

2011 COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT

*Vocational Rehabilitation Needs of
Rhode Islanders with Disabilities*



**State of Rhode Island
Department of Human Services
Office of Rehabilitation Services
in collaboration with the State Rehabilitation Council**

Table of Contents

- I. Commonly Used Terms and Acronyms
 - II. Acknowledgements
 - III. Introduction
 - IV. Goals of Comprehensive Needs Assessment
 - V. Findings and Implications for Programming
 - 2011 VR Counselor Comprehensive Needs Assessment Survey
 - 2011 CRP Comprehensive Needs Assessment Survey
 - 2010 Customer Satisfaction Surveys
 - 2010 RI Governors' Commission on Disability Public Forums
 - Employment Workgroup Report
 - VI. Summary of Findings and Implications for Programming
 - VII. Conclusion
 - VIII. References
- Addendums
- A. Environmental Scan/Source Documents
 - B. 2011 VR Counselor Survey
 - C. 2011 CRP Survey
 - D. 2010 Customer Satisfaction Surveys

I. Commonly Used Terms and Acronyms

To assist the user/reader of the Comprehensive Needs Assessment below are commonly used terms and acronyms throughout the CNA

CNA – Comprehensive Needs Assessment

CRP – Community Rehabilitation Provider

DLT – Department of Labor and Training

504 Education Plan – School Accommodation for Physically Disabled Student

MIS – Management Information System

ORS – Office of Rehabilitation Services

QA/QI – Quality Assurance/Quality Improvement

RIDE – Rhode Island Department of Education

RI Works – Family Independence Program

RSA – Rehabilitation Services Administration

SRC – State Rehabilitation Counselor

TANF – Temporary Assistance to Needy Families

UI – Unemployment Insurance

VR – Vocational Rehabilitation

II. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Comprehensive Needs Assessment report includes a summary of the survey design and tools, information gathered and findings. The Office of Rehabilitation Services and State Rehabilitation Counselor would like to thank all stakeholders who provided feedback and input to the 2011 CNA and the Paul V. Sherlock Center on Disabilities for their assistance in developing and coordinating the CRP survey. Additionally ORS thanks the Governor's Commission on Disabilities for their support and assistance with assessing the needs of our mutual customer groups and the many staff at ORS who assisted with the CNA design, implementation and synthesizing of information.

III. INTRODUCTION

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, mandates the Office of Rehabilitation Services (ORS); in partnership with the Rhode Island State Rehabilitation Counselor (SRC) complete a statewide needs assessment every three years to determine the rehabilitation needs of Rhode Islanders with disabilities.

Between FFY 2010 and FFY 2011 ORS utilized, a series of assessment activities to formulate an understanding of the rehabilitation needs of Rhode Islanders with disabilities. These activities included: CNA surveys to VR staff and CRP, customer satisfaction surveys, public forums, review of available MIS data, and environmental scan of data from sources such as FFY 2009 RSA Annual Agency Review, Internal MIS reports, 2009 Information Works: Measuring Rhode Island Schools, 2010 Rhode Island Department of Labor and Department of Bureau of Labor Statistics, Training and American Community Survey.

The results of the CNA were reviewed by a team of individuals from the Office of Rehabilitation Services and the State Rehabilitation Council to assist in the planning and development of a three-year strategic plan for the Office of Rehabilitation Services with a focus on improving services that increase employment outcomes of individuals with disabilities residing in Rhode Island.

Questions related to this CNA survey may be directed to:
Kathleen Grygiel, VR Deputy Administrator
Office of Rehabilitation Services
40 Fountain Street, Providence, RI 02903
Telephone: (401) 421-7005 **ext. 373** (v) ~ (401) 421-7016 (tty)
Email: kgrygiel@ors,ri.gov

IV. GOALS of THE COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT as OUTLINED by RSA:

Assess the vocational rehabilitation needs of individuals with most significant disabilities including their needs for Supported Employment

Assess the vocational rehabilitation needs of individuals with disabilities who are minorities

Assess the vocational rehabilitation needs of unserved and underserved population in Rhode Island

Assess the utilization of services through the statewide workforce investment system by individuals with disabilities, vocational rehabilitation counselors and community services providers

Assess the need to establish, develop, and enhance Community Rehabilitation Providers within the State

V. FINDING AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAMMING

a. Background/Environmental Scan Data

Rhode Island Economy: The Rhode Island economy continues to be significantly impacted by the recession. Unemployment Rates for October 2010 remain in double digits placing RI 5th in the nation. This coupled with the limited skills and low education rate of many RI workers has placed many individuals in a precarious employment situation. DLT Labor Market information projects that 12% of the jobs available in the coming years will require vocational training. This presents ongoing challenges for 15.3% of RI individuals age 25 and older who do not have a high school degree/equivalency. Per the information highlighted in the October 2010 RI Department of Labor and Training Employment Bulletin this places RI higher than the national average of 14.7 and the highest in New England for individuals with no high school degree or equivalency. The disparity between the skill set required for current projected employment need and that of RI unemployed has been highlighted by RI DLT.

Nationally: Information released in October 2010 by the Disability Employment Statistics – U.S. Department of Labor’s Bureau of Labor Statistics reflected that 21.4% of individuals in the labor force have a disability while those without equaled 69.8%. Information indicated that individuals with a disability are more likely to be UI at a rate of 14.8% of as compared to counterparts who had a rate of 8.8%. (Information not seasonally adjusted.)

Rhode Island Disability Information: Based on 2010 U.S. Department of Labor’s Bureau of Labor Statistics individuals with disabilities living below the poverty level in Rhode Island with a disability age 18 to 64 in 2008 represented 73.12% as opposed to their counterparts who represented 8.67%. Additionally

individuals have a higher likelihood by 6% of being unemployed. Rhode Islanders with disabilities have been particularly impacted by the persistent downturn of the RI employment rate as evidenced by:

Transition: RSA 2009 data for Transition age youth indicates ORS's outcomes are above the national average in percent of agency total served, employment outcomes, employment rates and average hourly wage. It remains important to be mindful that DLT information indicates individuals seeking to enter and/or remain in the labor force in Rhode Island will need to obtain a minimum education level of a high school degree/equivalency or higher with some vocational training. Data from 2009 Information Works: Measuring Rhode Island Schools for Change reflects 18% of RI public-school student population has an IPE and 2% have 504 plans. Of the students with an IPE 25.4% dropped out of high school as opposed to their counterparts at 15.5%. Based on 2010 U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics individuals with disabilities have a higher likelihood by 6% of being unemployed. Additionally individuals living below the poverty level in Rhode Island with a disability age 18 to 64 in 2008 represented 73.12% as opposed to their counterparts who represented 8.67%.

Veterans: Information from U.S. Department of Labor – Veterans' Employment and Training Services reflects the state of Rhode Island ranks third from the bottom in the number of disabled vets entering employment, maintaining employment and in average earnings. MIS data from March of 2010 reflects that the number of individuals identifying themselves as veterans who were in services with ORS was 58 raising the question of this being an underserved population.

Underserved populations: A comparison of Rhode Islander's by race, disability and employed status against VR stats identifies the Asian population as underserved. Analysis of 2009 RSA VR national and RI VR statistics for employment outcomes and disabilities served reflected the following underserved disabilities: physical disorders and communicative impairments. ORS was below its counterparts for average hourly earning for individuals with the following disabilities: communicative disorders, mental and emotional. Analysis of the RSA statistics for average hours worked per week highlights that ORS is below the national average for all disability categories (visual impairments, physical impairments, communicative impairments, cognitive impairments and mental and emotional disabilities).

b. FY 2011 VR Counselor Comprehensive Needs Assessment Survey Summary

The VR Counselor Survey utilized in this CNA was modeled after the survey in RSA's "Developing a Model Comprehensive Statewide Needs Assessment with Corresponding Training Materials for State VR Agency Staff and SRC Member Guide": In the fall of 2010, ORS sought input from VR counselors, Supervisors, Case Aids and students. The goal of the survey was to determine the needs, barriers to services and suggestions on improvement to the vocational rehabilitation services provided to customers. The survey assessed vocational need of the most significantly and significantly disabled, unserved and underserved populations, need for further development of CRP's, as well as

counselors' use of the DLT netWORKri One Stop system to assist customers with disabilities to maintain and/or enter employment.

