult service providers reported that they often must spend time orienting students to the importance of work before they can begin the process of job development further slowing the process of obtaining a job once the student has graduated.

### *Late allocation of adult funding limits collaboration prior to graduation*

A second issue that young adults who are transitioning face is that the systems that are in place to help them post-graduation are often not collaborating prior to the student's graduation day. In some counties it was reported that students lack access to DVR funding and services. It can also be difficult for students to engage with employment providers prior to graduation. One county reported that they used to sponsor provider agency open houses but stopped because providers are reluctant to establish relationships with individuals who do not have an identified funding source for post-graduation services. DDD and DVR's inability to allocate funding for these students at a sufficient interval before graduation is a stumbling block in the students' quest to seek employment services.

### *Time lag between graduation and receipt of adult supports*

The lack of an identified funding source and service provider is especially troubling for students with significant disabilities. Providers reported a time lag between graduation and the initial receipt of services. During this time students not only lose skills they acquired during secondary school but also the connections to their former teachers and the valuable information that these teachers could provide in the search for employment. One provider expressed concern that the skill and information loss between graduation and referral to employment services results in approximately 6 to 12 additional months of employment service prior to obtainment of a job. Further complicating the search for employment is that once students receive DDD authorization for services they are funded on average for 2-3 hours per week for individual employment and on average 6 hours across all employment services per week.<sup>12</sup> It was reported by an employment provider that this is not a sufficient allocation of time to efficiently assist individuals to obtain employment.

## **Families of Young Adults Transitioning from Secondary Education**

Families of young adults transitioning from secondary education experience their own set of concerns related to their family member's transition. Families are impacted by

---

<sup>12</sup>The figure of six hours of service per week is the average number of hours of service across the different types of employment settings: Individual Employment, Group Supported Employment, Person to Person Services, and Pre-Vocational Employment. The average hours of service data was provided by DDD staff.

their expectations related to post-secondary outcomes, their understanding of the differences between the adult service and education systems, and how these systems may or may not work together. It was reported by stakeholders that many families have never been supported to see work as a valid post-secondary outcome for their family member with developmental disabilities; in fact many families have been repeatedly told over the course of their family members life not to expect their family member to have experiences that mirror their same-age peers, including in employment.

### *Need for additional family preparation for transition*

Families' expectations and beliefs about the transition process can be shaped by a lack of understanding about the service systems. Multiple counties involved in the pilot year of the Jobs by 21 Transition Partnership Project reported that families do not recognize the distinction between the school entitlement model and adult services model. It was found that typically families do not understand the implications of their child with developmental disabilities graduating prior to the age of 21, and that between the ages of 18 and 21, DDD does not provide adult employment services.

Whether or not a student graduates prior to the age of 21, families struggle with the transition from a full to a partial day of service. Families are conditioned to having schools provide 6 hours of service per day per week. The reduction in the number of hours of service per week their child received, from 30 hours pre-graduation to 6 hours on average post-graduation is especially trying for families who often must reduce their work schedules to support their newly graduated family member on a more full-time basis; ensuring that the student graduates and quickly moves into a job would reduce the impact of some of these issues on families.

Families were reported to struggle with the idea that the adult service provider can not provide the same level of service that the school had previously. Families were adapting to greater responsibility for scheduling services and conducting outreach on behalf of their family members. Services include not only day services but transportation to employment and social activities. One parent advocate noted that "parents do not know who to contact about different aspects of their child's transition plan and do not know which entity is responsible for providing which service."

### **Overcoming the Barriers**

Partnership Project Counties used innovative strategies to address the urgent issues in transition identified in this section. Data collected on these strategies yielded a comprehensive list of *Best Practices*. *Best Practices* are summarized in the following sections and grouped under the following topics: Best practices to facilitate collaboration between schools and the adult service system, Best practices to address the expectations of and resources available to individuals with developmental disabilities, and Best practices to address the expectations and resources available to families of young adults with developmental disabilities.

## **Best Practices to Facilitate Collaboration across Systems**

Discussions about potential best practices to facilitate collaboration across systems had begun to occur in select counties across the state prior to the start of the Partnership Project. Stakeholders from the school and adult services system in Pierce County noted that they have been engaging in conversations for several years to determine what collaborative actions were necessary between schools and the adult services system to ensure a seamless transition for students<sup>13</sup>. These stakeholders agreed that a seamless transition would include the attainment of employment prior to the student's graduation, and a continuation of the job post-graduation with the same job coaches; they also agreed that the only aspect of change during this transition should be the funding source, which would transition from the school system to the county DD office.

In order for the vision of a seamless transition for students with developmental disabilities to occur, systems must begin to interact prior to a student's graduation from high school. Bridges between the systems need to be built at the funding, resource, and staff levels. Best Practices for collaboration between schools and the adult service system identified through the Partnership Project center around five themes:

- Working together to leverage dollars
- Working together to leverage non-monetary resources
- Working together: County DD and School Districts
- Working together: Professional Development for Educators
- Working together: Collaboration with employment systems and employers

### **Working together to leverage dollars**

Working towards the maximum use of taxpayer dollars for schools and adult developmental disabilities services was an important goal of the Partnership Project. In FY2008 as the national and state economies slowed and future tax revenues were predicted to decline, this goal took on a greater sense of urgency. As a result county Partnership Projects labored to leverage money across systems to support integrated employment for students graduating in June 2008. The total reported dollars leveraged across systems between February 1 and June 30, 2008 was \$556,346. The following groups contributed:

- Local School Districts: \$171,767
- Division of Vocational Rehabilitation: \$343,200

---

<sup>13</sup> Certo, Mautz, Pumpian, Sax, Smalley, Wade, Noyes, Luecking, Wechsler, & Batterman (2003) used the phrase "seamless transition to adulthood" to describe a change from school to adult services where the primary service entities: public school, developmental disabilities services, and rehabilitation services, work together to ease an individual from school to employment and adult life.

- The United Way or other charitable organizations: \$13,000
- County millage dollars: \$18,300
- Other sources: \$10,079

While DVR was the largest contributor reported by counties not all students were able to benefit from their employment services. Local DVR office commitments to pay for employment services for students prior to graduation were uneven across the counties. In some counties, DVR paid for students' job development and initial employment supports. However, it was reported that in other counties DVR had not yet paid for students to obtain job development and employment supports but they were willing to work on this issue on a student by student basis.

### **Working together to leverage non-monetary resources**

An equally important goal of the Partnership Project was to leverage non-monetary resources between the school and adult service system. Working together was reported to support good relationships between organizations and systems and lead to a better understanding of the available services and constraints faced by each group. The leveraged resources also helped to bring together stakeholders to problem solve and determine how to make the best use of the limited dollars available for transition age students. It was noted by several counties that without the Partnership Project it would have been difficult to bring stakeholders together to work to leverage resources to support employment outcomes for young adults with developmental disabilities.

A variety of in-kind resources were contributed to the project by school districts, DVR, DDD, adult employment providers, local community colleges, and local businesses.

#### *School Districts*

School districts contributed a variety of in-kind resources and in-kind dollars to the Partnership Project.

- Clark Educational Service District (ESD) #112 is a key partner and has been a leader in encouraging all local school districts to collaborate with the county DD on the Partnership Project. The ESD is the fiscal agent for the County's Project Search Transition and provides space for teacher training. Schools in Clark County also contributed time for their teachers to conduct Person Centered Plans and time for more experienced teachers to mentor new teachers on the process of transition to employment.
- In King County school district administrators have attended training, hosted meetings and training, and encouraged their staff to attend Partnership Project events. Shoreline, Seattle, and Federal Way schools have also created new transition programs in partnership with the county. King's ESD has sponsored county transition meetings and provided meeting space for Partnership activities.

- Kitsap County reported that they leveraged approximately \$7,700 in in-kind services from local school districts.
- Pierce County School Districts provided contributions such as 1:1 para-educators for job coaching, transportation to employment sites, and payment for substitute teachers so that instructors could attend training on transition services. Some Pierce County schools have provided in-kind employment services pre-graduation; para-educators have served as job coaches. School districts in Pierce have also promoted the Partnership Project to OSPI as part of their plan to improve transition outcomes.
- In Snohomish County the Granite Falls Special Education Director has stepped forward as a leader, assisting the Partnership Project to connect with schools and resources and serving as a consultant to the County. The Director has also partnered with Lake Stevens and Monroe School Districts to collaborate funding for students for off-campus services in Lake Stevens.

