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## Disabled people in employment in GB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage disabled</th>
<th>Percentage Non-disabled</th>
<th>Percentage gap between disabled and non-disabled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>77.7</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: Labour Force Survey*
## Disabled people in employment in GB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>% 2011 Low</th>
<th>% 2011 High</th>
<th>% 2012 Low</th>
<th>% 2012 High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical difficulties</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty seeing</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty in hearing</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe disfigurement</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest or breathing</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart, circulation</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stomach, liver, kidney, digestive</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>62.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression, anxiety</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epilepsy</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe ID or specific intellectual difficulties</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental illness</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: Labour Force Survey, showing 95% confidence intervals*
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Percentage of people with a learning disability in paid work

- Biased towards people with a mild learning disability

---

National Survey 2003/04
Percentage of people working 16+ hours per week

- Overall, biased towards small hours

National Survey 2003/04
People with learning disabilities in employment in England

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>-1.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire and the Humber</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Source: ASC-CAR L1 (NI146; Adults with learning disabilities in employment)*
Challenges for People with Learning Disabilities

- People in the moderate to profound range will require much higher levels of specialist support, for the whole of their lives.

- People in the severe and profound range are more likely to experience:
  - An additional sensory or physical impairment
  - About half of people with learning disabilities have an additional sensory impairment
  - 18% may have two such impairments.
  - Between 30% and 40% suffer from poor vision
  - 75% among those with severe learning disabilities
  - Higher levels of epilepsy
Challenges for people with learning disabilities in Employment

- Majority of people will have problems with:
  - speech and language
  - memory
  - cognitive processing/executive functioning

- For those with more severe learning disabilities:

- In vocational assessment problems with:
  - written and verbal tests
  - practical tests that exclude effective training
  - inexperience (poor transition experiences) means that they will have under-developed employment ideas
Challenges for people with learning disabilities in Employment

- Ability to understand verbal instruction and to provide information
- Cue dependency creates difficulty transferring tasks learned here (training) to there (job)
- Small changes can lead to the person being unable to do a well known task:
  - Changes in task sequence
  - Changes in work machinery
  - Changes in work materials
  - Changes in a co-worker role
  - Changes in workplace environment
- All this weakens the relevance of pre-training
Employment Pathways - Non-disabled young people

Secondary School → Ordinary work experience → Qualifications → Gap year?

Ordinary work experience → Part-time job

Gap year? → University or College

University or College → Work-based training → Further Qualifications

Further Qualifications → Vocational placements

Vocational placements → Career

Career
Employment Pathways - Non-disabled young people

- Secondary School
  - Ordinary work experience
  - Qualifications
  - Gap year?
  - Part-time job
  - Exclusion

- University or College
  - Work-based training
  - Further Qualifications
  - Vocational placements
  - Career

- N.E.E.T.s
Pathways - young people with learning disabilities

Special School/Unit → In-house or no work experience → No part-time job → No or poor qualifications → No gap year → FE College

Day Service → In-house or no work experience → No part-time job → No or poor qualifications → “Permanent gap year”
US Employment Models

- Day Activity Centre
- Work Activity Centres
- Sheltered workshop
- Transitional programme
- Competitive Job

Sheltered Work

Supported Employment

Place

Train

Maintain
Values of Supported Employment

- **Real Work**
  - Would be done by others

- **Real work settings**
  - Interaction with non disabled co-workers and supervisors

- **Real money**
  - At going rates of pay for the job
Values of Supported Employment

- Zero Reject Philosophy
  - all who want work can
  - problem in the way our services are structured
  - identification of strengths not weaknesses
  - Train, don’t test

- Careers are individually determined
  - by the person not others

- On-going support provided

- Employer determines job and quality
The Roots of Supported Employment - Applied Behavioural Analysis

- Replicable training and management procedures
  - antecedent stimulus, action, response
- Individualised training
- Direct observation and measurement of behaviour
- Repeated assessments
- Objective analysis including quantification
- Initiation, acquisition, maintenance
- Social and vocational survival skills are included
- Social validation of the actions performed
Systematic Instruction - Stimulus Response Chaining

Discriminatory Stimulus | Component Response
-------------------------|----------------------
Stapler empty            | Open staple slide    
Staple slide open        | Pick up staples      
Staple in hand           | Put points down      
Staples points down      | Pull back spring     
Spring retracted         | Put staples in       
Staples in slide         | Release spring       
Spring engaged           | Close staple slide   
Why supported employment for people with learning disabilities?