Of the 48 surveys distributed via e-mail, there was a return rate of 26 or 54.17%. Findings reflected the following results:

- i. **Rehabilitation Needs of individuals with most significant disabilities, including SE: (Information was similar for individuals with significant disabilities)**
 - a. Services for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing addressing areas such the enhancement of functional literacy, additionally access to interpreters with cultural awareness/ability to communicate in other languages and vendors with the ability to work with this population is limited to the Providence vicinity.
 - b. Transportation within Rhode Island remains a persistent barrier to employment for individuals unable to drive and/or have no access to a vehicle.
 - c. Service options in the area of Vocational Evaluation, Situation Assessment and Work Readiness are limited in the East Bay and Warwick areas.
 - d. Capacity of DD vendors in the area of Vocational Evaluation and Situational Assessment with a focus on integrated employment varies.
 - e. Selective job placement for individuals completing short-term training programs is limited.
 - f. ORS staff and their CRP network lack a consistent understanding of services provided by ORS and the CRP's, provision of consistent services for specific disabilities and cultures.
 - g. Need for ongoing education of employers to tax credits, hiring incentives, and services of ORS.
 - h. Access to treatment, services and funding sources for uninsured remains challenging
 - i. Service options addressing work place social skills and daily time management are limited.
- ii. **Rehabilitation needs of minorities:**
 - a. Development of cultural competence of ORS staff to specific cultures such as South East Asian and Portuguese was highlighted as an ongoing need

- b. Promotion and education of agency staff to internal resources and how to access the resources, which include bi-lingual staff, forms, etc.
- c. Development of individual IPE's that include access and utilization of ESL classes prior to job training and placement
- d. Service options in the area of Vocational Evaluation, Situational Assessments, and Work Preparation specific to identified minority populations within regions is limited.

iii. Unserved and Underserved Populations:

- a. Services to the Southeast Asian, Cambodian, African American and Portuguese communities were an area identified for further development and outreach.
- b. Transition age youth, with learning disabilities, developmental disabilities who do not qualify for DDD services and students with 504 plans/physically disabled were identified as underserved.
- c. Additionally respondents' identified the following disability groups as underserved populations: Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Autism Spectrum Disorder, Veterans.
- d. Also identified as underserved are individuals currently employed, general population not connected to an agency, school or netWORKri as some areas of the state do not have a local netWORKri office and those with a BCI.

iv. Further need to develop established and/or establish new CRP's:

- a. Consistency and accountability in the provisions of services such as Vocational Evaluation and report writing, Job Development, etc is limited.
- b. Continued assessment of Supported Employment process; movement through the services and resulting placement into integrated competitive wage work.
- c. Communication and collaboration with CRP's and referral sources i.e. Developmental Disabilities remains an ongoing area for growth.
- d. Limited number of CRP's with the capacity to provide job development and placement, supported employment, pre-employment planning, longer SAC's, programs similar to SWEEP and soft skills training.
- e. Development of CRP's and services that addresses the changing needs of the customers and employers remains an ongoing challenge.

- f. Development of CRP's is limited in the some of areas of the State such as South County and Newport.
 - g. Accessing Vocational Evaluations, job development, SAC's and other services throughout the State for specific disability populations and minorities such as the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Asian, etc. remains challenging.
 - h. Access to cost effective vendors; Wal-Mart and Salvation Army for services such as office supplies and clothing is limited.
 - i. Transportation remains a barrier to services and employment in Rhode Island; assessment of CRP capacity to provide transportation services.
- v. **Utilization of the DLT netWORKri resources:**
- a. All but two of the respondents utilize the netWORKri resources to some degree. The highest utilization fell within information and referral, DLT/LMI/RI Red website, DLT website, WIA Training grant, Job Leads/Job Fairs and utilization of the Youth Resource Centers.
 - b. A limited number of netWORKri offices coupled with transportation issues i.e. no longer a resource in East Bay area resulting in need to access the Providence or Pawtucket offices hinder the use of the resource for many individuals with disabilities.

c. **FFY 2011 CRP Comprehensive Needs Assessment Survey Summary of Findings**

During the fall of 2010, the Rhode Island Department of Human Services/Office of Rehabilitation Services and the Rhode Island State Rehabilitation Council conducted a needs assessment survey. The survey was disseminated to Community Rehabilitation Program providers and netWORKri/One Stop Center managers.

A committee consisting of representatives from the Office of Rehabilitation Services and Paul V. Sherlock Center on Disabilities at Rhode Island College designed the survey. The intent of the survey was to identify (1) the services that people with disabilities are receiving to obtain and maintain employment (2) the availability of services throughout the state (3) the obstacles that customers confront in attempting to work and (4) the groups of people with disabilities who are underserved. The purpose of the survey was to assist the Department of Human Services/Office of Rehabilitation Services and the State Rehabilitation Council in examining program design, delivery systems, and gaps in services so that the agency can more effectively help people with disabilities become and stay employed.

The survey, distributed to sixty-seven (67) CRPs representing community providers, school/ educational collaboratives and netWORKri – Onestop Career Centers, resulted in 34 (51%) submitted surveys. No surveys (0) were received from netWORKri/Onestop Career Centers.

The following themes emerged from the responses:

- i. In determining what prevents people with disabilities from obtaining or maintaining employment, the top five (5) issues were the same, though ranked differently.**
 - a. Fear of losing SSI and SSDI, medical benefits and other subsidies, along with cost/availability of transportation ranked as the top three (3) issues preventing individuals from obtaining employment.
 - b. The top three (3) issues preventing people from maintaining employment include: individual's social skills, availability/cost of transportation, and an individual's skills/job match.
 - c. Availability/cost of transportation was identified in the top three (3) for both obtaining and maintaining employment.

- ii. Organizations reported that they were not able to meet the following needs sufficiently:**
 - a. Benefits counseling, transportation, training and education support, travel training, case management, and retention supports (on/off site). These service gaps also correspond to the top reasons preventing people with disabilities from obtaining and maintaining employment (i.e., fear of losing SSI and SSDI, medical insurance, and other subsidies along with transportation and an individual's skills/job match).

- iii. ORS ability to serve various populations:**
 - a. No disability group, nor ethnic group, received a rating of underserved. However, there were several comments stating that respondents were unprepared to answer these questions adequately due to limited experience/information.
 - b. Though a clear statement of need was not reported, some insight may be gained when considering primary disability populations served by reporting organizations. Most provided services are available to Mental Health (15) and Cognitive (13) disability groups compared to other disability groups served: Communicative (7), Physical (5), Orthopedic/Neurological (4), Deaf/Hearing (3), Blindness/Visual (2) and Respiratory (0). Twelve respondents reported serving all disability groups.

iv. Utilization of netWORKri/DLT

- a. All but three providers report utilizing the services of netWORKri/ DLT in some capacity. The top five services accessed are Websites- DLT/netWORKri/Employri, Job Leads/ Recruitments/Job Fairs, the Ocean State Employer Service Network (OSESN), and the netWORKri resource area.

v. CRP vendors reported that ORS could do the following to help them provide services more effectively:

- a. Provide information on available ORS resources.
- b. Provide access to and improve communication with counselor(s).
- c. Streamline paperwork, and increase awareness of other provider resources.
- d. Four (4) individuals requested more information from ORS.

d. Office of Rehabilitation Services FFY 2010 Customer Satisfaction Surveys

ORS maintained utilization of the Customer Satisfaction Surveys designed in 2009 with input from the SRC State Plan and Quality Improvement Committee. The satisfaction surveys sent quarterly to customers whose case closed successfully employed and to customers whose case closed unsuccessfully post receipt of services yielded the following information.

i. Status 26 Customer Satisfaction Survey - Successful Closures:

During FFY 2010, ORS sent 561 Customer Satisfaction Surveys to customers closed successfully during the federal fiscal year. This resulted in a return rate of 101/18% surveys. Of the 561 surveys, 39/6.95% were returned as address unknown/undeliverable.

71.6% of those who responded identified themselves as living in the city. 28.4% indicated they reside in a rural area. The age range of responders in the highest three-age groupings was: ages 18-28 (29.6%), ages 40 -50 (25.5%) and ages 51-61 (23.5%). Survey responders by race/ethnicity fell in the following highest three categories: White (74.0%), Hispanic (13.0%) and Black (9.0%).

Survey responders fell within the following primary disability categories (some responders chose more than one answer): Mental Health 34.2%, Physical 15.8%, Cognitive 11.7%, Orthopedic/Neurological 10.0%, Deaf and Hard of Hearing 9.2%, Communicative 9.2%, Visual 8.3% and Respiratory 1.7%

The following conclusions formulated based on overall results per question that indicated a 20% or higher no response rate includes:

- a. Ensure customer understanding of informed choice in obtaining employment that matches their stated goals and interest;
- b. Continue to offer and provide benefits counseling regarding Social Security and work incentives;
- c. Increase customer understanding of self-sufficiency as it relates to ORS' role, and their role in becoming more financially independent
- d. Educate customers on progressive learning, training resources and on the job training to enable job keeping and/or advancement
- e. Increase customer awareness and linkages to support services to assist with job retention

ii. Status 28 Customer Satisfaction Survey - Unsuccessful Closures:

Additionally during FFY 2010, ORS sent 789 surveys to customers who had received services from ORS and whose case closed unsuccessfully. This resulted in a completion rate of 87/11.03% surveys. Of the 789 surveys, 173/21.93% were returned as address unknown/undeliverable.