#### *Local and State Level DVR and DDD*

Local DVR offices provided in-kind resources. DVR counselors in Clark County contributed time to provide presentations and complete the DVR intake process with students. In Snohomish County DVR counselors offered training on the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to employment providers to help them better understand the employment expectations for students with developmental disabilities. The state DVR office, in support of the Partnership Project, offered guidance to local DVR and county DD offices concerning the role of the local DVR office's school transition liaison's role around supporting young adults to transition from school to employment. Further, the individual client *Data Exchange Agreement* between DDD and DVR is another way that these systems have leveraged non-monetary resources to support the Partnership Project and ultimately the mutual goal of employment for young adults with developmental disabilities.

Both Clark County and Snohomish County DD reported contributing significant staff time and effort to the Partnership Project. Clark County Government also volunteered to be the work site for County's Project Search Transition and hosted the Project's graduation ceremony. Additionally, they provided space for the Project Search Transition classes. Kitsap County also used \$3,300 in millage funds to provide in-kind services to the Partnership Project.

#### *Adult Employment Providers*

Employment providers in three counties allocated in-kind resources to the Partnership Project. In Pierce County employment providers offered students employment assessments and dedicated staff time to attend project meetings with school districts. The Northwest Center in King County allocated a full-time staff member to the Partnership Project. Spokane County also contributed staff time in excess of contract requirements to the project.

### *Community Colleges*

Pierce and King Counties received in-kind resources from their local community colleges. Tacoma Community College (TCC) in Pierce provided the Tools 4 Success Conference the use of their campus free of charge for a full day. TCC, Pierce College, and Bates Technical College all provided in-kind staff time to assist in organizing and supporting the Tools 4 Success Employment Conference. King County secured a reduced rate for the use of space at Shoreline and North Seattle Community Colleges and Highline Community College provided space for Partnership Project activities.

### *Local Businesses*

Kitsap County received \$3,750 in in-kind resources from the Educational Service District and Harrison Medical Center contributed time for their staff to engage in Partnership Project activities.

### **Working together: County DD and School Districts**

School districts face structural and informational barriers to support students with developmental disabilities -to learn about and access adult services. County DD offices have served as a resource to local schools districts for many years but schools have often been unable to make the best use of the available expertise. The Partnership Project has been able to bring schools and the county DD staff together to work together toward the common goal of a seamless transition to employment for students with developmental disabilities.

### *The formation and expansion of relationships*

The Partnership Project has been important in supporting the formation and expansion of relationships between county DD offices and school districts. School District relationships are supported by the direct involvement of local schools with county DD offices as well as the involvement of Educational Service Districts (ESDs). In some counties it was the county DD office that took the lead to facilitate relationships with the school districts and in other counties it was the school districts or the ESD that facilitated the relationship, however it was not clear whether the initiation of the relationship by one stakeholder over another impacted the level of collaboration. Examples of relationships between county DD offices and school districts include:

- Island County noted that since the start of the Partnership Project the South Whidbey school district has joined the county's Transition council for the first time and has also begun attending Partnership Project meetings.
- In King County, the Puget Sound ESD sponsors Transition Network meetings. Since the start of the Partnership project these meetings have been an important catalyst for communication about how new partnerships can be formed to support students to transition to employment. The agenda for the

October 2008 included how schools can shift existing resources to hire supported employment providers and embed the providers within school transition programs.

- Kitsap County's Transition Council meets on a monthly basis and has a series of sub-committees to support the transition of students with developmental disabilities to employment. Sub-committees include: Assistive Technology, Parent Information Night, Barriers to Employment, Student Information Night, and Teacher Information Night. An Olympic College representative is also on the committee, as is the Parent Coalition coordinator, and some Developmental Disabilities Advisory Board members. To ensure that the Transition Council's work is disseminated to schools, the Kitsap ESD has helped the Council to develop connections within local school districts.
- The Granite Falls school district in Snohomish County has taken a strong role in collaborating with the county DD office. The Special Education Director of Granite Falls is the chair of the local Special Education Directors group and ensures that the county DD office has a regular place on the Director's group's meeting agendas and assists in facilitating communications between the county DD office and local school districts.
- In Spokane the Assistant Special Education Director took a lead role in early Partnership Project discussions and a second school administrator played a vital role in launching the Project's activities. These administrators worked closely with the Spokane County Developmental Disabilities Coordinator prior to her retirement to take actions to ensure a seamless transition for students with developmental disabilities to employment.

*The impact of relationships on student employment outcomes*

Ultimately the development of relationships between county DD offices and school districts cannot be deemed a successful outcome of the Partnership Project unless it leads to improved employment outcomes for students with developmental disabilities. Stakeholders in several counties offered examples of how the relationships that developed through the Partnership Project lead to better transition outcomes for young adults in their communities.

- Kitsap County felt that the relationship between the county DD office and school districts resulted in the communication of a consistent cross system message to students and families that employment is the goal for adult services. One example of this is from an Individual Education Plan (IEP) meeting. A Special Education Director was able to call a DD caseworker

during the meeting to provide clarity on an element of a student's transition to adult services. The immediate response enabled a more effective and efficient IEP to support the student's transition to employment

- A Pierce County DD coordinator reported that the Partnership Project provides an opportunity for schools and the county to partner to assist families to apply for DDD eligibility and help get young adults on to the DDD roster at age 18. While no dollars would be attached to the students prior to the age of 21, the roster would allow DDD to anticipate the specific number of new individuals each year who will request services and lead to the more efficient and equitable budgeting of dollars for eligible individuals post-graduation.
- Snohomish County stakeholders shared that the relationships facilitated by the Partnership Project allow schools the opportunity to better understand what their students' lives will be like after they graduate. Several teachers reported that prior to the Partnership Project they did not have a clear picture of the opportunities available to students after they graduate. This knowledge has improved the writing and coordination of IEP goals to facilitate the obtainment of employment in the student's final years of school.

### **Working Together: Professional Development for Educators**

Through project resources, training on transition and employment were made available to special education teachers. Teachers across the counties attended instructional presentations on the following topics:

- In 100% of the counties teachers received training on Adult Service Programs,
- In 67% of the counties teachers received training on Developing a Transition IEP,
- In 56% of counties teachers received training on Customized Employment<sup>14</sup>, and
- In 56% of the counties teachers received training on Career or Person-Centered Planning.

---

<sup>14</sup> According to the Office of Disability Employment Policy (2008) customized employment is, "the voluntary negotiation of a personalized employment relationship between a specific individual and an employer that fulfills the business needs of the employer. The negotiation process addresses areas such as job duties, terms of employment, services and supports necessary to carry out the job duties, and expectations adapted to the needs or special circumstances of one particular job seeker."

Stakeholders felt that the information provided to special education teachers through these trainings was an important factor in the employment outcomes of transition age students with developmental disabilities. Kitsap County noted that the Partnership Project enabled a greater variety of transition-related training to be offered within the county and increased the importance that teachers placed on the information they learned at the events. Pierce County stakeholders noticed that as a result of the training special education teachers were widely developing IEP goals that included: training students to use assistive technology to support employment and independence, employment planning, and job sampling. Snohomish County schools saw as a result of Partnership Project training that teachers were engaging students and families in conversations about job carving and non-traditional jobs available for students who have significant disabilities.

### **Working Together: Collaboration with Employment Systems and Employers**

The development of collaborative relationships with stakeholders in the Workforce Development System and the labor market are important parts of linking transition age students with developmental disabilities to competitive employment.

#### *Collaboration with Workforce Development Systems*

Washington's Work Source system, adult employment providers, and businesses have each collaborated with the Partnership Project to support students with developmental disabilities to obtain employment. In the first year of the Partnership Project, collaboration with the Workforce Development Board has resulted in the inclusion of information about the workforce training programs specifically available to individuals supported by clients of the Division of Developmental Disabilities in the Washington Workforce Development Directory.