- Effective task training research going back into 1970s
  - Complex & dangerous tasks
  - Systematic training in a specific workplace crucial to this client group
- Matching “ecology” of workplace to person’s wishes, talents and specific strengths researched in 1980/90s
- “Zero reject” vocational profiling in use since the mid 1980s instead of “work/can’t work” testing
- Put together, these techniques were called “supported employment” and success with people with learning disabilities demonstrated in US University evaluations in 1980 and 90s
Supported Employment Activities

Place
- Profiling
  - Job finding
  - Job Analysis
  - Job Match
  - Placement Plan

Train
- Task Analysis
- Task Training
- Problem Solving
- Natural support

Maintain
- Monitoring
  - Accountability
  - Career Development

Career Development
What works for people with a intellectual disability learning jobs?

Severe
- Training on the job - Systematic Instruction
- Job coach support on-site
- Breaking tasks into steps
- “Chaining” tasks together
- Hierarchy of cues
  - Physical guidance
  - Gestures
  - Verbal prompts
- Job adaptation if needed
- Managing praise and reinforcement more closely
- Specific social training strategies
- Work-based accreditation of skills demonstrated

Moderate
- Pre-employment training is possible
- Verbal instruction & demonstration
- Simple language
- Greater time to learn
- Use of naturally occurring praise and reinforcement through:
  - Supervisors, work-mates
  - Ordinary pay incentives
- Managing work pressure/productivity demands
- Shaping social contact through co-workers
- Qualifications for job and career development

Mild
What works in finding jobs?

Severe

- Greater use of support to find & plan
  - Families
  - Job coaches
- Extended Vocational Profiling/Discovery
  - 20+ hours in various environs?
  - Interests and what good at
  - Relevant experiences
  - Work types and environments
  - Days and schedules
  - Welfare benefit planning
- Use of practical job tryouts to aid decision-making
- Aided CV and support planning
- Proactive and specific job finding and matching jobs to people
- Employer presentation and negotiation
- Adaptation of interview and induction

Moderate

- Greater independent action
- More use of generic help to identifying strengths, interests and experience
- Use of more generic sources for vacancies
- Greater use of courses, “job clubs”
  - CV development
  - Job search
  - Writing applications
- More use of mainstream job application & interviewing and induction processes

Mild
Outcomes from supported employment in the US

- Schalock, Mcgaughey and Kiernan (1989)
  - 1629 vocational services
  - wages per hour in SE double those in sheltered work
  - average full-time hours higher in SE

Outcomes from supported employment in the US

- Shafer *et al.* (1990)
  - 27 states - 1,400 SE programs
  - People with a intellectual disability most frequent participants
  - 157% increased participating individuals during the study period
  - Individual placement superior to sheltered employment and group supported employment models on wage outcomes

- West *et al.* (1992)
  - 42 states - 74,960 individuals in SE
  - People with a intellectual disability 62.8% of all participants
  - 30.4% classified moderate, 8.7% as severe or profound
  - Individual placement model dominant model
Outcomes from supported employment in the US

- **Griffin et al. (1996)**
  - Showed clients trained in SE had higher self-esteem and higher job satisfaction than those trained within a sheltered employment setting.

- **McDonnell et al. (1988)**
  - Using the Utah Supported Employment Project Implementation Checklist found relationships between high implementation scores and better wages and greater hours, and retention.

- **Wacker et al. (1989)**
  - Found a relationship between higher scores on a 10 point checklist and longer-term employment of worker
Employees with disabilities who have had information and support from coworkers are more likely to have:

- more typical job acquisition
- more typical work roles
- higher wages
- participate in work social activities
- participate in social activities outside of work
- positive relationships with coworkers

(Mank et al., 1997a,b, 1998, 2000)
Natural Support Outcomes- “Typicalness”

- Typicalness of Job acquisition, Compensation, Work Role & Orientation
- Rated on a scale of
  1  2  3  4  5  6  7
  (not typical)  (somewhat)  (quite typical)
- How "Typical" is this person's conditions and features of employment when compared to other employees without disabilities in the same work setting?
Influence of “typicalness” approach and team organisation on outcome

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Monthly wage</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta Coefficient</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of team meetings</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.87**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar pay and conditions</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>7.21**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar job finding approach</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-3.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of un- qualified staff</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>3.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work roles</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>276.91</td>
<td>6.62**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 0.05 Level  ** Significant at 0.01 Level
Randomised Control Trials of Supported Employment for people with Mental Health problems

- People with mental health problems have become a major user of supported employment
- Their supported employment is integrated with clinical MH team
- Emphasis on off-site support, motivation and employer negotiation

International evidence on mental health outcomes
- 11 completed randomised controlled trials of high fidelity supported employment (Individual Placement & Support)
- 6 studies of day treatment programs converted to supported employment programs
- 7 correlational studies of fidelity and competitive employment (studies to find out if fidelity gives better outcome)
Competitive Employment Rates in 11 Randomized Controlled Trials of Individual Placement and Support