70.5% of those who responded identified themselves as living in the city. 29.5% indicated they reside in a rural area. The age range of responders in the highest three-age groupings was: ages 51-61 (32.1%), ages 40 -50 (22.6%) and ages 27-28 (27.4%). Survey responders by race/ethnicity fell in the following highest three categories: White (80.3%), Hispanic (14.5%) and American Indian (3.9%).

Survey responders fell within the following primary disability categories (some responders chose more than one answer): Mental Health 38.3%, Physical 21.5%, Orthopedic/Neurological 12.1%, Respiratory 6.5%, Cognitive 5.6%, Visual 5.6%, Communicative 5.6%, and Deaf and Hard of Hearing 4.7%,

The following conclusions formulated based on overall results per question that indicated a 20% or higher unfavorable response rate includes:

- a. Ensure customer understanding of informed choice in obtaining employment that matches their stated goals and interest;
- b. Ensure and educate customers on assistive technology and obtaining of resources if applicable;

- c. Develop a better understanding of what prevents customers from moving forward toward employment once engaged with services;
- d. Educate customer early in the VR process about VR services to enable an informed decisions about services prior to IPE development;
- e. Ensure timely case management;
- f. Educate customers and provide information regarding ability to re-apply when ready to seek employment;

e. **FFY 2010 RI Governors' Commission on Disability Public Forums to Identify the Concerns of People with Disabilities & Their Families**

The Office of Rehabilitation Services participates annually in the Rhode Island Governor's Commission on Disabilities Public Forums. In 2010, staff from ORS participated in the six forums held throughout the state. The forums allow individuals with disabilities, family member, advocates and providers to present concerns related to services for individuals with disabilities. The forums and subsequent public document by the GCD provides ORS with information on themes relevant to employment services for individuals with disabilities.

Results of the 2010 forums indicated themes in the areas of accessibility, employment, education, health care, housing and transportation. A common thread throughout the themes was the affect of the economy on services to individuals with disabilities.

i. **Comments specific to employment indicated the following:**

- a. Need to assist individuals in maximizing their abilities and support movement toward self-sufficiency.
- b. Improve awareness and access to (central location) employment related resources such as skill training, benefits counseling, Sherlock Plan, etc.
- c. Increase availability of specific disability related educational opportunities for providers of employment services.
- d. Continue to address employer perception/stigma issues related to disabilities and ability to work.
- e. Increased need for awareness related to assistive technology.

VI. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PROGRAMMING:

Assessment	<p>Enhance job retention by ensuring utilization of evaluation, assessment and referral information with customer to facilitate identification of transferable skills, skill discrepancy in the job person match</p> <p>Determine accommodation needs of employee</p> <p>Support longer SAC's and further provision of programs similar to "SWEEP"</p>
Marketing	<p>Educate employers, community providers and customers to assistive technology and workplace accommodations</p> <p>Promote and educate customers throughout the rehabilitation process on informed choice, movement toward self-sufficiency through highlighting customer abilities</p> <p>Develop marketing strategies specific to targeted underserved audiences such as Asian, Veterans, individuals with physical and communicative disabilities, etc.</p> <p>Maintain development of marketing strategies aimed at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employers/Business Sector Prospective Vendors Customers and/or Prospective Customers <p>Explore utilization of a variety of venues to reach targeted audiences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Website Information meetings Radio Community papers/bulletins <p>Recruit bi-lingual staff</p>
Referrals	<p>Develop liaison relationships when feasible with agencies to enable ease of referral and delivery of service to identified customers such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RI Works ATR <p>Outreach to underserved populations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asian Portuguese Individual with Physical Disabilities, Communicative disabilities Students with 504 Education Plan Veterans
Collaboration	<p>Assess and clarify ORS liaison role to agencies and determine need for additional liaison roles to improve collaboration with community resources currently serving individuals identified as underserved groups</p> <p>Clarify and maintain the ongoing linkage and collaboration with the workforce investment system/netWORKri</p>

	<p>Develop Memorandums of Understanding based on program need</p> <p>Utilize the cooperative agreements with RIDE and State colleges to enhance the provisions of services to students</p> <p>Continue to enlist the Business Leadership Network, State Rehabilitation Counsel Employer sub-committee and ORS Business Advisory Counselor for information regarding employment trends</p> <p>Work with statewide transportation workgroup(s) addressing the public transportation barriers within RI</p>
<p>Trainings</p>	<p>Continue to provide benefits counseling to customers, support systems and provider groups regarding SSI/SSDI work incentives, medical benefits and other subsidies as they relate to employment</p> <p>Support training of ORS Counselors and CRP providers and when feasible joint training in the areas such as specific disabilities, specific cultures, work place accommodations, self-determination, informed choice and available services from ORS</p> <p>Promote customer use of ESL classes prior to job training and placement</p> <p>Promote collaboration and communication opportunities between ORS and CRP's staff.</p> <p>Encourage training/orientation of interpreters to specific populations i.e. Southeast Asian and Portuguese</p> <p>Develop/identify customer training opportunities based on need and labor market information</p> <p>Provide Business Sector with information/training on tax credits, work place accommodations, assistive technology and the partnership between ORS and employers</p>
<p>CRP's</p>	<p>Ongoing development of services for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing population in the areas of functional literacy, interpreters with cultural awareness/ability to communicate in other languages, vendors outside the Providence area</p> <p>Develop CRP's with specific expertise in working with populations such as Deaf and Hard of Hearing and specific minority populations</p> <p>Develop CRP's based on regional needs with a focus outside of the Providence area</p> <p>Further develop assessment activities in the areas of Vocational Evaluation, Situational Assessments and Work Preparation Services predominately in the East Bay and Warwick areas, also to specific to identified minority</p>

	<p>populations and with DD vendors</p> <p>Support development of services for social skills and life management skills for individuals as it relates to work</p> <p>Continue to develop CRPs' ability to provide training and support which leads to improved job skills and job placement</p> <p>Enhance selective job placement services s/p provision of short-term training</p> <p>Develop consistency and accountability among CRP's in the area of service provision</p> <p>Provide CRP's with information on services provided by ORS, awareness of community resources, and orientation to required paperwork</p> <p>Assess CRP capability to provide transportation services</p>
<p>Quality Improvement</p>	<p>Ensure vendor information is up to date</p> <p>Focus QI activities on improving the quality and type of competitive employment outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Customer Satisfaction Surveys Case Reviews Clinical Supervision Sound Fiscal Management at the field level Monitoring of customer movement from application to eligibility to plan status <p>Assess and utilize the information obtained in MIS reports to improve services provided to customers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase average hourly wage Increase number of hours worked Increase competitive employment outcomes for individuals with visual impairments Develop method(s) of program evaluation for Transition Services <p>Meet the standards and Indicators as outlined by RSA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance Indicator 1.1 – Employment Outcomes Performance Indicator 1.2 – Rehabilitation Rate Performance Indicator 1.3 – Competitive Employment Outcomes Performance Indicator 1.4 – Significant Disability Performance Indicator 1.5 – Earnings Ratio Performance Indicator 1.6 – Self-Support Performance Indicator 2.1 – Minority Service Ratio

VII. CONCLUSION

Through the process of the CNA the Office of Rehabilitation Services gathered information from several sources. The information provided ORS with validation of services to individuals with disabilities seeking employment that are going well. Additionally and more importantly, the agency learned information regarding areas for further consideration as the agency moves forward to assist individual with disabilities in these changing times with obtaining and maintaining employment. The findings from the 2011 CNA will provide the structure and focus for agency strategic planning forums with staff and for the 2012 – 2014 State Plans.

VIII. REFERENCES

- Rhode Island Department of Labor & Training. (2010, October). *Educational Attainment in Rhode Island – 2009*. Retrieved Employment Bulletin.
- U.S. Department of Labor. (2010). *October 2010 Disability Employment Statistics*. Retrieved from <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/empsit.t06.htm>
- RIDE. *Measuring of RI Schools in 2009 for Change – Disability Information & ESL*. (2009). Retrieved from www.inforworks.ride.uri.gov
- U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS). (2008). *Age by Disability Status by Poverty Status*. Retrieved from www.factfinder.census.gov/serlet/DDTable
- U.S. Department of Labor-Veterans' Employment and Training Services. (2009). *State Level Employment Outcomes for Veterans and Disabled Veterans*. Retrieved from www.dol.gov/vets/vetoutcomes/index/htm
- Department of Human Services, Office of Rehabilitation Services. (2010). *Veterans currently in services by disability Report*. Retrieved from ORS MIS
- RSA annual review of state plan, S & I as established under Section 106. (2009). *Annual Review for Rhode Island Department of Human Services – Office of Rehabilitation Services*. Retrieved from <http://www.rsa.ed.gov>
- American Community Survey (ACS). (2007). *Minority Populations 2007 List of all tables – ACS Tables C18020 A-I*. Retrieved from <http://factfinder.census.gov>
- Department of Human Services, Office of Rehabilitation Services. (2010). *Open Case by Race Report*. Retrieved from ORS MIS
- Department of Human Services, Office of Rehabilitation Services. (2010). *Successful Closure List by Race Report*. Retrieved from ORS MIS

Rehabilitation Services Administration. (2009). *Developing a Model Comprehensive Statewide Needs Assessment with Corresponding Training Materials for State VR Agency Staff and SRC Member Guide The VR Needs Assessment Guide*. Retrieved from <http://www.rsa.ed.gov>

Department of Human Services, Office of Rehabilitation Services. (2011). *VR Counselor Comprehensive Needs Assessment Survey*.