As a result of the Partnership Project, the WorkSource systems in several counties served as resources to support students with developmental disabilities to explore employment opportunities. The WorkSource centers in Island, Mason, and Pierce Counties presented at the Transition Fair to introduce students to their services. The King County WorkSource hosted trainings and job fairs which Partnership Project students attended. The Work Source in Thurston County hosted a Job Club for students with developmental disabilities and offered work-related resources to students.

#### *Collaboration with Employers*

The local business community was an important part of the success of the Partnership Project. In Clark County several local businesses employed and provided internship experiences for students with developmental disabilities. Mason County businesses participated in a Local Employers Panel and offered worksite tours and information about their employment needs to students with developmental disabilities. Pierce and

Thurston counties' local businesses provided employment and volunteer opportunities.

*Spotlight on Kitsap County: Innovative partnerships with business*

As part of the Partnership Project the Work Independence Network (WIN) a local provider in Kitsap County, approached Harrison Hospital about the potential for hiring transition age individuals. Harrison Hospital was targeted because it is the second largest employer in the county and WIN had previously been challenged to identify supported employment positions at the hospital. The provider had several students who wanted to work at the hospital but found it difficult to identify and develop jobs within the hospital in a timely manner.

The Partnership Project funds allowed WIN to market their supported employment services to various hospital departments and begin identifying opportunities for job carving, WIN made connections with the managers of various hospital departments to identify potential jobs.

By October 2008, 11 jobs had been identified and obtained by transition age students with developmental disabilities at Harrison Hospital. Job opportunities can be full-time in one department or across several departments. In October 2008 three WIN supported employees had obtained fulltime employment at the Hospital earning an hourly wage of \$9.44 plus benefits.

## **Best Practices to Address Individual Expectations for Employment**

A focus of the Partnership Project has been changing the post-graduation expectations of young adults with developmental disabilities. County partnerships have focused on:

- Ensuring that young adults receive the message that employment is important,
- Providing opportunities to explore employment while still in school,
- Supporting collaboration between individuals, DDD, and DVR, and
- Supporting young adults to identify and receive services from employment providers prior to graduation.

### **Ensuring that young adults receive the message that employment is important**

Including the goal of employment in students' Individualized Education Plans (IEPs) reinforces its importance. Seven out of 9 counties reported that including the goal of employment in students IEPs occurred for over 70% of transition age students participating in the project. Of these 7 counties, 4 (57%) felt that the Partnership Project was a key reason that this activity occurred in their county.

Several school districts in Snohomish County have made a stronger connection between communicating that employment is a valued outcome and the writing of IEP employment goals. These districts have made use of county-funded Person Centered Plans for students to craft IEP employment goals that reflect each student's skills and unique goals for their future. By using information in the person centered planning to develop employment goals, the message is that employment is a valued outcome but that employment that matches the student's desires is the ultimate goal. In Clark County teachers have also used student's Person Centered Plans as a tool to gather information for IEPs and to craft goals that identify specific employment objectives for students. This increased focus on employment within the IEP has helped to raise the profile of employment for students.

A second strategy that several counties have implemented to encourage post-graduation employment has been to implement a split school day. One school district in Snohomish structures students' days so that each student spends some time sampling jobs in the community and some time mastering skills for daily living. The program provides a realistic example of what students can expect their post-graduation days to entail and places an emphasis on employment as a part of the adult day.

### **Ensuring young adults have the opportunity to explore employment while still in school**

Developing opportunities for career exploration was an important outcome of the Partnership Project for students with developmental disabilities. Seventy-four percent of students (n=121) who participated in the partnership project worked in a community-based volunteer or internship position to explore employment

opportunities. Obtaining paid work experiences became a priority for students involved in the project.

Underlying the career exploration activities of students was the opportunity to be supported through the job development process to obtain employment and through the job coaching process to master employment skills. Seventy-eight percent (n=128) of students participating in the Partnership Project engaged in job development activities and 62% (n=101) received job coaching. Both of these activities were reported by county stakeholders as important to student's success in obtaining employment prior to graduating from high school.

The development of a resume was another Best Practice put in to place by the Partnership Project. In all but one Partnership Project County over 70% of students developed a resume or a career portfolio, and 75% of counties who put this practice into place believed that the Partnership Project had a positive impact on the implementation of this activity. The creation of a resume or portfolio is an important result of student's exploration of different employment wage earners. Career exploration allows students to craft a resume or portfolio that highlights their unique career goals and skills, and catalogues the goals and skills in a way that is accessible to potential employers. The ultimate goal is to speed the process of obtaining employment by targeting the employment search process to the student's resume.

### **Supporting collaboration between individuals, DDD, and DVR**

A third issue that young adults who are transitioning face is that DDD, DVR, and other adult service providers are not interacting with all students with developmental disabilities prior to the student's graduation day. Stakeholders expressed that the lack of coordination results in a disjointed transition for individuals with developmental disabilities between school and adult employment services. Therefore several Partnership Project activities were aimed at improving this process.

In the opinion of the majority of counties who have Partnership Project grants, the Project encouraged 100% of participating students to apply for and receive DDD eligibility or have DDD eligibility pre-determined prior to graduation. In Snohomish County, the Partnership Project supported the development of relationships between DDD eligible students and the county transition coordinator prior to the student's graduation from high school. Stakeholders believed that the relationships improved the transition for students from school to employment.

Counties also found that establishing relationships between students with developmental disabilities and DVR was an important outcome of the Partnership Project. More than 70% of Partnership Project students in six counties met with a DVR counselor prior to their final year of school and had an open DVR case as a result of the Partnership Project. In four counties over 70% of students had also developed an Individual Plan for Employment (IPE). Counties reported other secondary benefits to the Partnership Project's encouragement of the development of relationships. Clark and Snohomish Counties noted that this past year DVR began engaging with students earlier than in years past. And Island County noted that DVR

met with students, their families and schools and followed up with the county DD to check on the progress of the students.

### **Supporting young adults to identify and receive services from employment providers prior to graduation**

The fourth area impacting students with developmental disabilities transition to employment has been students' inability to engage with employment providers prior to graduation. Valuable information about the student's pre-graduation employment experiences can be lost when there is not an established connection between individuals and employment vendors prior to the date of graduation.

Every participating county assisted students participating in the project to connect with an adult employment provider prior to graduating from high school. The majority of counties also felt that their involvement with the Partnership Project allowed them to better support this activity. For example Snohomish County's Partnership Project supported students to interview and choose an employment provider at a one day event sponsored at the school. Stakeholders expressed that this was an important outcome because once the student chose an employment provider the school, provider, and student could begin working together to ensure a successful transition to employment.

The Partnership Project also made resources available to counties to target individuals with significant disabilities to engage with employment providers. Thurston County used Partnership Project dollars to serve individuals with significant disabilities to access job development and job coaching activities from a local provider. This was an important outcome because school districts in Thurston typically do not refer individuals with the most significant disabilities to employment providers for services prior to the date of graduation. Because of the Partnership Project students with the most significant disabilities in Thurston County were supported to obtain employment.

Additional evidence that the Partnership Project has increased the likelihood of adult employment providers interacting with students with developmental disabilities to support employment opportunities prior to the date of graduation comes from Clark, King, Mason, Pierce, Spokane, and Thurston counties. In these counties employment providers have used their expertise to help guide the employment process for students and provide employment services that schools do not have the capacity to provide. Examples varied across counties and met the unique collaborative needs of each county. Specific examples include:

- In Clark County employment providers connected with students prior to graduation to ensure a smooth handoff between school and adult services,

- In King County employment providers conducted comprehensive assessments, job development, placement and training for students,
- In Mason County employment providers participate in the Transition Conference and Partnership Project meetings,
- In Pierce County employment providers have supported students by blending funding from various sources to fund community based assessments, job development, job coaching and employment maintenance support, and
- In Thurston County employment providers offered job development, training, and coaching, and customized employment services.

## **Best Practices to Address Familial Expectations and Resources**

As students transition from school to adult services and work in the community, it becomes increasingly important to provide information and resources to not only the students but their families. Families have an important role in supporting individuals with developmental disabilities during the transition process, however as one parent advocate noted they often lack the information and resources to fully assist their child with developmental disabilities. Respondents shared information centered around four information deficits that they felt families face when supporting their child with developmental disabilities to transition to adult services and employment:

- The differences between education services and adult services,
- The process of transition to employment,
- The differences between the school and work environments, and
- The supports available to assist young adults with developmental disabilities to obtain employment.

