

Appendix H

Employment Recommendation A. 6.

Goal Setting for Increasing Persons in
Community Employment

Goal Setting for Increasing Persons in Community Employment

The committee, after a review of the relevant employment data from 2004, recommends that the number of persons on individual community jobs be increased by 5% per year on a statewide basis. Appendix B. provides the specific work data, by CCB, on the number of persons employed on individual community jobs during June 2004.

The data revealed a total of 946 persons had community employment during the time period. Individual CCB data showed a range of 33% of adults having a community job (Mountain Valley) to 1.9% (Colorado Bluesky Enterprises). The statewide average was 15.5%. The goal, utilizing 2004 data would be to increase the number of persons on community jobs by 47 to a total of 993 representing 20.5% of the total adults in day service. This number will be altered based on the collection and analysis of June 2005 data on the number of persons working on community jobs.

National data, showing the percentage of persons provided supported employment, is available. The State of the States in Developmental Disabilities - 2004, from the Coleman Institute for Cognitive Disabilities provides a State by State review of persons in supported employment in 2002 (<http://www.cu.edu/ColemanInstitute/stateofthestates/>). This data defines supported employment as persons competitively employed as well as persons on mobile crews and enclaves. Table 9 from this publication, Supported Employment Programs in the States: MR/DD Participants and Spending in FY 2002, is attached.

The data shows that Colorado ranked in the upper ¼, at 35%, in the percentage of persons in supported employment of all persons receiving services. Utilization rate, however, shows us in the bottom half of all States but above the national average.

TABLE 9
SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS IN THE STATES:
MR/DD PARTICIPANTS AND SPENDING IN FY 2002

State	Participants ¹	Utilization		Spending		Supported/ Competitive % ⁴
		Rate ²	Spending	Per Capita ³		
Alabama	250	6	\$620,300	\$0.14	6%	
Alaska	307	48	\$3,917,183	\$6.13	48%	
Arizona	1,122	21	\$5,213,162	\$0.95	16%	
Arkansas	91	3	\$24,779	\$0.01	2%	
California	9,289	27	\$79,911,461	\$2.29	17%	
Colorado	2,001	46	DNF	DNF	35%	
Connecticut	3,662	106	\$54,986,243	\$15.85	50%	
Delaware	393	49	\$3,467,103	\$4.29	32%	
DC	44	7	\$99,222	\$0.17	4%	
Florida	4,098	24	\$10,219,484	\$0.61	27%	
Georgia	4,427	52	\$18,401,865	\$2.15	39%	
Hawaii	143	12	\$546,084	\$0.44	11%	
Idaho	640	48	\$2,901,391	\$2.16	13%	
Illinois	3,008	24	\$15,481,400	\$1.23	11%	
Indiana	2,308	37	\$7,579,447	\$1.23	21%	
Iowa	2,098	71	\$7,679,050	\$2.61	27%	
Kansas	477	18	\$3,909,193	\$1.44	12%	
Kentucky	672	16	\$2,662,705	\$0.65	25%	
Louisiana	818	18	\$6,997,782	\$1.56	35%	
Maine	695	54	\$4,640,400	\$3.58	20%	
Maryland	3,099	57	\$39,296,221	\$7.23	38%	
Massachusetts	5,400	84	\$66,834,675	\$10.37	45%	
Michigan	6,431	64	\$27,655,440	\$2.75	39%	
Minnesota	4,081	81	\$18,228,288	\$3.62	27%	
Mississippi	397	14	\$1,673,050	\$0.58	18%	
Missouri	465	8	\$1,952,792	\$0.34	10%	
Montana	278	31	\$2,025,370	\$2.22	17%	
Nebraska	938	54	\$7,280,201	\$4.21	28%	
Nevada	492	22	\$590,400	\$0.27	35%	
New Hampshire	433	34	\$5,755,252	\$4.51	21%	
New Jersey	1,590	19	\$13,334,081	\$1.55	18%	
New Mexico	1,020	55	\$6,817,884	\$3.67	33%	
New York	10,012	52	\$38,490,000	\$2.01	16%	
North Carolina	1,229	15	\$4,627,836	\$0.55	15%	
North Dakota	361	57	\$1,882,867	\$2.98	23%	
Ohio	8,556	75	\$25,123,855	\$2.20	22%	
Oklahoma	2,641	76	\$16,081,925	\$4.60	59%	
Oregon	1,644	47	\$18,031,417	\$5.13	34%	
Pennsylvania	9,007	73	\$30,470,464	\$2.48	41%	
Rhode Island	545	50	\$3,486,125	\$3.23	19%	
South Carolina	1,183	29	\$5,794,154	\$1.41	16%	
South Dakota	707	93	\$4,913,611	\$6.43	34%	
Tennessee	827	14	\$3,319,422	\$0.57	14%	
Texas	3,099	14	\$19,023,123	\$0.87	35%	
Utah	1,028	44	\$5,984,000	\$2.59	41%	
Vermont	733	118	\$5,381,556	\$8.69	42%	
Virginia	2,333	32	\$18,055,378	\$2.48	27%	
Washington	3,608	60	\$21,307,204	\$3.52	53%	
West Virginia	229	13	\$1,247,092	\$0.69	7%	
Wisconsin	3,258	60	\$18,168,803	\$3.34	20%	
Wyoming	250	50	\$677,580	\$1.36	25%	
United States	112,417	39	\$662,768,320	\$2.30	24%	

¹ Does not include 5,232 competitively employed workers assisted by MR/DD agencies in CT, KS, LA, PA, and TX.

² Supported employment participants per 100,000 citizens of the general population of the state.