Department of Human Services, Office of Rehabilitation Services. (2011). *Comprehensive Needs Assessment Survey for ORS CRP Employment Service Vendors and DLT/netWORKri*.

Department of Human Services, Office of Rehabilitation Services. (2010). *Customer Satisfaction Surveys Status 26 & Status 28*. Retrieved from ORS Survey QI data

FFY 2010 RI Governors' Commission on Disabilities Public Forums to Identify the Concerns of People with Disabilities and their Families. (2010). Retrieved from <http://www.gcd.state.ri.us/>

Addendums

Addendum A: Environmental Scan/Source Documents

Vocational Rehabilitation Services in Rhode Island (characteristics of population):

Title: Annual Review for Rhode Island Department of Human Services – Office of Rehabilitation Services

Survey or data from: RSA annual review of state plan, S & I as established under Section 106

Source: RSA website

Needs Assessment information goal(s) to which this information applies: Underserved, Minorities, Most Significantly Disabled, CRP's

Information available (summarize table or information contents): Outcomes by disability category and national average for general/combined agencies.

Key finding, useful tables and information:

ORS has continued to see an increase in applicants and in the number of individuals served since 2006. RSA Annual Review Reports for RI Dept. of Human Services

	Number	Percent increase from prior year
FFY 2006		
Applicants	2322	(+) 3.6
Individuals Served	4099	(+) 6.7
FFY 2007		
Applicants	2383	(+) 2.6
Individuals Served	4174	(+) 1.8
FFY 2008		
Applicants	2507	5.2
Individuals Served	4369	(+) 4.7
FFY 2009		
Applicants	2679	(+) 6.9
Individuals Served	4444	(+) 1.7

ORS cases by disability closed after receiving services FFY 2009:

Category	Number Served	% of agency total	National average for general/combined agencies
Visual impairments	86	7.14%	3.10%
Physical disorders	199	16.53%	26.27%
Communicative impairments	88	7.31%	10.65%
Cognitive impairments	371	30.81%	27.80%
Mental and emotional disabilities	460	38.21%	32.19%

rsa.ed.gov

ORS Employment Outcomes by Disability FFY 2009:

Category	Number Served	% of agency total	National average for general/combined agencies
Visual impairments	64	8.47%	3.81%
Physical disorders	119	15.74%	24.93%
Communicative impairments	58	7.67%	14.91%
Cognitive impairments	241	31.88%	28.24%
Mental and emotional disabilities	274	36.24%	28.10%

Average hours worked/week and average hourly earning by disability FFY 2009:

Category	Average hours worked/week	National average for general/combined agencies of hours worked/week	Average hourly earnings	National average for general/combined agencies of hourly earnings/week
Visual impairments	17.23	24.21	\$10.13	\$9.52
Physical disorders	27.88	31.51	\$12.30	12.02
Communicative impairments	31.48	33.47	\$11.32	\$13.79
Cognitive impairments	25.90	28.98	\$9.49	\$9.07
Mental and emotional disabilities	24.85	31.03	\$9.81	\$10.19

ORS Employment Outcomes by Special Population Served – Transition FFY 2009:

Category	Number Served	% of agency total	National average for general/combined agencies
Transition age (14-24)	275	36.38%	32.69

Average hours worked/week and average hourly earning by Special Population Served – Transition FFY 2009:

Category	Average hours worked/week	National average for general/combined agencies of hours worked/week	Average hourly earnings	National average for general/combined agencies of hourly earnings/week
Transition age 14 - 24	26.12	30.41	\$9.60	\$9.49

ORS Employment Outcomes SSI and SSDI Recipients FFY 2009:

Category	Number Served	% of agency total	National average for general/combined agencies
SSI recipients	154	20.37%	14.51%
SSDI recipients	168	22.22%	16.09%

Average hours worked/week and average hourly earning SSI and SSDI Recipients FFY 2009:

Category	Average hours worked/week	National average for general/combined agencies of hours worked/week	Average hourly earnings	National average for general/combined agencies of hourly earnings/week
SSI recipients	17.37	22.27	\$8.42	\$8.44
SSDI recipients	19.18	22.56	\$9.41	\$9.44

3/16/10 MIS Report - Veterans currently in services by disability

Totals served by Impairment Code:

Impairment Code	# served in code
Sensory/Communications Impairments	6
Physical Impairments	28
Mental Impairments	24

Characteristics of Minority Population:

Minority Populations from American Community Survey (ACS) state disability data and state MIS VR data

State's 2007 (ACS)	Percentage of people by race with a disability and not employed in RI		Current percentage of VR consumers by race - FFY 2010 (11/22/10)	
Race 16 – 64 years	57,710	100%	4,908	
White	47,914	83.02%	3,977	82.30%
African American	3,729	6.46%	567	10.78%
Asian	1,172	2.03%	508	.96 %
American Indian/Alaska Native	No info	0	50	1.15%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	No Info	0	5	.16%
Uncoded	No Info	No Info	258	5.26%
Some Other race (s)	3,232	6.30%	No Info	0%
Two or more races	1,763	3.05%	No Info	0%
Ethnicity				
Hispanic	7,166	12.43%	793	16.15%

Source: 2007 List of all tables - ACS Tables C18020 A-I and VR Open Case by Race Report 11/22/10

State's 2007 (ACS)	Percentage of people by race with a disability and employed in RI		Successful closures of VR consumers by race - FFY 2010 – total 566	
Race 16 – 64 years	34,051		566	
White	28,070	82.44	487	86.04
African American	1,804	5.30	63	11.13
Asian	1,096	3.22	4	.71
American Indian/Alaska Native	No Info	0	11	1.94
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	No Info	0	1	.18
Some Other race (s)	1,567	4.60%	0	0
Two or more races	1,154	3.39%	0	0
Ethnicity				
Hispanic	2,745	8.06	84	14.84

Source: 2007 List of all tables - ACS Tables C18020 A-I and MIS Successful Closure List by Race FY 2010

Characteristics of Rhode Island population:

Title: State Level Employment Outcomes for Veterans and Disabled Veterans (9) **Survey or data from (e.g., ACS 2007, VR agency data):** U.S. Department of Labor – Veterans’ Employment and Training Services

Source: ETA 9002 D Qtr Ending June 30, 2009

URL and download date (if applicable): www.dol.gov/vets/vetoutcomes/index.htm

Need Assessment information goal(s) to which this information applies: Underserved

Information available (summarize tables or information contents): Performance Outcomes by State of Veteran and Disabled Veteran of: Entered Employment; Employment Retention Rate; and Average Earnings.

Key findings, useful tables and information: RI Veterans and disabled veterans rank below the national average for # entered employment, retained employment and average earnings.

	Veterans			Disabled Veterans		
	Entered Employ Rate	Employ Retention Rate	Average Earnings	Entered Employ Rate	Employ Retention Rate	Average Earnings
RI	43%	75%	\$14,026	35%	72%	\$13,380
National Average	59%	81%	\$16,583	56%	80%	\$16,873
	Of the 52 states RI ranks 3 rd from the bottom in % of Vets entering employment; 5 th from the bottom with retention and 14 th from the bottom in average earnings			Of the 52 states RI ranks 3 rd from the bottom in # of Disabled Vets entering employment; 3 rd from the bottom with retention and 3 rd from the bottom in average earnings		

Title: Age by Disability Status by Poverty Status

Survey or data from (e.g., ACS 2007, VR agency data): American Fact Finder

Source: U.S. Census Bureau 2008, American Community Survey

URL and download date (if applicable): www.factfinder.census.gov/serlet/DTTable

Need Assessment information goal(s) to which this information applies: Significantly Disabled, Underserved, Minorities

Information available (summarize tables or information contents): Summary by age category of RI’s with and with out disabilities living under and above the poverty level

Key findings, useful tables and information (add additional pages as needed, examples of information content/tables):

	RI Income past 12 months below poverty level -2008	RI Income past 12 months at or above poverty level - 2008
Age 18 – 64 With a Disability	73.12%	26.88%
Age 18 – 64 With no Disability	8.67%	91.33%

ADDENDUM B: 2011 VR Counselor Survey

What is your role within ORS?	Numb. Cit.	Percent
Counselor	23	88.46
Supervisor	3	11.54
Case Aid	0	0
Student/Practicum	0	0
Student/Intern	0	0

What geographic area most reflects the area in which you provide services? (Check only one)	Numb. Cit.	Percent
Metro/Providence	8	30.77
East Bay	4	15.38
Northern RI	4	15.38
West Bay	3	11.54
Southern RI	3	11.54
Aquidneck Island/East Bay	2	7.69
NRI/Statewide	1	3.85
Statewide	1	3.85

1. From your experience with individuals with the most significant disabilities, please check off your response and reply about their vocational rehabilitation needs.

