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Objectives

• Describe how my study addresses gaps in research

• Describe study:
  • Method
  • Findings
  • Implications for research and practice
Significance of Identifying Predictors of Supported Employment Outcomes for TYDD

- For schools, Indicators 13 and 14 (IDEA 2004) place increased demands of accountability on schools for transition planning and outcomes yet little is known about the employment outcomes for TYDD.

- Existing research does not account for relevant predictor variables (e.g., school setting) or typical employment outcomes (e.g., mobile crews).

- In Maryland, Employment First Advisory Committee (in alignment with the Alliance for Full Participation) is committed to collecting meaningful data and increasing the rates of integrated employment.
Research Related to Employment Outcomes

**Follow-Up Studies of Youth with Disabilities**

- Follow-up Studies
  (Baer et al., 2003; Benz et al., 2000; Doren & Benz, 1998; Dunn & Shumaker, 1997; Grigal et al., 2007; Rabren et al., 2002; Wagner, 1991; Wehmeyer & Palmer, 2003; White & Weiner, 2004; Heal & Rusch, 1995; Fabian, 2007)

- Other Studies focused on Transitioning Youth Outcomes/Variables
  (Moon et al., in press; Morgan et al., 2000; Redd, 2004; Repetto et al., 2002)

*Emphasize individual skills & school variables*

**Adults with DD Outcome Studies**

- Trends in Supported Employment
  (Butterworth et al., 2008; Rizzolo et al., 2004)

- Research about important predictors of employment
  (Cunningham & Altman, 1993; Dixon & Reddacliff, 2001; Moore et al., 2002; Morgan et al., 2000; Olsen et al., 2000)

- Survey research of CRP staff
  (Conley, 2007; Olsen et al., 2000)

*Emphasize demographic, family & community variables*
Gaps in Research

- Need for consideration of five system levels (demographic, individual skill, family, school, and community) of variables including relevant school experiences for students with DD

- Limited research that focuses on transitioning youth with developmental disabilities

- Typically dichotomous outcome variable- there is a need for multinominal logistic regression analyses for meaningful categorical outcome variables
1. What are the employment outcomes for TYDD who receive long-term supports from a CRP one year after exiting school?

2. How are demographic, individual skill, family, school, and community variables related to employment outcomes for TYDD?
Individual Supported Employment (ISE)

Definition:
• Subject works in a community-based job with typical peers and is paid at least minimum wage by employer.

Examples:
• Brian* works in a retail position 20 hours weekly. He is paid minimum wage by the store and relies on natural supports.
• Shante* works in a food service position for 10 hours weekly. She is paid more than minimum wage by the restaurant and has a job coach that provides weekly support.
Other Supported Work (OSW)

**Definition:**

- Subject works in a paid community-based job alongside other peers with disabilities (in an enclave or crew) and/or makes less than minimum wage.

**Examples:**

- Andre* works in a janitorial crew that travels to various government buildings. He makes minimum wage and works 30 hours weekly and has a full-time job coach.
- Tina* works in an enclave at a store that her CRP has a contract with for five hours per week. She receives a paycheck from her CRP for less than minimum wage.
Unpaid/Sheltered/ Non-Work (USNW)

**Definition:**
- Subject participates in unpaid community-based or facility-based work/non-work activities.

**Examples:**
- Latoya* works at her CRP building collating mailings for a company that contracts with her CRP. She gets paid $.10 for every completed package and works 15 hours per week.
- Enoch* participates in recreation activities for 30 hours weekly. Some of the activities are at the CRP building and others are in the community. He is not participating in work activities at this time.
I conducted a survey of CRP staff members who worked with transitioning youth who began receiving DDA funded supports in 2008.
Sample

338 Subjects (60.4%)
59 CRPs across state (72.8%)
60.9% Male; 39.1% Female
49.4% Caucasian/Non-Hispanic; 50.6% Other
Analyzing the Data to Answer the Research Questions

Research Question #1:

What are the employment outcomes for TYDD who receive long-term supports from a CRP one year after exiting school?

Descriptive Statistics
338 Subjects

193 (57.1%) Unpaid/Sheltered/Non-work activities

145 (42.8%) Supported Employment

97 (28.7%) Other Supported Work

48 (14.2%) Individual Supported Employment
Analyzing the Data to Answer the Research Questions

Research Question #2:

How are demographic, individual skill, family, school, and community variables related to employment outcomes for TYDD?

Multinomial Logistic Regression
Model Building Strategy

1. Screening - bivariate regression analyses
2. Testing
3. Evaluating

(Hosmer & Lemeshow, 1989)
Significant relationship (p<.10) after controlling for demographic and community variables:

- Lives with Family
- Family Expressed Preference for SE
- Self-Management Skills
- Self-Determination Skills
- Community Mobility Skills
- Post-Secondary Program
- Typical high School
- Paid Work Experience
- Having a VR Counselor
Once entered into the regression model, the following variables were significant predictors:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family SE</td>
<td>24.03</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Management</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mobility</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Work Experience</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluating

- **Odds Ratios** - a way of comparing whether the probability of a certain event is the same for two groups

- **Effect Size** - practical significance of the relationship between two variables
## Evaluating Individual Supported Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Odds Ratios</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family SE</td>
<td>6.48</td>
<td>.60 (large)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Work Experience</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>.51 (large)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mobility</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.25 (small)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluating Other Supported Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family SE</th>
<th>2.71</th>
<th>.32 (medium)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paid Work Experience</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.27 (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.18 (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mobility</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.13 (small)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluating
Most salient predictors

Subjects whose families expressed a preference for paid, community employment were:

• **6.48** times more likely to be in ISE and
• **2.71** times more likely to be in OSW

Subjects who had paid work experience were:

• **4.53** times more likely to be in ISE
Other Interesting Findings

• >15% of respondents didn’t know whether the transitioning youth had a DORS Counselor or received SSI.

• ONLY 7.8% of respondents reported that the individual’s file included the MD Exit Document although this Summary of Performance document has been mandated for more than 5 years!
Implications for Educators

- Empower individuals and families to advocate for supported employment
- Advocate for paid work experiences for students with DD
- Emphasize instruction in self-management and community mobility
Implications for TYDD and Families

• Advocate for ISE or OSW outcomes

• Advocate for transition goals in the IEP that are directly linked to post-school outcomes

• Become familiar with Summary of Performance document
Implication for Policy Makers

- Monitor Transitioning Youth Initiative

- Develop programs that emphasize important malleable predictors (e.g. *paid* work experience)

- School systems and state DD systems should collaborate to collect outcome data using ISE and OSW categories
Implications for Research

• Replicate the method (CRP survey) and analysis (MLR)
• Continue to use the categorization (ISE and OSE) but consider including number of hours/wages earned
• Replicate use of five levels of variables (especially new variables used in this study)
• Reduce amounts of missing data
• Conduct mixed methods research
• Consider including CRP level data and using MLR or HLM to account for nested data
Implications for Organizational Change Efforts

• Clarify definitions for targeted outcomes
• Focus on data collection! Use MLR to analyze data!
• Renew our commitment to family empowerment and advocacy!
• Work with schools to facilitate paid work experiences during school!
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