Mean = 61%

Mean = 23%

Bond, 2008
Randomised Control Trials of Supported Employment for people with Mental Health problems

Europe

- Supported Employment was more effective than vocational services for every vocational outcome.
- Patients assigned to vocational services were significantly more likely than IPS to:

  - drop out of the service (45% - VS 13% - IPS)
  - be readmitted to hospital (31% - VS 20% - IPS)

Burns et al (2007)
Costs and worker benefits: North Lanarkshire

- Generated significant interest because of reported high levels of employment of people with learning disabilities for 16 hours per week or more
- Significant financial benefits to the people reported
- Noted for challenging the view that the 'benefits trap' is the biggest problem restricting movement into employment
- An opportunity arose to examine in detail the North Lanarkshire experience and to analyse their data.
## Costs and worker benefits: NLSE Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>All workers</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Workers with LD</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.5-15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>104</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>88</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Hours= 24.2 hours per week
>16 hours= 91.3% all (89.8% LD)
Costs and worker benefits: Workers “Better off”

- Overall, average total gross income from all sources after employment was £252.25 per week per person
- Better off by +94.8% for people with LD
- Most common increase 51% and 75%
- Included DLA and Working Tax Credit
Costs and worker benefits: Costs to Local Government

- Equivalent Locality Support Service, which catered for 295 people on a full- and part-time basis with an annual cost of £14,998
- Using the average number of people in jobs 122 (ranging from 109 Jan. to 129 Dec. 2007) the cost per employed person of SE rises to £7,126 per job.
- This still represents 47.5% of the cost of a LSS place
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Costs and worker benefits: Costs to Local Government

- Equivalent Locality Support Service, which catered for 295 people on a full- and part-time basis with an annual cost of £14,998.

- Using the average number of people in jobs 122 (ranging from 109 Jan. to 129 Dec. 2007) the cost per employed person of SE rises to £7,126 per job.

- This still represents 47.5% of the cost of a LSS place.

- Taxpayer “net cost”: -£6,894
Costs and worker benefits: Costs to LG- Kent

- The annual costs of SE in Kent, based on 2010/2011 budget was £7,811 per person per year, based on “actual capacity” - 116 people
- Equivalent Locality Support Service, which catered for people on a full- and part-time basis with an annual cost of £12,792
- This represents 61.1% of the cost of a LSS place
- Taxpayer “net cost”: £1,321
The implications of the results in the present study are potentially substantial. This study reaffirms, on a national level as well as with current data, that providing supported employment services to individuals with intellectual disabilities is a financially sound decision in 46 out of 55 states and territories. As indicated by many authors, providing supported employment services to this population is a “win–win” situation for both individuals with intellectual disabilities and taxpayers

Cimera (2010)
## Supported Employment comparative outcomes - People with ID, USA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2002-8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly net benefit</td>
<td>$481.74</td>
<td>$483.60</td>
<td>$474.60</td>
<td>$462.02</td>
<td>$472.76</td>
<td>$477.39</td>
<td>$475.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit-cost ratio</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cimera, 2010)
Supported Employment comparative outcomes - USA

- Mean cost:benefit ratio 2002-2007 by client group:
  - All clients = 1.46
  - Mental Illnesses = 1.68
  - Physical Disabilities = 1.66
  - Autism Spectrum Disorder = 1.62
  - Sensory Impairments = 1.35
  - Intellectual Disabilities = 1.20
  - Traumatic Brain Injuries = 1.17

(Cimera, 2011)
Evidence that Supported Employment is the most effective solutions to supporting people into paid jobs

Most economic analysis has been comparative Cost Benefit Analysis

Relatively little in the way of overall Cost Effectiveness analysis has been published (e.g. investment vs jobs)

Poor evidence on what is being delivered, “model fidelity” and effective of elements such as natural support, input intensity and job coach training

Problem of part-time jobs

Problem of relative effectiveness of cross- rather than single-client employment services and scalability

(Greig et al, 2014)
Distribution of 2011-12 spend on employment

(Greig et al, 2014)
**Cost per job outcome**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average costs</th>
<th>Average cost per person supported</th>
<th>Average cost per paid job outcome</th>
<th>Average hours delivered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All (n=70)</strong></td>
<td>£263,132</td>
<td>£1,730</td>
<td>£8,217</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LD (n=32)</strong></td>
<td>£217,047</td>
<td>£1,948</td>
<td>£8,218</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MH (n=31)</strong></td>
<td>£316,148</td>
<td>£1,485</td>
<td>£8,024</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N.Lanarkshire</strong></td>
<td>£1,019,733</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£8,359</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kent</strong></td>
<td>£926,896</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>£8,030</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LD$^+$ = 43% job outcomes (53% new)  
LD$^*$ = 60% job outcomes (90%+ new)  
LD$^x$ = ?? job outcomes (83%+ new)