Is there vocational rehabilitation services that you feel are needed to better serve this population?	Numb. Cit.	Percent
No	5	19.23
Yes	20	76.92
N/A	1	3.84
Total Comments/Responses = 28		
Themes		
Collaboration/Services/Vendors	5	17.86
Deaf & Hard of Hearing	(4)	(80)
Collaboration	(1)	(20)
Transportation	5	17.86
Vocational Evaluations/SAC's/Work Experience	4	14.29
Job Development/Placement	4	14.29
Access to Treatment	3	10.71
Other	3	10.71
Social/Soft Skills Training	2	7.14
Supported Employment	2	7.14

Are there barriers to the provision of these services?	Numb. Cit.	Percent
No	7	26.92
Yes	19	73.08
Total Comments/Responses = 22		
Themes		
Fiscal/Resources	5	22.73
Services/Vendors	4	18.18
Transportation	4	18.18
Vendor and/or ORS Staff Training	3	13.64
Job Development/Placement	2	9.09
Supported Employment	1	4.55
Client Engagement	1	4.55
PR/Marketing	1	4.55
Other	1	4.55

What can ORS do to improve the vocational rehabilitation services to those with the <u>most significant disabilities</u> ?	Numb. Cit.	Percent
Total Comment/Responses = 23		
Themes		
Collaboration/Vendors/Services	8	34.78
Vendors	(3)	(37.5)
Services	(3)	(37.5)
Supported Employment	(1)	(12.5)
Collaboration	(1)	(12.5)
Other	5	21.74
Fiscal/Resources	4	17.39
Job Development/Placement	2	8.69
Vendor and/or ORS Staff Training	2	8.69
PR/Marketing	1	4.34
Cultural Diversity	1	4.34

2. From your experience with individuals with significant disabilities, please check off your response and reply about their vocational rehabilitation needs.

Is there vocational rehabilitation services that you feel are needed to better serve this population?	Numb. Cit.	Percent
No	10	38.46
Yes	12	46.15
No Answer	4	15.38
Total Comments/Responses = 19		
Themes		
Training	4	21.05
Vocational Evaluations/SAC's/Work Readiness	3	15.79
Collaboration/Vendors/Services	3	15.79

Vendors/Services	(1)	(33.33)
Supported Employment	(1)	(33.33)
Deaf and Hard of Hearing	(1)	(33.33)
Other	3	15.79
Transportation	2	10.53
Fiscal/Resources	2	10.53
Cultural Diversity	1	5.26

What can ORS do to improve the vocational rehabilitation services to those with significant disabilities	Numb. Cit.	Percent
Total Comment/Responses = 12		
Themes		
Collaboration/Vendor/Services	5	41.67
Services	(3)	(60)
Collaboration	(2)	(40)
Other	4	33.33
Job Development/Placement	2	16.67
PR/Marketing	1	8.33

3. From your experience with minority individuals with disabilities, please check off your response and reply about their vocational rehabilitation needs.

Is there vocational rehabilitation services that you feel are needed to better serve this population	Numb. Cit.	Percent
No	9	
Yes	12	
No Answer	5	
Total Comments/Responses = 17		
Themes		
Bilingual Staff/Training	6	35.29
Vendors/Services	4	23.52
Vocational Evaluations/SAC's/Work Readiness	3	17.64
Other	3	17.64
Outreach/Education	1	5.88

Are there barriers to the provision of these services?	Numb. Cit.	Percent
No	8	30.77
Yes	11	42.31
No Answer	7	26.92
Total Comments/Responses = 17		
Themes		
Bilingual Staff/Training	6	35.29

Vendors/Services	5	29.41
Other	4	23.53
Fact Sheet/Forms	1	5.88
Fiscal/Resources	1	5.88

What can ORS do to improve the vocational rehabilitation services to minority individuals with disabilities?	Num. Cit.	Percent
Total Comments/Responses = 16		
Themes		
Bilingual Staff/Training	7	43.75
Collaboration/Vendors/Services	6	37.50
Collaboration	(3)	(50)
Services	(3)	(50)
Other	2	12.50
Fact Sheets/Forms	1	6.25

4. From your experience, who do you believe to be unserved populations with disabilities by ORS?

	Numb. Cit.	Percent
No Answer	7	26.92%
Total Comment/Responses = 18		
Themes		
Other	6	33.33
Race/Ethnicity	5	27.78
Physical Disabilities	3	16.67
Learning Disabilities	1	5.56
DD	1	5.56
Individuals with a BCI record	1	5.56
General Population	1	5.56

5. From your experience, who are underserved populations with disabilities by ORS?

	Numb. Cit.	Percent
No Answer	6	23.08
Total Comment/Responses = 20		
Themes		
Physical Disabilities	3	15
Minorities	3	15
Other	3	15
Race/Ethnicity	2	10
Currently Employed	2	10
Individual with a BCI record	2	10
Deaf and Hard of Hearing	2	10
Autism Spectrum	2	10

Veterans	1	5
----------	---	---

6. From your experience with underserved individuals with disabilities, please check off your response and reply about their vocational rehabilitation needs.

Is there vocational rehabilitation services that you feel are needed to better serve this population?	Numb. Cit.	Percent
No	7	26.92
Yes	13	50
No Answer	5	19.23
Unsure	1	3.84
Total Comments/Responses = 17		
Themes		
Collaboration/Vendors/Services	7	41.18
Services	(4)	(57.14)
Vendors	(2)	(28.57)
Collaboration	(1)	(14.28)
Other	3	17.64
Deaf and Hard of Hearing	2	11.76
Staff Training	2	11.76
Currently Employed	2	11.76
Public Relations	1	5.88

Are there barriers to the provision of these services?	Numb. Cit.	Percent
No	8	30.77
Yes	11	42.31
No Answer	7	26.92
Total Comments/Responses = 15		
Themes		
Fiscal/Resources	8	53.33
Other	3	20
Transportation	2	13.33
Language	1	6.67
Ex-felons	1	6.67

What can ORS do to improve the vocational rehabilitation services to <u>underserved individuals with disabilities</u> ?	Numb. Cit.	Percent
Total Comments/Responses = 21		
Themes		
Collaborative/Vendors/Services	8	38.10
Services	(7)	(87.50)
Collaboration	(1)	(12.5)
PR/Marketing	4	19.05
Vendor and/or ORS Staff Training	3	14.29

Deaf and Hard of Hearing	2	9.52
Other	2	9.52
Transportation	1	4.76
Job Development/Placement	1	4.76

7. Please check the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

There is a need to <u>further develop established</u> Community Rehabilitation Programs (CRPs) – Please describe in what areas:	Numb. Cit.	Percent
Strongly Agree	11	42.31
Agree	10	38.46
Neutral	4	15.38
Disagree	1	3.85
Strongly Disagree	0	0
Total Comments/Responses = 16		
Themes		
Services/Customer Needs	8	50
Communication/Consistency	5	31.25
CRP Training	1	6.25
Employers	1	6.25
Other	1	6.25

There is a need to <u>establish new CRP's</u> – Please describe in what areas:	Numb. Cit.	Percent
Strongly Agree	10	38.46
Agree	7	26.92
Neutral	6	23.08
Disagree	3	11.53
Strongly Disagree	0	0
Total Comments/Responses = 18		
Themes		
Collaboration/Vendors/Services	12	66.67
Vendors	(5)	(41.67)
Deaf and Hard of Hearing	(3)	(25)
Job Development/Placement	(3)	(25)
Transportation	(1)	(8.33)
Vocational Evaluation/SAC's	4	22.22
Job Development/Placement	1	5.56
Community Needs Assessment for underserved	1	5.56

8. How do you incorporate the services of the netWORKri/DLT employment and/or training services into your work/employment planning with individuals?