³ Spending per citizen of the general population.

⁴ Percentage in supported employment includes persons in competitive employment (referenced in Note 1).

"DNF" = did not furnish.

The Division for Developmental Disabilities provided the work data in Appendix B. to CCB's in November 2004. At the end of January 2005 CCB Executive Directors, Alliance and CCB Partners received Statewide and individual CCB trend data on day services for 1997, 2000, 2003 and 2004. A memo sent with the data informed the CCB Directors that, based on a recommendation from the Ad Hoc Committee, goals to increase the number of persons in community employment would be established. The memo that accompanied the data is attached.

In addition, Al Orlofsky, Chairperson of the Ad Hoc Committee on Employment and Community Participation, made a presentation to the CCB Executive Directors and the DDD Management Team, in May 2005 going over employment and community participation data and indicating meeting will be established to discuss setting goals for the increase of persons in community employment.

Work data for FY 2005 will be compiled and shared as soon as it is available. As a result of the Ad Hoc Committee recommendation, data on individual and group (mobile crew & enclave) jobs are being collected in the DDD Community Contract and Management System (CCMS). The June 2005 work data will be used it as the baseline for the 5% increase.

STATE OF COLORADO



Colorado Department of Human Services

people who help people

**OFFICE OF ADULT, DISABILITY, AND REHABILITATION
SERVICE**

John P. Daurio, Manager

DIVISION FOR DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

3824 West Princeton Circle

Denver, Colorado 80236

Phone 303-866-7450

TDD 303-866-7471

FAX 303-866-7470

www.cdhs.state.co.us

Fred L. DeCrescentis

Director



Bill Owens
Governor

Marva Livingston Hammons
Executive Director

To: CCB Executive Directors

From: Allan Orlofsky, Program manager

Subject: Day Service Data

Date: January 25, 2005

As you are aware, the Division for Developmental Disabilities, Community Centered Boards, advocates and others have been concerned about the trends, over the past six or seven years, in the utilization of day services. Specific concerns have been raised about the decline in persons receiving integrated work services and the increase in persons involved in community participation programs. General statewide data was collected, analyzed and made available during the past year that confirmed the reduction of integrated work and the increase in community participation. Although we do not specifically know why this change has occurred it appears it may be due to multiple factors that could include:

- The state of Colorado's economy over the past five years.
- The changes in funding of supported employment services in 1998.
- Demise of "slot-based" funding.
- Desire for a full day of supervised activity.
- Individual availability of greater choice in service options.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Employment and Community Participation reviewed the statewide day service data and made numerous recommendations designed to reverse the current trend and encourage greater participation in community employment. One of the recommendations is for the establishment of statewide goals to increase the number and percentage of adults

engaged in community employment. A few months ago, all CCB's were provided with work service data that showed the number of adults on individual jobs, the number on group jobs (mobile crews and enclaves) and the number of persons working in non-integrated settings. This was the first step in data collection and analysis.

Attached to this memo is additional information regarding the utilization of all day services by adults in the Colorado developmental disabilities system. The attached information covers integrated work, non-integrated work, integrated activity, and non-integrated activity. It is both statewide and CCB specific and is reported for major program and all participants. Further explanation for each data sheet is provided below.

1. CCB specific day service by major program – This sheet shows trend data for your CCB across four years beginning in 1997 (1997 data represent pre-system change information). For the purposes of this comparison, each individual is only shown in one day service category (integrated work, non-integrated work, integrated activity, or non-integrated activity). Each individual's major program is defined as the service where they have the most billable hours. This data also shows the percentage of total adults, from your CCB, in each day service category.
2. Program Ranking of Day Service Major Program by CCB – May/June 04 – This sheet shows the ranking of day services of each CCB using May/June 2004 major program data. A rank of 1 is the service where the greatest percentage of individuals spend most of their time. A rank of 4 is the service where the lowest percentage of individuals spend most of their time. The statewide data indicate that integrated activity (community participation) is the most prevalent major program while non-integrated activity (day habilitation) is the least prevalent.
3. CCB specific day service – All Participants – This sheet is similar to the major program sheet in that it shows trend data for your CCB across four years beginning in 1997. However, rather than assigning each person to a major program, it shows the number of persons who received any hours of service in each category during the reporting timeframe. This data also shows the total percentage of adults, from your CCB, that participated in each service.
4. Program Ranking of Day Service by CCB – May/June 04 – All Participants - This sheet is similar to the major program sheet in that it shows the ranking of day services of each CCB for May/June 2004 data. However, this sheet used data for all participants rather than just major program figures. A rank of 1 is the service where the greatest percentage of individuals received service hours. A rank of 4 is the service where the smallest percentage of individuals received some hours of service. The statewide data indicate that the highest percentage of persons received integrated activity (community participation) services while non-integrated work (sheltered employment) saw the smallest percentage of utilization.

5. All CCB's Day Service By Major Program – This sheet is identical to the individual CCB sheets (#1) above, but reflects trend data for the total number of adults in service across all 20 CCB's.

6. All CCB's Day Service – All Participants - This sheet is identical to the individual CCB sheets (#3) above, but reflects trend data for the total number of adults in service across all 20 CCB's.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Employment and Community Participation will be analyzing the statewide data and making a recommendation for DDD to establish a specific goal to increase the number and/or percentage of persons participating in and having integrated work as their service. In addition, DDD will be following up with individual CCB's to discuss service trends.

Please review the attached information with appropriate staff. Should you have any questions or comments please contact me at (303) 866-7460 or al.orlofsky@state.co.us.

C: DDD Management Team