### **Addressing the differences between education services and adult services**

Partnership Project Counties implemented strategies to address families' lack of understanding regarding the differences between education services and adult services.

Stakeholders noted that often families do not understand the implications of their child with developmental disabilities graduating prior to the age of 21 and were not informed that between the ages of 18 and 21, DDD does not provide employment services. Several counties implemented practices to ensure that parents have access to this information. In Kitsap County, DDD caseworkers and schools districts work together to provide a consistent message that no funded services for young adults who graduate prior to age 21 are available. And in Spokane County the Spokane School District has taken a lead in sharing this information with parents and individuals. Stakeholders in the county reported that the availability of Partnership Project funds has made it possible for schools to develop better programming for transition age students which has the effect of encouraging more students to stay and receive school based services until they reach 21.

Another factor that families struggle with during the transition from school to adult services is the number of hours of service available to their family member through DDD. Five counties involved in the Partnership Project reported having schools that offer modified school days to support families to plan for the decrease in service hours once a student graduates. A program in Snohomish County involved the creation of a school day schedule specifically for transition age students. The transition students' school day intentionally starts later than the typical school day. This compressed day helps parents and students to make the transition to adult services and allows for adequate time for families to develop and put in place day time plans for students once they transition to adult services and employment.

### **Sharing information with families about the process of the transition to employment**

Funds from the Partnership Project have strengthened counties' efforts to narrow the information gap surrounding transition. Informational presentations throughout the state help families understand the differences between education and employment plans, learn about transition-related vendors and other resources and hear from individuals who have recently been through transition. Each county customized the ways in which they shared information:

- In Clark County in collaboration with their local Schools Project group, Clark County DD has sponsored informational presentations for parents on transition to employment,
- In Kitsap County the local DD office held an event on employment at a local school district,
- In Pierce County the Pierce Coalition for Developmental Disabilities shared that they believe that the Partnership Project is an important resource to help families understand the differences between an Individual Education Plan (IEP) and an Individualized Plan for Employment (IPE), and
- In Snohomish County school districts host Parent Nights focused on transition and have partnered with Partnership Project stakeholders to provide families with important information about employment.

### **Addressing the differences between school environments and work environments**

Stakeholders noted that families also need support to understand the differences between the school and work environments. Many families in Washington have taken an active role in advocating for their minor child with developmental disabilities and struggle with handing that role over to employment providers once the child matures and becomes employed in the community. In many instances where a parent might have interceded when an individual was younger, the transition-age individual, often with help from the employment provider, is now expected to handle issues at work.

Work Independence Network (WIN), a Kitsap County employment provider, works with individuals and their families so that they understand the boundaries of the workplace and that the type of family involvement common in the education system is not as appropriate with employers. WIN works with individuals and their families to make sure that they know that workplace advocacy is done by the employment provider and that the importance of developing trust in WIN staff that they will fully support their family member in their job.

Another difference between school and adult services is the provision of transportation. Students with developmental disabilities are provided transportation by their local school district, however once a student graduates this resource is no longer available. Individuals and their families must use public transportation or

transportation from family or friends to get to the young adult's job. Partnership Project counties are addressing the need to train young adults with developmental disabilities to use public transportation through several initiatives:

- Clark, Mason, Pierce, Spokane, and Thurston counties all partnered with their local public transportation entities to train students on how to use public transportation, including information on accessible transportation,
- In Island and King Counties, the local transit authority attends Transition Fairs to introduce services to students and their families,
- In Mason County, the transit authority provides bus passes and transportation to and from transition conferences to acquaint students and their families with the services they offer, and
- Snohomish County staff has been working with a local coalition of stakeholders to improve all aspects of the public transit system. This includes policy level work in rural areas, improving transit routes, and the use of vouchers for eligible individuals.

### **Sharing information with families about the supports available to assist young adults with developmental disabilities to obtain employment**

The expectation for families that transition-age individuals can obtain employment in their communities was fostered in several counties:

- King County advocacy organizations such as, Parent-to-Parent, People First, and the ARC, are talking directly to families about adult supported employment,
- Advocacy groups in Kitsap County, Mason County and Thurston are attending Partnership Planning meetings and offering guidance on the types of supports families need around planning for adult services and employment, and
- Several groups in Spokane County are providing information about planning for adulthood and employment supports. Groups include People First and the Spokane Parent Coalition.

During the fiscal year 2008 Partnership Project family members' community connections were untapped resources in the mission to assist students to obtain employment. Of the 79 jobs obtained by Partnership Project Participants, 9 jobs (11%) were identified through personal contacts identified by family members. Fifty-five percent (55%) of individuals who obtained jobs through their family member's personal connections were still employed in the three months after their graduation from high school. This is a slightly higher retention rate when compared with

individuals who participated in the Partnership Project and obtained jobs through connections such as those developed by employment providers and school district personnel.

## Policy Implications

Information documented in this report suggests a series of strategies that can be implemented statewide to improve employment outcomes for youth with developmental disabilities in Washington. Lessons learned during the first phase of the Partnership Project suggest that while Washington has begun to institute policies and practices to support a seamless transition for young adults with developmental disabilities, continued efforts at the state and local level are needed to ensure that all young adults with developmental disabilities are able to obtain employment prior to their graduation from high school. Findings of the evaluation indicate that: there is a need for frequent and meaningful engagement with students and families about post school life and employment prior to the age of 18; DDD, DVR, and the Education System must work together on a regular basis to support students to plan for a meaningful transition to adult life; and employment and post school planning needs to be a focus throughout student's high school with stabilization in paid employment a priority during the final years before graduation.

### **Incorporate employment into student's IEP beginning at high school entry at the latest.**

For all transition age students who are not pursuing post-secondary education, including the goal of employment in the students IEP's at an earlier age than IDEA requires is one practice that could be implemented to ensure that students recognize the importance of obtaining and maintaining employment. *This goal should be included in every student's IEP regardless of their level of support need or barriers to employment.* Employment should be a topic in IEPs beginning at least at entry into high school services and academic objectives should be taught in the context of each student's career interests. Opportunities for students to work in a community-based volunteer or internship positions, obtain paid work experiences, participate in the job development process, receive job coaching, and develop a resume should be instituted throughout the high school years, and post school outcomes should be a focus of discussion with students and family members when planning high school education services. This would encourage the expectation that students with significant disabilities will have and realize their career goals, and schools will be better poised to meet the post school outcomes outlined in the IDEA and OSPI's *State Performance Plan*.

### **Encourage the development of educational service models that focus on community-based career and postsecondary supports following the completion of four years of high school.**

Once a student has completed four years of high school, their educational program needs to address career preparation (including paid employment or postsecondary education) during the final available years of school services. Towards that end, several school districts have established formal off-campus programs for young adults, but having a formal location for students to spend their school days after age 18 is not considered necessary. The development of a "school without walls" based in the community, perhaps with an office location as a staff base, may be sufficient.

Curriculum models should be revised to better address the post-secondary goals of IDEA and specifically employment outcomes for young adults with developmental disabilities. A curriculum focused on vocational and career goals incorporated into the required academic components should be extended to all students who will likely be eligible for DDD or DVR services, and in particular to students with the most significant support needs.

**County DD, DDD, DVR, and School Districts should be supported to collaborate early and often around individual transition outcomes.**

A county level DD staff member should be designated to lead a group made up of local DVR and school district staff to proactively identify and follow students at high school entry; with a focus on ensuring that students obtain employment prior to their final year in high school. This group should be empowered to work together to develop and implement a transition plan for services for students graduating from school to adult services. The focus of the group should be to ensure that students are working and able to immediately enter needed adult services on the date of graduation. The attainment of employment for students, and allocation of DDD and DVR funds for post-graduation services prior to graduation would help to make certain that this expectation is met.

Individual agencies need to review policies and practices regarding supports for students prior to turning 21. Early involvement in student's career planning will provide significant dividends at both an individual and systems level.