	Numb. Cit.	Percent
No Answer	1	3.85
Total Responses = 121		
Information and referral	18	14.88
DLT/LMI/RI Red website	17	14.05
DLT website	16	13.22
Training grant (WIA)	15	12.40
Job Leads/Job Fairs	14	11.57
Youth Works Employment Centers	13	10.74
Placement assistance	11	9.09
Job Readiness Workshop(s) (resume writing, interviewing skills)	8	6.61
Employer Service Representative	6	4.96
Have not utilized netWORKri services	2	1.65
Other (please specify)	1	.85

Addendum C: 2011 CRP Survey

2011 Comprehensive Needs Assessment Survey For ORS CRP Employment Service Vendors and DLT/netWORKri

Survey period October 2010

*=required question

Survey outreach ORS vendors = 67

(Community Rehabilitation Program providers, and netWORKri/One Stop Center managers)

Survey responses received = 34

Survey Response Rate= 51%

1. Please check the affiliation that best represents you: *

Item	Count	Percent %
CRP/Vendor	25	74%
School/Collaborative	9	26%

DEMOGRAPHICS

2. Check the title that most reflects your primary responsibilities: *

Item	Count	Percent %
Program Manager	20	59%
Administrator	7	21%
Direct Service	7	21%

3. What geographic area most reflects the area in which you provide services? (check only one)

Item	Count	Percent %
Northern RI	8	24%
Statewide	8	24%
West Bay	6	18%
East Bay	5	15%
Metro/Providence	3	9%
Aquidneck Island	2	6%
Southern RI	2	6%

4. Please list the primary disability populations(s) that your organization services (choose all that apply).

Item	Count	Percent %
Mental Health	15	44%
Cognitive	13	38%
All Disability	12	35%
Communicative	7	21%
Physical	5	15%
Orthopedic/Neurological	4	12%
Deaf/Hearing	3	9%

Blindness/Visual	2	6%
Respiratory	0	

5. What populations are you currently serving? (choose all that apply)

Item	Count	Percent %
White/Caucasians	33	97%
Black/African American	32	94%
Hispanic/Latino	28	82%
Portuguese	20	59%
Cape Verdean	16	47%
Asian/Pacific Islander	12	35%
American Indian/Alaska Native	11	32%
Russian	4	12%
All populations	1	3%
Other: multi-racial	1	3%

SERVICES

6. What employment-related services does your organization provide? (choose all that apply)

Item	Count	Percent %
Assessment/Employment Planning	29	85%
Job Development	28	82%
Job Seeking Counseling	28	82%
Engagement	27	79%
Training Educ. Support	25	74%
Work-Trial	24	71%
Case Management	23	68%
Retention Onsite	23	68%
Retention Offsite	22	65%
Supported Employment	22	65%
Preparation WS	20	59%
Job Retention WS	17	50%
Skills Training	8	24%
None	1	3%
Other:	2	6%
comprehensive vocational evaluation		
Independent Living Services		

6a. No comments provided

7. From your experience, indicate your level of agreement with the following Statements:

7 a. My organization has the time and resources...

1= strongly agree 3= Somewhat 5 = strongly disagree

Item	Average	Total
To support people to obtain employment	2.0	32
To support people to maintain employment	2.0	32
To access employment related programs/services NOT provided by your organization (i.e., education programs, childcare, job accommodations, etc.)	2.2	31

7 a. Comments related to time and resources (optional):**Open Text Responses:**

Due to staff size, we can only provide some of these services to a small number of clients. With greater resources, we can provide the services to a larger number of clients.

To support people to obtain employment I would typically strongly agree but with the economy it has been difficult

Independent living services

We have had our staff cut drastically which in turn affect the quality and quantity of service that we are able to provide to our clients.

7 b. My organization has the skill and knowledge to...

1= strongly agree 3= Somewhat 5 = strongly disagree

Item	Average	Total
To assist people to obtain employment	1.6	33
To assist people to maintain employment	1.7	33
To access employment related programs/services NOT provided by your organization (i.e., education programs, childcare, job accommodations, etc.)	1.9	33

7b . Comments related to time and resources (optional):**Open Text Responses:**

Provide IL Services

again staff cuts affect everything

8. What employment-related service is your agency not able to sufficiently meet? (Choose all that apply)

Item	Count	Percent %
Benefits Counseling	19	66%
Transportation	11	38%
Training/Ed. Support	10	34%
Travel Training	10	34%
Case Management	9	31%
Retention Off Site	9	31%
Retention On Site	8	28%
Work-Trial/Internship/Situational Assessment	8	28%
Job Development	5	17%

Job Prep. Counseling	5	17%
Interview Prep.	4	14%
Resume Dev.	4	14%
Assessment/Empl.	3	10%
Voc. Awareness	3	10%
Other:	1	3%
just don't have the staff to meet the needs		

8 a. Comment regarding services organization is not able to sufficiently meet:

Open Text Responses:

Organization is primarily for voter education.

While we are providing the services in the areas not checked, it is again to a small pool of applicants. We provide high quality service but to a limited number of clients due to staff size capacity because of funding.

without the funding it is difficult to provide the resources

9. From your experience, rate how often the following prevent people you serve from Becoming Employed:

Item	Average	Total
Fear of Losing SSI or SSDI	3.8	33
Cost/Availability of Transportation	3.7	34
Fear of Losing Medical Benefits	3.7	33
Fear of Losing Subsidies (i.e., housing, food stamps, etc.)	3.6	34
Personal/Home Life Issues	3.4	34
Individual's Social Skills	3.4	34
Individual's Expectations	3.3	34
Individual's Job Skills	3.2	34
Staff/Family Expectations	3.1	34
Insufficient Job Search Preparation	2.7	34
Availability of Job Development	2.5	33
Availability of Retention Support	2.5	34
Staff Skills/Knowledge	2.2	34
Cost/Availability of Job Accommodations	2.1	34

9 a. Comment regarding issues that prevent the people you serve from becoming employed:

Open Text Responses:

Changes over the last year has caused a lot of confusion for staff, clients and ORS counselors

Sometimes our clients need more retention services than allotted.

10. From your experience, rate how often the following prevent people you serve from MAINTAINING employment:

Item	Average	Total
------	---------	-------

Individual's Social Skills	3.5	33
Cost/Availability of Transportation	3.4	33
Individual's Job Skills	3.4	33
Fear of Losing SSI or SSDI	3.4	33
Personal/Home Life Issues	3.3	33
Individual's Expectations	3.2	33
Fear of Losing Medical Benefits	3.2	33
Fear of Losing Subsidies (i.e., housing, food stamps, etc.)	3.1	33
Job Match	3.0	32
Staff/family expectations	3.0	33
Availability of Retention Support	2.5	33
Cost/Availability of Accommodations	2.2	33
Staff skills/knowledge	2.1	33

10 a. No comments provided.

11. In the past six months what netWORKri/DLT employment and/or training services have you incorporated into your work with referrals from ORS?
(choose all that apply)

Item	Count	Percent %
Website	18	62%
Job Leads	16	55%
OSESN	13	45%
Info/referral	12	41%
Resource Area	12	41%
Hiring Incentives	9	31%
Testing	7	24%
Placement help	5	17%
Youth centers	5	17%
Workshop(s)	4	14%
ESR	3	10%
None	3	10%
WIA	2	7%
Other:	2	6%
DDD Supported Employment Council (<i>this is not a networkri service</i>)		
There is a need for Network RI in Warren to reopen		

11 a. Comment regarding netWORKri services/programs utilized:

Open Text Responses:

Being that travel is needed to reach a center, it makes it difficult to for our staff and clients to utilize these services on a regular basis as we did when the Warren center was opened.

SERVING POPULATIONS

12. From your experience, rate how well the following disability groups are served by ORS (1 = Adequately Served; 5 = Unserved):

Item	Average	Total
Mental Health (interpersonal and behavioral impairments, difficulty coping)	2.2	29
Cognitive (impairments involving learning, thinking, processing information, and concentration)	2.0	26
Orthopedic/Neurological (mobility, limited range of motion, manipulation/dexterity)	2.0	20
Communicative (expressive/receptive)	1.9	23
Blindness and/or Other Visual Impairments	1.8	20
Physical	1.8	24
Respiratory	1.8	17
Other: Please note in comment area below	1.8	4
Deaf/Hard of Hearing	1.7	21

12 a. Comment regarding disability groups served by ORS:

Open Text Responses:

People with physical and developmental disabilities must be given the opportunity for advancement in careers through skills training that meets their individual needs.

I can only speak to the population our agency serves (cognitive and mental health), but the services provided are only as good as the vendor providing them.

N/A NO DIRECT EXPERIENCE W/ALL GROUPS

I do not have any experience with any of the above except for my own experience where I asked for help getting hand controls for my vehicle to get to work and etc. but after giving them info at initial interview never heard from anyone again. I ended up getting the service elsewhere.

I'm unfamiliar with some of the groups so could not provide a rating.

ORS is very accommodating to our BH clients and networking with our center is a primary goal when providing services.

13. From your experience, rate how well the following groups are served by ORS (1 = Adequately Served - 5 = Unserved):

Item	Average	Total
Russian	1.9	14
American Indian/Alaska Native	1.8	17
Cape Verdean	1.7	18
Hispanic/Latino	1.6	23
Portuguese	1.6	22
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.5	14
Black/African American	1.4	25
White/Caucasian	1.3	23

13 a. Comment regarding ethnic groups served by ORS:

Open Text Responses:

being the richest country in the world, we can do more...