*Inflated to 2013 prices (Beyer, 2008; Kilsby & Beyer, 2011)  
+ (Greig et al, 2014)
Proportion of people who secured a job outcome and cost per job outcome

(Greig et al, 2014)
Research Results in the UK - Factors Impacting on Cost

Mean hours of support per month

Months in the Job (Number of people)

Net cost ratio

0.07 0.50

1 Month 1 adjusted upwards to allow for part month starts

(Beyer et al. 1998)
Engagement in meaningful activity

- Total engagement the same for disabled workers
- Work engagement for disabled workers higher than co-workers
- Employment social engagement low
Social Interaction Comparisons

- Directions
- Questioning
- Greetings
- Joking
- General talk

Day Centre Clients
Disabled Workers
Non-disabled Co-workers

Stephen Beyer - Welsh Centre for Learning Disabilities, Cardiff University
Research Results in the UK-Psychological outcomes

- Higher prevalence of anxiety disorders associated with not having a job among people with ID
  - Odd ratio 2.46
  - C21st Health Check/PAS-ADD Checklist

- Individuals in employment can have significantly higher engagement in 9/11 life areas than controls, and challenging behaviour improved in work for some
  - Direct structured observation engagement including challenges
  - Third party interview

- Break down no significantly impact on people’s psychological well-being but self-reported trauma
  - Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale, and a self-report measure of quality of life (ComQol)
Research Results in the UK - Psychological outcomes

- A review has shown that Quality of Life, well-being and autonomy are largely positive for those entering work. There is a lack of perceived social acceptance. 28
High percentage of agencies giving advice on healthy diet and physical activities

Half of the agencies give suggestion on smoking

Verbal advice is quite diffuse when there are concerns for alcohol use
SE and Health- Planning for health promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weight problems</th>
<th>Smoking</th>
<th>Alcohol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plan with client &amp; employer</td>
<td>plan with family</td>
<td>plan with client &amp; employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- It is unlikely that agencies plan with client and employer
- Families are rarely involved in plan for a healthy lifestyle

Vigna, Beyer & Kerr, 2012
80% of agencies report health gains for clients after they have been employed.

Manipulation of SE processes can increase health of people with LD.

Vigna, Beyer & Kerr, 2012
What challenges does the future hold?

For people with learning disabilities
Issues facing Supported Employment

- Availability of jobs in recession
- Funding
  - The funding model for Work Choice excludes people with more significant disabilities
  - We need programmes to fund a “high fidelity” model of Supported Employment
- Dominance of skill/qualification development as a vocational rehabilitation model rather than apprenticeship/work-based learning or direct job support
- Lack of staff skill and training
Staff in Supported Employment

- 88% of "employment officers" work with a range of clients:
  - learning disabilities, mental health, autistic spectrum disorder, acquired brain injury, physical disabilities and sensory disabilities
- Only 7% worked with non-disabled people
- 96%+ worked directly with employers and families
- 35% had a relevant professional qualification:
  - supported employment, counseling, careers guidance, social work, teaching, adult training or occupational therapy
- 40% had no qualification
- Mean time in job 4 years

Shneider (2003) in New thinking about mental health and employment
Issues facing Supported Employment - Staff training

- Career specification for job coaches
  - No career path - many second career people
  - Few relevant qualifications or training options
- Currently some have a diploma in SE from Vocational Training providers
  - National Vocational Qualifications Level 3
  - Training in Systematic Instruction Certificate
    (City College Norwich)
Issues facing Supported Employment- Staff training

- National Occupational Standard in Supported Employment may offer a way forward
- BASE qualification now running
- Under local development in South West
  - Collectives of independent job coaches
  - Community of Practice Models
Conclusions

• Not all people with learning disabilities are able to benefit from training of a full range of skills before they enter a job.
• This does not mean that they cannot be employed.
• It means that they are more likely to need a skilled person to help them find, learn and keep a job.
Conclusions

- SE works for people with a wide range of disabilities
- It has positive outcomes compared to other vocational rehabilitation approaches
- This only works if the key approaches of supported employment are applied
- Potential for invest to save at Taxpayer and local authority level, with unexplored opportunities for impact on Health & Well-being agenda
- We need:
  - Investment in what works to provide enough job coach and management resources to deliver the full SE process
  - Better differentiation of what training approaches are effective for who
- There is a recession. However:
  - Supported Employment has always increased jobs during recessions, probably because it is an individualised approach that also meets employer need for stable workers
  - Disability Rights laws that promotes equal access (and equal share of the jobs that we do have)
  - We need to move people nearer to the labour market so they fare well in any upturn
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