**Support young adults to identify and receive services from employment providers before school exit.**

Supporting young adults statewide to identify a preferred employment provider and begin receiving services from the provider prior to graduation would support better employment outcomes for transition age students. For the fiscal year 2008 the abbreviated length (5 months) of the Partnership Project made it difficult for many students to explore multiple jobs, limiting the number of opportunities they had to find the right job to match their interests and skills. Assisting students to connect with an adult employment provider prior to graduating from high school, supporting the provider to use their expertise to help guide the pre-graduation employment process, and allocate funding to allow the employment provider to supply employment services that schools do not have the capacity to provide will lead to increased opportunities for students to obtain employment prior to graduation from high school and ultimately improved employment outcomes for young adults with developmental disabilities.

**Provide opportunities for teachers to receive professional development related to supporting students to transition to employment.**

The development of educational goals that are focused on the student's goals for adulthood and support employment opportunities were found to lead to employment for young adults with developmental disabilities. Special education teachers across the state would benefit from continuing education on how to develop educational

goals for transition age students that are grounded in the expectations students will face during adulthood and that allow students to gain the skills they need to pursue their desired career. Encouraging the growth of programs already available in the state, such as the Employment Professional Certificate Program offered through Highline Community College, and increasing the number of special education teachers who attend the Center for Change in Transition Services (CCTS) workshops and trainings on how to best fulfill IDEA requirements for transition are strategies to provide continuing education on supporting students to transition to employment. Additionally, the co-sponsorship of trainings by County DD offices, adult service providers, school districts, and Education Service Districts could be another method to provide professional development for special education teachers on the topic of the transition of students with developmental disabilities to employment.

**Support young adults and their families to transition from education services to adult services.**

Individuals and families should be supported while the student is still in high school to plan for the change from 30 hours of school service pre-graduation to a more limited allocation of support post-graduation. Combining off-campus school programming with a modified school day with supports available for families to plan for the decrease in service hours can help to reduce the burden of the abrupt reduction in hours once a student graduates. Ultimately, families need to be supported to understand that transitioning from school to employment is a natural progression and that the work day is a natural replacement for the school day.

**Systems need to continue to work together to leverage dollars and non-monetary resources.**

The importance of systems working together towards the maximum use of taxpayer dollars will continue to be a crucial element needed to support young adults with developmental disabilities to attain employment prior to their graduation from high school. The Washington Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board's *Partnering for Performance: Washington's Workforce Compact* provides an example of how stakeholders at the state and local levels can develop formal relationships to promote the effective coordination of employment services for young adults with developmental disabilities. Additionally the *Data Exchange Agreement* between DDD and DVR is another example of how systems can develop strategic practices to support the mutual goal of employment.

Working together to leverage dollars and non-monetary resources was reported to support good relationships between organizations and systems and lead to a better understanding of the available services, and constraints faced by each group. The leveraged resources also helped to bring together stakeholders to problem solve and determine how to make the best use of the limited dollars available for transition age students. The development of relationships to leverage dollars and non-monetary resources across school and adult service systems should continue to be supported at

the state and local levels. Additionally the development of Memorandums of Understanding between systems at the state level would help to solidify the relationships that have been developed at the local level in Partnership Project Counties.

**Establish a process for identifying and committing DDD and DVR post-school funding to individuals at least 1 year prior to the student's graduation from high school.** The ability to allocate adult service funds prior to an individual's graduation from high school would increase the likelihood of a seamless transition from school to adult services. Concerns about the late commitment of post-school funding were raised by several stakeholder groups. Early commitment of funds allows for more effective planning and lessens the likelihood of service gaps that lead to a loss of skills and momentum for young adults with developmental disabilities.

**Support young adults and their families to understand that DDD does not provide adult employment services before the age 21.** Individuals and families need to be provided information prior to the student reaching 18 years that informs them that between the ages of 18 and 21 DDD does not provide adult employment services. Information should also be included that helps young adults and their families maximize their final years of high school so that students obtain community-based employment experiences while in high school and graduate with a job regardless of whether the student chooses to graduate before the age of 21.

**Provide information and training to young adults and families about the services available to support their transition to adulthood.** Statewide the introduction of informational presentations can help young adults and families understand the differences between education and employment plans, learn about transition-related vendors and other resources, and hear from individuals who have successfully completed the transition process.

**Support families to explore their personal networks as sources for employment for young adults with developmental disabilities.**

Individuals who obtained jobs through family members' community connections had a strong job retention rate in the three months after their graduation from high school, demonstrating that families are a source of good employment wage earners. All families should be supported to explore their personal networks as sources of jobs for young adults with developmental disabilities. Providing families with the information and skills necessary to be involved in the job development process would expand opportunities for families to pursue their personal contacts as potential employers for their family member with a developmental disability.

## **Conclusion**

Stakeholders interviewed for this project made it clear that they are interested in developing strategies in their counties to sustain and enhance the relationships developed through the Partnership Project. Each recognized that the attainment of employment prior to graduation from high school enhanced students' autonomy and self-worth and stakeholders expect to see a reduction in the cost of DDD funded long-term care for Partnership Project Participants. Most importantly, stakeholders expressed that the jobs obtained by students' who participated in the project resulted in a more seamless transition from school to adult life.

Individual employment outcome data and the identification of a comprehensive list of best practices to facilitate collaborative relationships to support students who are clients of DDD obtain employment clearly demonstrates that the Jobs by 21 Partnership Project had a significant impact on both the school and adult service system in Washington. Students who participated in the project were not only more likely to be working while in high school but were more likely to continue to be employed once they graduated from high school. Typically these students worked a greater number of hours and earned more income than Non-Participant students, regardless of the type of employment service they billed for or their level of employment support need. These students' outcomes were achieved, in part, due to the innovative practices instituted in Partnership Project Counties. County DD offices, schools districts, DDD, DVR, employment providers, employers, individuals with developmental disabilities and their families all came together to demonstrate that collaborative relationships between stakeholders lead to "Jobs by 21" for young adults with developmental disabilities.

## References

- AAIDD. (2008). *Supports Intensity Scale*. Retrieved November 20, 2008 from <http://www.siswebsite.org/>
- Certo, N. J., Mautz, D., Pumpian, I., Sax, C., Smalley, T., Wade, H., Noyes, D., Luecking, R., Wechsler, J., & Batterman, N. (2003). A review and discussion of a model for seamless transition to adulthood. *Education & Training in Developmental Disabilities*, 38(1), 3-17.
- Highline Community College. (n.d.). *Employment Professional Certificate*. Retrieved November 20, 2008 from <http://flightline.highline.edu/cg/emp.prof.html>
- Hasazi, S. B., Johnson, R. E., Hasazi, J. E., Gordon, L.E., & Hull, M. (1989). Employment of youth with and without handicaps following high school: Outcomes and correlates. *The Journal of Special Education*, 23(3), 243-255.
- National Center on Secondary Education and Transition. (2007). *Key provisions on transition*. Retrieved November 20, 2008 from <http://www.ncset.org/publications/related/ideatransition.asp>
- National Longitudinal Transition Study-2. (n.d.). Data tables. Retrieved November 20, 2008 from [http://www.nlts2.org/data\\_tables/index.html](http://www.nlts2.org/data_tables/index.html)
- Office of Disability Employment Policy. (2008). *Customized employment: Principles and indicators*. Retrieved November 20, 2008 from <http://www.dol.gov/odep/pubs/custom/indicators.htm>
- Office of the Superintendent for Public Instruction. (n.d.). *Part B state performance plan for 2005-2010*. Retrieved November 20, 2008 from [http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/Data/Performance\\_Data/Wa\\_SPP.pdf](http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/Data/Performance_Data/Wa_SPP.pdf)
- Washington State Department of Social and Health Services. (n.d.). *Data Exchange Agreement*. Olympia, WA.
- Washington Division of Developmental Disabilities. (2008, January). *County request for award of Partnership Project funds for fiscal year 2008*. Olympia, WA.
- Washington Division of Developmental Disabilities. (n.d.) *County services for Working Age Adults Policy 4.11*. Olympia, WA.
- Washington Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. (n.d.). *School transition liaisons*. Retrieved November 20, 2008 from <http://www1.dshs.wa.gov/DVR/aboutdvr/transition/default.aspx>

Washington Workforce Training and Education Coordination Board. (2007). *Focus on people with disabilities*. Olympia, WA.