I don't feel I'm in a position to adequately respond to this question.

Not sure of the demographics to answer but it appears diverse by the referrals we receive.

N/A

I cannot comment on this due to lack of knowledge in this area.

I can't comment on differences in service based on ethnic group.

DON'T REALLY KNOW

Finding an appropriate vendor for an individual with a language barrier is sometimes difficult for ORS

14. What could ORS do to support CRP vendors to more effectively provide services to our mutual customers? (Choose top 3)

Item	Count	Percent %
ORS resources available	17	61%
Improve communication with counselor(s)	14	50%
Streamline paperwork	13	46%
awareness of provider resources	12	43%
Updates ORS policies/services	7	25%
Training- <i>see comment below 14 a.</i>	6	21%
Information on ORS services	3	11%
Other - <i>see comment below 14 b</i>	2	7%

14 a Trainings, specify:

Open Text Responses:

develop/implement consumer sensitivity trainings.

Working more closely with ORS internal employer person to increase awareness with larger employers in the state.

On changes that have occur in the past year at ORS along with the different levels of funding for the assessment of employment.

14 b. Other, specify:

Item

Assistance w/ job development.

Recently it has been increasingly difficult to get ORS funding/services approved, even though the client is ORS eligible. It seems that our requests for services is scrutinized more and more than ever before.

15. Additional comments about ORS Services (optional):

Open Text Responses:

ORS reps should be more encouraging to clients. Sometimes that individual may need to be reminded of the potential and opportunities available to him/her...

Having a good working relationship with the counselor has been critical in delivering quality service to clients. Our counselor that we have worked with have been informative, knowledgeable, and responsive.

Many times we are placed with the impossible task of doing job development for a client with an unrealistic job goal. With the job market/economy being what it is, and unemployment still at nearly critical levels, it is not plausible to try to develop a job that requires some advanced training, education or experience for a client that has no experience, work history, training or education in the industry. When meeting with clients and developing a memorandum of understanding, I think it is important for the job developer to have more input prior to establishing a career goal. Many times, A client needs to develop general work behaviors and learn to just how to be an employee, and navigate the different social environment of the workplace. Many individuals struggle with this piece to the point where they do not even have the opportunity to begin the work they were hired for (and also inadequately prepared for). The end result is that months of hard work to secure a job within the interest area are lost because of simple undeveloped skill sets (knowing your schedule, showing up to work on time, getting along with others in the workplace, taking direction from people, learning how to meet the needs of customers, etc)

In general, most ORS Counselors are understanding of this issue and will work with the client/vendor to adjust the goal. The clients would be best served if the criteria in place had standards that were more in touch with real employment settings. For example, in a situational assessment, you can't really assess the individual's ability show up for work consistently each shift scheduled and on time each day, when the ORS vendor is providing transportation. This is one of hundreds of issues that are not addressed and do not come into play until the individual is in a real world job, with real world standards.

It was easier to access ORS services when a child was transitioning from school to adult services with MHRH. At this present time it seems that services are very strict in the utilization of these funds for transitions

Services seem adequate

I think that generally speaking ORS staff and administrators do a great job attempting to meet the needs of the clients we support in our agency.

I believe ORS is providing all the above to our Center. They have also been keeping us well informed of any and all changes effecting ORS's systems, procedures, and policies. As client advocates, of course we would like to see changes in the "order of selection", as it is most difficult to maintain client motivation when placed on a waiting list. However, ORS has been working with us in brainstorming ideas of how to address this issue.

16. Would you like more information about ORS? (ORS CRP Supervisor was provided the list of Contact information)

Item	Count
Yes	4

17. What is your specific question or need? No questions or needs provided

Addendum D: 2010 Customer Satisfaction Surveys

**Data Collection Instrument
Customer Satisfaction Survey
2010 Employment Closures (26's)**

Period Covered:																	
		1st Quarter			2nd Quarter			3rd Quarter			4th Quarter			Totals			
		Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	
#1	As a result of your participation in VR Services, were you assisted in obtaining employment that matched your stated goals, interests and abilities?	16	7	3	12	4	2	18	8	5	0	0	0	46	19	10	
		61.5%	26.9%	11.5%	66.7%	22.2%	11.1%	58.1%	25.8%	16.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	62.1%	25.0%	12.9%	
#2	As a result of your participation in VR Services, were you better prepared to enter employment?	21	4	0	13	2	3	23	4	4	0	0	0	57	10	7	
		84.0%	16.0%	0.0%	72.2%	11.1%	16.7%	74.2%	12.9%	12.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	76.8%	13.3%	9.9%	
#3	As a result of your participation in VR Services, were you better prepared to maintain employment?	15	7	1	13	3	2	25	3	2	0	0	0	53	13	5	
		65.2%	30.4%	4.3%	72.2%	16.7%	11.1%	83.3%	10.0%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	73.6%	19.0%	7.4%	
#4	As a result of your participation in VR Services, did you have the information you needed to make decisions regarding your benefits such as Social Security and work incentives?	15	3	5	11	6	1	17	6	8	0	0	0	43	15	14	
		65.2%	13.0%	21.7%	61.1%	33.3%	5.6%	54.8%	19.4%	25.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	60.4%	21.9%	17.7%	
#5	As a result of your participation in VR Services, are you more financially independent now that you are working?	15	7	1	9	6	2	16	9	4	0	0	0	40	22	7	
		65.2%	30.4%	4.3%	52.9%	35.3%	11.8%	55.2%	31.0%	13.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	57.8%	32.3%	10.0%	

**Data Collection Instrument
Customer Satisfaction Survey
2010 Employment Closures (26's)**

Period Covered:																
		1st Quarter			2nd Quarter			3rd Quarter			4th Quarter			Totals		
		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No		Yes	No	
#6	Have you or do you ever feel the need for additional supports/services to help you maintain your job (i.e. counseling, assistive technology, information on Social Security work incentives, accommodations in the work place, etc.)?	17	9		11	6		15	14		0	0		43	29	
		65.4%	34.6%	0.0%	64.7%	35.3%	0.0%	51.7%	48.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	60.6%	39.4%	0.0%
#7	Have you or do you ever feel the need for additional training to enable you to keep your job or advance in your job?	16	8		9	8		17	14		0	0		42	30	
		66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	52.9%	47.1%	0.0%	54.8%	45.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	58.1%	41.9%	0.0%
#8	Do you know that you can re-contact the Office of Rehabilitation Services if you lose your job?	20	5		14	4		26	5		0	0		60	14	
		80.0%	20.0%	0.0%	77.8%	22.2%	0.0%	83.9%	16.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.5%	19.5%	0.0%
#9	Do you know that you can re-contact the Office of Rehabilitation Services for support and services after you are closed?	19	6		16	2		23	6		0	0		58	14	
		76.0%	24.0%	0.0%	88.9%	11.1%	0.0%	79.3%	20.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	81.4%	18.6%	0.0%

**Data Collection Instrument
Customer Satisfaction Survey
2010 Employment Closures (26's)**

Period Covered:																
#10	Would you refer a friend or family member with a disability to the Office of Rehabilitation Services for services?	23	2		16	2		27	3		0	0		66	7	
		92.0%	8.0%	0.0%	88.9%	11.1%	0.0%	90.0%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	90.3%	9.7%	0.0%

**Data Collection Instrument
Customer Satisfaction Survey
2010 Employment Closures (26's)**

Period Covered:

1st Quarter Demographics

		18-28	29-39	40-50	51-61	62-72	73+		
#11	Age Range	7	5	7	4	1	0		
		29.2%	20.8%	29.2%	16.7%	4.2%	0%		
		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native Pacific	American	Other:	
#12	Race/Ethnicity	19	3	1	0	0	0	1	
		79.2%	12.5%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.2%	
		Rural/Country	Urban/City						
#13	Area Living In	8	14						
		36.4%	63.6%						
		Mental Health	Cognitive	Ortho/Neuro	Visual	Deaf/Hearing	Physical	Communicative	Respiratory
#14	Primary Disability Category	11	6	5	0	2	4	2	1
		35.5%	19.4%	16.1%	0.0%	6.5%	12.9%	6.5%	3.2%

2nd Quarter Demographics

		18-28	29-39	40-50	51-61	62-72	73+		
#11	Age Range	6	5	4	2	0	0		
		35.3%	29.4%	23.5%	11.8%	0.0%	0%		
		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native Pacific	American	Other:	
#12	Race/Ethnicity	15	2	1	0	0	0	1	
		78.9%	10.5%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	