## Appendix A

### Partnership Project Steering Committee Roster

#### Washington Association of County Human Services: Developmental Disabilities

- Carrie Bayha: Benton and Franklin Counties
- Gail Goodwin: Grant County
- Ray Jensen: King County
- Kelly Oneal: Kitsap County
- Lynn Pippard: Spokane County
- Mary Strehlow: Clark County
- Susy Stremel: Pierce County
- Stuart Torgerson: Snohomish County

#### Self-Advocacy Liaison

- Emily Rogers, Arc of Washington State

#### Parent Representative

- Susan Atkins, Washington State Parent to Parent (P2P)

#### Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI)

- Lou Colwell

#### Center for Change in Transition Services (CCTS) at Seattle University

- Denny Hasko
- Cinda Johnson

#### Education Service District Representative (ESD)

- Dennis Matthews, ESD 112

#### Washington State Department of Social & Health Services: Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR)

- Lynnae Ruttledge

#### Washington State Workforce Training and Education Coordinating Board (Workforce Board)

- Martin McCallum

#### Washington State Employment Security Department: WorkSource

- Lorraine Coots

#### P-2020 (Consortium of Supported Employment Providers in Washington State)

- Karen DiPol, Vadis

#### Technical Assistance Contractors

- Candace O'Neill, O'Neill and Associates
- Cesilee Coulson, Washington Initiative for Supported Employment (WiSe)

#### Washington State Division of Developmental Disabilities

- Linda Rolfe, Director
- Jane Boone, Partnership Project Manager
- Branda Matson, County Liaison
- Randy Burge, Regional Administrator, Region 3
- Doug Washburn, Office Chief

#### Resources:

- John Butterworth, Institute for Community Inclusion, UMass Boston
- Jean Winsor, Institute for Community Inclusion, UMass Boston
- John Rhodes, Rhodes Consulting
- John Stern, DDD

## Appendix B

### School Districts Participating in Partnership Project

<b>County</b>	<b>Number of Participating School Districts</b>	<b>Names of Participating School Districts</b>
<b>Clark</b>	8	Vancouver, Camas, Ridgefield, Hockinson, La Center, Evergreen, Battleground, and Washougal.
<b>Island</b>	2	Oak Harbor and Coupeville
<b>King</b>	17	Auburn, Bellevue, Enumclaw, Federal Way, Highline, Issaquah, Kent, Lake Washington, Mercer Island, Northshore, Renton, Riverview, Seattle, Shoreline, Snoqualmie Valley, Tahoma, and Tukwila.
<b>Kitsap</b>	5	South Kitsap, Bremerton, Central Kitsap, North Kitsap, and Bainbridge Island.
<b>Mason</b>	3	Shelton, North Mason, Mary M. Knight.
<b>Pierce</b>	6	Franklin Pierce, White River, Steilacoom, Puyallup, Peninsula, and Tacoma.
<b>Snohomish</b>	10	Edmonds, Everett, Lake Stevens, Lakewood, Marysville, Monroe, Mukilteo, Northshore, Snohomish, and Stanwood.
<b>Spokane</b>	1	Spokane Public Schools District #81
<b>Thurston</b>	5	Olympia, North Thurston, Tumwater, Yelm, and Tenino.

## Appendix C

### Partnership Project Participant Data reported by Counties

#### Clark County

##### *Individual Outcomes*

Data reflect the employment outcomes for individuals who participated in Clark County's Jobs by 21 Partnership Project from February 1, 2008-June 30, 2008.

##### **Description of Individual Jobs:**

Number of different businesses employing individuals	6
--	---

The following businesses were employing individuals involved in the Partnership Project on June 30: Salvation Army, Target, Red Robin, Hartley Seafood, and Dragon Fly.

Number of different types of jobs individuals were employed in	3
--	---

The following are the different types of jobs individuals were employed in on June 30: office and clerical jobs, wholesale and retail trade jobs, and food service jobs.

##### **Description of Individual Job Search:**

Number of different sources of jobs for	NA
---	----

The following were sources of jobs for individual: NA- only provided information on "other" sources.

Clark County

*Career Experiences*

Data reflect the career experiences for individuals who participated in Clark County's Jobs by 21 Partnership Project from February 1, 2008-June 30, 2008.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Participation</b>		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
Work in a community based volunteer or internship position	26% (n=6)	4% (n=1)	70% (n=16)
Receive a stipend for an internship or other work experience	0% (n=0)	35% (n=8)	65% (n=15)
Participate in a career specific job training program	0% (n=0)	30% (n=7)	70% (n=16)
Participate in postsecondary education classes	0% (n=0)	30% (n=7)	70% (n=16)
Meet with a Benefits or Work Incentives Planner	13% (n=3)	48% (n=11)	39% (n=9)
Person Centered Planning	31% (n=7)	52% (n=12)	17% (n=4)
Job development	22% (n=5)	13% (n=3)	65% (n=15)
Job coaching	9% (n=2)	26% (n=6)	65% (n=15)

Island County

*Individual Outcomes*

Island County did not report any employment outcomes for individuals who participated in Island County's Jobs by 21 Partnership Project from February 1, 2008- June 30, 2008.

Island County

*Career Experiences*

Data reflect the career experiences for individuals who participated in Island County's Jobs by 21 Partnership Project from February 1, 2008- June 30, 2008.

Activity	Participation		
	Yes	No	Unknown
Work in a community based volunteer or internship position	n=1	n=0	n=0
Receive a stipend for an internship or other work experience	n=1	n=0	n=0
Participate in a career specific job training program	n=0	n=1	n=0
Participate in postsecondary education classes	n=0	n=1	n=0
Meet with a Benefits or Work Incentives Planner	n=0	n=1	n=0
Person Centered Planning	n=1	n=0	n=0
Job development	n=1	n=0	n=0
Job coaching	n=1	n=0	n=0

King County

*Individual Outcomes*

Data reflect the employment outcomes for individuals who participated in King County's Jobs by 21 Partnership Project from February 1, 2008- June 30, 2008.

**Description of Jobs:**

Number of different businesses employing individuals	30
--	----

The following businesses were employing individuals involved in the Partnership Project on June 30: Safeway, Redmond Reporter Newspaper, Sears, Jet Chevrolet, Northwest Center, Kids Country Child Care and Learning Center, Euresst Dining Services, Old Navy, Wesley Homes, Kohl's, Petco, Fred Meyer, Trader Joes, REI, QFC, Children's Hospital, Applebee's Neighborhood Bar and Grill, Panera Bread, System's Biology, Dominos Pizza, Stroum Jewish Community Center, Marshall's, The Ballard Manor, Gretchen's Shoebox Express, Starbucks, Value Village Thrift Store, Goodwill Industries, Central Market, Alchemy Goods, and CJ's Bakery.

Number of different types of jobs individuals were employed in	5
--	---

The following are the different types of jobs individuals were employed in on June 30: wholesale and retail trade jobs; lodging, building, and landscaping jobs; health and personal service jobs; transportation and related jobs; and food services jobs.

**Description of Individual Job Search:**

Number of different sources of jobs for individuals	6
---	---

The following were sources of jobs for individuals: business contact with which employment provider has worked in the past; new or existing business contact identified by school faculty or staff; new business contact developed by employment provider; personal contact identified by friend, or other acquaintance; personal contact identified by family member; and personal contact identified by job seeker.

King County

*Career Experiences*

Data reflect the career experiences for individuals who participated in King County's Jobs by 21 Partnership Project from February 1, 2008- June 30, 2008.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Participation</b>		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
Work in a community based volunteer or internship position	96% (n=67)	4% (n=3)	NA (n=0)
Receive a stipend for an internship or other work experience	46% (n=32)	54% (n=38)	NA (n=0)
Participate in a career specific job training program	NA (n=0)	100% (n=70)	NA (n=0)
Participate in postsecondary education classes	6% (n=4)	94% (n=66)	NA (n=0)
Meet with a Benefits or Work Incentives Planner	20% (n=14)	7% (n=5)	73% (n=51)
Person Centered Planning	NA (n=0)	NA (n=0)	100% (n=70)
Job development	94% (n=66)	6% (n=4)	NA (n=0)
Job coaching	73% (n=51)	27% (n=19)	NA (n=0)

Kitsap County

*Individual Outcomes*

Data reflect the employment outcomes for individuals who participated in Kitsap County's Jobs by 21 Partnership Project from February 1, 2008- June 30, 2008.