**Data Collection Instrument
Customer Satisfaction Survey
2010 Employment Closures (26's)**

Period Covered:									
		Rural/Country	Urban/City						
#13	Area Living In	5	13						
		27.8%	72.2%						
		Mental Health	Cognitive	Ortho/Neuro	Visual	Deaf/Hearing	Physical	Communicative	Respiratory
#14	Primary Disability Category	10	4	0	3	2	2	3	0
		41.7%	16.7%	0.0%	12.5%	8.3%	8.3%	12.5%	0.0%
3rd Quarter Demographics									
		18-28	29-39	40-50	51-61	62-72	73+		
#11	Age Range	6	4	7	13	0	0		
		20.0%	13.3%	23.3%	43.3%	0.0%	0%		
		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native Pacific	American	Other:	
#12	Race/Ethnicity	22	3	5	0	0	1	0	
		71.0%	9.7%	16.1%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	
		Rural/Country	Urban/City						
#13	Area Living In	9	21						
		30.0%	70.0%						
		Mental Health	Cognitive	Ortho/Neuro	Visual	Deaf/Hearing	Physical	Communicative	Respiratory
#14	Primary Disability Category	11	2	3	4	5	5	3	0
		33.3%	6.1%	9.1%	12.1%	15.2%	15.2%	9.1%	0.0%

**Data Collection Instrument
Customer Satisfaction Survey
2010 Employment Closures (26's)**

Period Covered:																		
------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

4th Quarter Demographics

	18-28	29-39	40-50	51-61	62-72	73+	
#11 Age Range	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0%	

	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native Pacific	American	Other:
#12 Race/Ethnicity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

	Rural/Country	Urban/City	
#13 Area Living In	0	0	
	0.0%	0.0%	

	Mental Health	Cognitive	Ortho/Neuro	Visual	Deaf/Hearing	Physical	Communicative	Respiratory
#14 Primary Disability Category	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%



**Data Collection Instrument
Customer Satisfaction Survey
2010 Employment Closures (26's)**

Period Covered:

Total - Demographics

		18-28	29-39	40-50	51-61	62-72	73+		
#11	Age Range	19	14	18	19	1	0		
		26.8%	19.7%	25.4%	26.8%	1.4%	0%		
		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native Pacific	American	Other:	
#12	Race/Ethnicity	56	8	7	0	0	1	2	
		75.7%	10.8%	9.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.4%	2.7%	
		Rural/Country	Urban/City						
#13	Area Living In	22	48						
		31.4%	68.6%						
		Mental Health	Cognitive	Ortho/Neuro	Visual	Deaf/Hearing	Physical	Communicative	Respiratory
#14	Primary Disability Category	32	12	8	7	9	11	8	1
		36.4%	13.6%	9.1%	8.0%	10.2%	12.5%	9.1%	1.1%

**Data Collection Instrument
Customer Satisfaction Survey
Status 28 Closures**

Period Covered:																
		1st Quarter			2nd Quarter			3rd Quarter			4th Quarter			Totals		
#	Statement	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A
#1	I was provided information to assist me with making a decision regarding my benefits such as Social Security and work incentives.	8	1	3	3	0	0	40	10	1	0	0	0	51	11	4
		66.7%	8.3%	25.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	78.4%	19.6%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	81.7%	9.3%	9.0%
#2	I was provided assistance with identifying my interests, abilities and strengths.	11	0	1	3	0	0	34	15	4	0	0	0	48	15	5
		91.7%	0.0%	8.3%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	64.2%	28.3%	7.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	85.3%	9.4%	5.3%
#3	I was assisted with identifying an employment goal that matched my stated interests, abilities and strengths.	9	1	2	1	1	1	32	17	4	0	0	0	42	19	7
		75.0%	8.3%	16.7%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	60.4%	32.1%	7.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	56.2%	24.6%	19.2%
#4	I received assessments to assist with determining my need for assistive technology. (i.e. visual aids, mobility aids, writing aids, etc.)	6	1	4	1	1	1	19	14	19	0	0	0	26	16	24
		54.5%	9.1%	36.4%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	36.5%	26.9%	36.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	41.5%	23.1%	35.4%
#5	I was assisted in obtaining assistive technology based on my assessed need to enable me to move forward with my employment goals	7	1	4	1	1	1	22	18	8	0	0	0	30	20	13
		58.3%	8.3%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	45.8%	37.5%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	45.8%	26.4%	27.8%
#6	I was referred to services that matched my individual needs.	9	1	1	2	0	0	28	16	4	0	0	0	39	17	5
		81.8%	9.1%	9.1%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	58.3%	33.3%	8.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.1%	14.1%	5.8%

**Data Collection Instrument
Customer Satisfaction Survey
Status 28 Closures**

Period Covered:		1st Quarter			2nd Quarter			3rd Quarter			4th Quarter			Totals		
		Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A	Yes	No	N/A
#7	I did not move forward with VR Services as my disability prevented me from working at that time.	8	3	1	3	0	0	20	15	11	0	0	0	31	18	12
		66.7%	25.0%	8.3%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	43.5%	32.6%	23.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	70.0%	19.2%	10.7%
#8	I did not understand VR Services so did not continue with program.	3	6	3	0	1	1	9	27	9	0	0	0	12	34	13
		25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	0.0%	50.0%	50.0%	20.0%	60.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	15.0%	53.3%	31.7%
#9	I did not think VR Services matched my needs.	4	6	2	1	0	2	12	24	7	0	0	0	17	30	11
		33.3%	50.0%	16.7%	33.3%	0.0%	66.7%	27.9%	55.8%	16.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	31.5%	35.3%	33.2%
#10	I was concerned about losing my Social Security, medical coverage, etc. so did not continue with program.	3	6	2	0	2	1	10	27	9	0	0	0	13	35	12
		27.3%	54.5%	18.2%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	21.7%	58.7%	19.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.3%	60.0%	23.7%
#11	I found the process took too long, so I did not continue with the program	7	4	1	0	2	1	10	27	9	0	0	0	17	33	11
		58.3%	33.3%	8.3%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	21.7%	58.7%	19.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	26.7%	52.9%	20.4%
#12	Are you aware that you can re-apply for services through the ORS when you are ready to seek employment?	8	4	0	2	1	0	26	18	5	0	0	0	36	23	5
		66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	66.7%	33.3%	0.0%	53.1%	36.7%	10.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	62.1%	34.5%	3.4%
#13	Are you currently working?	0	12	0	0	3	0	4	39	0	0	0	0	4	54	0
		0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	9.3%	90.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.1%	96.9%	0.0%
#14	Are you aware that you can re-apply for services through the ORS if you are in need of services to assist you with getting and keeping a job?	10	2	0	3	0	0	26	21	3	0	0	0	39	23	3
		83.3%	16.7%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	52.0%	42.0%	6.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	78.4%	19.6%	2.0%

**Data Collection Instrument
Customer Satisfaction Survey
Status 28 Closures**

Period Covered:									
1st Quarter Demographics									
		18-28	29-39	40-50	51-61	62-72	73+		
#15	Age Range	2	1	3	6	0	0		
		16.7%	8.3%	25.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0%		
		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native	American	Other:	
#16	Race/Ethnicity	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	
		81.8%	0.0%	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	
		Rural/Country		Urban/City					
#17	Area Living In	5		5					
		50.0%		50.0%					
		Mental Health	Cognitive	Ortho/Neuro	Visual	Deaf/Hearing	Physical	Communicative	Respiratory
#18	Primary Disability Category	8	1	2	1	1	3	1	0
		47.1%	5.9%	11.8%	5.9%	5.9%	17.6%	5.9%	0.0%

2nd Quarter Demographics									
		18-28	29-39	40-50	51-61	62-72	73+		
#15	Age Range	0	0	0	3	0	0		
		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0%		
		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native	American	Other:	
#16	Race/Ethnicity	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
		Rural/Country		Urban/City					
#17	Area Living In	2		1					
		66.7%		33.3%					
		Mental Health	Cognitive	Ortho/Neuro	Visual	Deaf/Hearing	Physical	Communicative	Respiratory
#18	Primary Disability Category	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	0
		20.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	20.0%	0.0%

**Data Collection Instrument
Customer Satisfaction Survey
Status 28 Closures**

Period Covered:									
Total - Demographics									
		18-28	29-39	40-50	51-61	62-72	73+		
#15	Age Range	17	6	14	23	3	1		
		26.6%	9.4%	21.9%	35.9%	4.7%	2%		
		White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native	American	Other:	
#16	Race/Ethnicity	49	0	5	0	0	1	1	
		87.5%	0.0%	8.9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.8%	1.8%	
		Rural/Country	Urban/City						
#17	Area Living In	19	40						
		32.2%	67.8%						
		Mental Health	Cognitive	Ortho/Neuro	Visual	Deaf/Hearing	Physical	Communicative	Respirato
#18	Primary Disability Category	34	4	10	4	4	16	6	4
		41.5%	4.9%	12.2%	4.9%	4.9%	19.5%	7.3%	4.9%