**Description of Jobs:**

Number of different businesses employing individuals	1
--	---

The following businesses were employing individuals involved in the Partnership Project on June 30: Harrison Medical Center

Number of different types of jobs individuals were employed in	2
--	---

The following are the different types of jobs individuals were employed in on June 30: office and clerical job; and lodging, building, and landscaping job.

**Description of Individual Job Search:**

Number of different sources of jobs for individuals	1
---	---

The following was the source of jobs for individuals: business contact with which employment provider has worked in the past.

Kitsap County

*Career Experiences*

Data reflect the career experiences for individuals who participated in Kitsap County's Jobs by 21 Partnership Project from February 1, 2008- June 30, 2008.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Participation</b>		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
Work in a community based volunteer or internship position	33% (n=1)	67% (n=2)	NA (n=0)
Receive a stipend for an internship or other work experience	33% (n=1)	67% (n=2)	NA (n=0)
Participate in a career specific job training program	NA (n=0)	100% (n=3)	NA (n=0)
Participate in postsecondary education classes	NA (n=0)	100% (n=3)	NA (n=0)
Meet with a Benefits or Work Incentives Planner	NA (n=0)	100% (n=3)	NA (n=0)
Person Centered Planning	NA (n=0)	100% (n=3)	NA (n=0)
Job development	100% (n=3)	NA (n=0)	NA (n=0)
Job coaching	100% (n=3)	NA (n=0)	NA (n=0)

Mason County

*Individual Outcomes*

Data reflect the employment outcomes for individuals who participated in Mason County's Jobs by 21 Partnership Project from February 1, 2008- June 30, 2008.

**Description of Jobs:**

Number of different businesses employing individuals	2
--	---

The following businesses were employing individuals involved in the Partnership Project on June 30: Squaxin Island Child Development Center and Shelton Health & Rehab.

Number of different types of jobs individuals were employed in	2
--	---

The following are the different types of jobs individuals were employed in on June 30: building and grounds cleaning and maintenance job; and personal care and service job.

**Description of Individual Job Search:**

Number of different sources of jobs for individuals	1
---	---

The following was the source of jobs for individuals: business contact with which employment provider has worked in the past.

Mason County

*Career Experiences*

Data reflect the career experiences for individuals who participated in Mason County's Jobs by 21 Partnership Project from February 1, 2008- June 30, 2008.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Participation</b>		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
Work in a community based volunteer or internship position	67% (n=2)	33% (n=1)	NA (n=0)
Receive a stipend for an internship or other work experience	33% (n=1)	67% (n=2)	NA (n=0)
Participate in a career specific job training program	NA (n=0)	100% (n=3)	Na (n=0)
Participate in postsecondary education classes	NA (n=0)	100% (n=3)	NA (n=0)
Meet with a Benefits or Work Incentives Planner	NA (n=0)	100% (n=3)	NA (n=0)
Person Centered Planning	NA (n=0)	67% (n=2)	33% (n=1)
Job development	67% (n=2)	33% (n=1)	NA (n=0)
Job coaching	100% (n=3)	NA (n=0)	NA (n=0)

Pierce County

*Individual Outcomes*

Data reflect the employment outcomes for individuals who participated in Pierce County's Jobs by 21 Partnership Project from February 1, 2008- June 30, 2008.

**Description of Jobs:**

Number of different businesses employing individuals	5
--	---

The following businesses were employing individuals involved in the Partnership Project on June 30: Costco, Emerald Queen Casino, Papa John's Pizza, L'Arche, and Tahoma Associates.

Number of different types of jobs individuals were employed in	4
--	---

The following are the different types of jobs individuals were employed in on June 30: wholesale and retail trade jobs, lodging, building and landscaping jobs, food service jobs, and animal husbandry, agriculture, and related jobs.

**Description of Individual Job Search:**

Number of different sources of jobs for individuals	2
---	---

The following were sources of jobs for individuals: new business contacts developed by the employment provider and business contact with which employment provider has worked in the past.

Pierce County

*Career Experiences*

Data reflect the career experiences for individuals who participated in Pierce County's Jobs by 21 Partnership Project from February 1, 2008- June 30, 2008.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Participation</b>		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
Work in a community based volunteer or internship position	78% (n=7)	11% (n=1)	11% (n=1)
Receive a stipend for an internship or other work experience	11% (n=1)	NA (n=0)	89% (n=8)
Participate in a career specific job training program	NA (n=0)	11% (n=1)	89% (n=8)
Participate in postsecondary education classes	11% (n=1)	11% (n=1)	78% (n=7)
Meet with a Benefits or Work Incentives Planner	56% (n=5)	44% (n=4)	0NA (n=0)
Person Centered Planning	67% (n=6)	33% (n=3)	NA (n=0)
Job development	78% (n=7)	22% (n=2)	NA (n=0)
Job coaching	56% (n=5)	44% (n=4)	NA (n=0)

Snohomish County

*Individual Outcomes*

Data reflect the employment outcomes for individuals who participated in Snohomish County's Jobs by 21 Partnership Project from February 1, 2008- June 30, 2008.

**Description of Jobs:**

Number of different businesses employing individuals	11
--	----

The following businesses were employing individuals involved in the Partnership Project on June 30: Old Spaghetti Factory, Best Buy, AA Party Rentals, Auntie Anne's Pretzels, Weight Loss Clinic, Safeway, Albertsons, Merrill Gardens, Kaas Tailors, Children's Hospital, Stanwood Café.

Number of different types of jobs individuals were employed in	5
--	---

The following are the different types of jobs individuals were employed in on June 30: food service; wholesale and retail trade; office and clerical; lodging, building, and landscaping; and health and personal services.

**Description of Individual Job Search:**

Number of different sources of jobs for individuals	4
---	---

The following were sources of jobs for individuals: new business contacts developed by employment provider; personal contacts identified by friend, or other acquaintance; new or existing business contacts identified by school faculty or staff; and personal contacts identified by family member.

Snohomish County

*Career Experiences*

Data reflect the career experiences for individuals who participated in Snohomish County's Jobs by 21 Partnership Project from February 1, 2008- June 30, 2008.

Activity	Participation		
	Yes	No	Unknown
Work in a community based volunteer or internship position	75% (n=15)	25% (n=5)	NA (n=0)
Receive a stipend for an internship or other work experience	NA (n=0)	100% (n=17)	NA (n=0)
Participate in a career specific job training program	NA (n=0)	100% (n=20)	NA (n=0)
Participate in postsecondary education classes	NA (n=0)	100% (n=20)	NA (n=0)
Meet with a Benefits or Work Incentives Planner	25% (n=5)	70% (n=14)	5% (n=1)
Person Centered Planning	22% (n=4)	78% (n=14)	NA (n=0)
Job development	80% (n=16)	20% (n=4)	NA (n=0)
Job coaching	80% (n=16)	20% (n=4)	NA (n=0)

Spokane County

*Individual Outcomes*

Data reflect the employment outcomes for individuals who participated in Spokane County's Jobs by 21 Partnership Project from February 1, 2008- June 30, 2008.

**Description of Jobs:**

Number of different businesses employing individuals	5
--	---

The following businesses were employing individuals involved in the Partnership Project on June 30: Albertson's; Holiday Inn; Little Caesar's Pizza; Trade a Game; and Macy's.

Number of different types of jobs individuals were employed in	3
--	---

The following are the different types of jobs individuals were employed in on June 30: wholesale and retail trade jobs; lodging, building, and landscaping jobs; and food services jobs.

**Description of Individual Job Search:**

Number of different sources of jobs for individuals	1
---	---

The following was the source of jobs for individuals: new business contact developed by employment provider.

Spokane County

*Career Experiences*

Data reflect the career experiences for individuals who participated in Spokane County's Jobs by 21 Partnership Project from February 1, 2008- June 30, 2008.

Activity	Participation		
	Yes	No	Unknown
Work in a community based volunteer or internship position	NA (n=0)	100% (n=10)	NA (n=0)
Receive a stipend for an internship or other work experience	NA (n=0)	100% (n=10)	NA (n=0)
Participate in a career specific job training program	NA (n=0)	100% (n=10)	NA (n=0)
Participate in postsecondary education classes	NA (n=0)	100% (n=10)	NA (n=0)
Meet with a Benefits or Work Incentives Planner	100% (n=10)	NA (n=0)	NA (n=0)
Person Centered Planning	100% (n=10)	NA (n=0)	NA (n=0)
Job development	100% (n=10)	NA (n=0)	NA (n=0)
Job coaching	90% (n=9)	10% (n=1)	NA (n=0)

Thurston County

*Individual Outcomes*

Data reflect the employment outcomes for individuals who participated in Thurston County's Jobs by 21 Partnership Project from February 1, 2008- June 30, 2008.

**Description of Jobs:**

Number of different businesses employing individuals	9
--	---

The following businesses were employing individuals involved in the Partnership Project on June 30: Olympia Child Care Center; Sertino's Café; Target; Safeway; Sizzler; SPSCC; O'Blarney's; MAACO; and McDonald's.

Number of different types of jobs individuals were employed in	5
--	---

The following are the different types of jobs individuals were employed in on June 30: personal care and service jobs; food preparation and serving related jobs; sales and related jobs; education, training, and library; and transportation and material moving jobs.

**Description of Individual Job Search:**

Number of different sources of jobs for individuals	4
---	---

The following were sources of jobs for individuals: business contact with whom employment provider has worked in the past; new business contact developed by employment provider; personal contact identified by family member; personal contact identified by job seeker.

Thurston County

*Career Experiences*

Data reflect the career experiences for individuals who participated in Thurston County's Jobs by 21 Partnership Project from February 1, 2008- June 30, 2008.

<b>Activity</b>	<b>Participation</b>		
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
Work in a community based volunteer or internship position	88% (n=22)	8% (n=2)	4% (n=1)
Receive a stipend for an internship or other work experience	24% (n=6)	72% (n=18)	4% (n=1)
Participate in a career specific job training program	16% (n=4)	80% (n=20)	4% (n=1)
Participate in postsecondary education classes	NA (n=0)	96% (n=24)	4% (n=1)
Meet with a Benefits or Work Incentives Planner	NA (n=0)	96% (n=24)	4% (n=1)
Person Centered Planning	48% (n=12)	52% (n=13)	NA (n=0)
Job development	76% (n=19)	24% (n=6)	NA (n=0)
Job coaching	44% (n=11)	56% (n=14)	NA (n=0)

All Partnership Project Counties

*Individual Outcomes*

Data reflect the employment outcomes for all individuals who participated in Thurston County's Jobs by 21 Partnership Project from February 1, 2008- June 30, 2008.

**Description of Jobs:**

Number of different businesses employing individuals from the FY 2008 Project	78
---	----

A wide range of businesses were employing individuals involved in the Partnership Project. Below is a list of distinct business names and the number of individuals they employed who were participating in the Partnership Project.

<b>Business Name</b>	<b>Number of Individuals</b>
AA Party Rentals	1
Adidas	1
Albertsons	2
Alchemy Goods	1
Aldercrest Retirement Center	1
Applebee's Neighborhood Grill	1
Auntie Anne's	1
Best Buy	1
Blanchard Auto Electric	1
Burger King	1
CJ's Bakery	1
CenterForce	1
Central Market	1
Children's Hospital	2
Clark County	1
Click Warehouse	1
Costco	1
Domino's Pizza	1
Doubletree Hotel	2
Dragon Fly	1
Emerald Queen Casino	1
Eurest Dining Services	1
Fred Meyer	2
Goodwill Industries	1
Gretchen's Shoebox Express	1
Harrison Medical Center	3
Hartley Seafood	1
Hearthstone Retirement Home	1
Holiday Inn Express	1
Jet Chevrolet	1
Kaas Tailored	1

Kid's Country Child Care and Learning Center	1
Kinder Care	1
Kmart	1
Kohl's	1
L'Arche	1
Little Caesar's Pizza	1
MAACO	1
Macy's	1
Marshall's	1
McDonald's	1
Merrill Gardens	1
Mr. Carwash	1
Northwest Center	3
O'Blarney's	1
Old Navy	1
Old Spaghetti Factory	1
Olympia Child Care Center	1
Panera Bread	1
Papa John's Pizza	1
Petco	1
QFC	2
REI	1
Red Robin	1
Redmond Reporter Newspaper	1
Rock Wood Fired Pizza	1
SPSCC	1
Safeway	11
Salvation Army	2
Sears	1
Self Employment	1
Serino's Cafe	1
Shelton Health & Rehab	1
Sizzler	1
Squaxin Island Child Development Center	1
Stanwood Café	1
Starbucks	1
Stroum Jewish Community Center	1
System's Biology	1
Tahoma Associates	1
Target	2
The Ballard Manor	1
Trade a Game	1
Trader Joe's	2
Value Village Thrift Store	1

Weight Loss Clinic	1
Wesley Homes	1
YMCA	1

Number of different types of jobs individuals were employed in	14
--	----

Individuals were employed in a variety of different jobs. Below is a list of the distinct types of jobs and the number of individuals they employed who were participating in the Partnership Project.

<b>Job Type</b>	<b>Number of Individuals</b>
Office & Clerical	3
Education, Training, and Library	1
Wholesale& Retail Trade	42
Food Preparation and Serving Related	5
Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	1
Personal Care and Service	2
Food Services	18
Sales and Related	2
Lodging, Building, & Landscaping	8
Transportation and Material Moving	1
Health and Personal Services	11
Animal Husbandry, Agriculture, & Related Jobs	1
Manufacturing, Construction, & Related Jobs	2
Transportation & Related Jobs	1

**Description of Individual Job Search:**

Number of different sources of jobs for individuals employed who participated in the FY 2008 Partnership Project	7
--	---

Individuals used a range of different sources to obtain their jobs. Below is a list of the sources used to obtain jobs and the number of individuals who used each source.

<b>Job Source</b>	<b>Number of Individuals</b>
Business contact with whom employment provider has worked in the past	27
New business contact developed by employment provider	39
New or existing business contact identified by school staff	13
Personal contact identified by family member	9
Personal contact identified by friend or acquaintance	2
Personal contact identified by job seeker	2
Other	3

All Partnership Project Counties

*Career Experiences*

Individuals who participated in the Partnership Project engaged in a variety of activities to expand their understanding of the range of opportunities available to them after they graduated from high school. The overwhelming majority of Partnership Project participants graduated with the experiences of: working in a community based volunteer or internship position (74%), engaging in job development activities (78%), and receiving job coaching (62%). To a lesser extent students also had the experiences of: receiving a stipend for an internship or other work experience (25%), meeting with a benefits or work incentives planner (23%), and engaging in person centered planning (25%).

Activity	Participation		
	Yes	No	Unknown
Work in a community based volunteer or internship position	74%	15%	11%
Receive a stipend for an internship or other work experience	25%	60%	15%
Participate in a career specific job training program	2%	82%	16%
Participate in postsecondary education classes	3%	82%	15%
Meet with a Benefits or Work Incentives Planner	23%	39%	38%
Person Centered Planning	25%	29%	46%
Job development	78%	13%	9%
Job coaching	62%	29%	9%

## Appendix D

### Determination of DDD Client Overall Support Need for Employment

DDD assesses the following factors to determine the overall employment support need for individual clients:

- Behavior
- Medical
- Interpersonal Support
- Activities of Daily Living (ADL)
- Mobility
- Employment Activities Supports Intensity Subscale (SIS)<sup>15</sup>
- Environment (work history, transportation, job match, other barriers)

The factors are given the following weights in the calculation of the acuity score:

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Factor Weight</b>
Behavior	25%
Medical	20%
Interpersonal Support	20%
ADL	13%
Mobility	7%
Employment Activities (SIS)	10%
Environment	5%

Clients who are on the Community Protection waiver are automatically assigned to the High Employment Support Level, regardless of their other scale values.

---

<sup>15</sup> The Employment Activity Support Subscale is Part D on the AAIDD Supports Intensity Scale (SIS). This subscale assesses an individual's general support needs to find and keep a job based upon the following activities: accessing/receiving job/task accommodations; learning/using specific job skills; interacting with co-workers; interacting with supervisors/coaches; completing work-related tasks with acceptable speed; completing work related tasks with acceptable quality; changing job assignments; and seeking information and assistance from an employer. Individuals are scored on the frequency of support, time devoted to support, and type of support needed.