

A COMPARISON STUDY OF SHELTERED WORK VERSUS SUPPORTED  
EMPLOYMENT WITHIN COMMUNITY-BASED  
REHABILITATION FACILITIES

by

Jamie E. Cox

A Research Paper

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the  
Master of Science Degree  
With a Major in

Vocational Rehabilitation

Approved: \_\_\_\_ Semester Credits

---

Investigation Advisor

The Graduate School  
University of Wisconsin-Stout  
August, 2002

**The Graduate School  
University of Wisconsin-Stout  
Menomonie, WI 54751**

**ABSTRACT**

Cox                      Jamie                      E.

A comparison study of sheltered work versus supported employment within community-based rehabilitation facilities

Vocational Rehabilitation      Dr. Robert Peters-Advisor      August, 2002      44 Pages

American Psychological Association (APA) Publication Manual

"In 1993 the NHIS estimated the number of persons in the United States with a disability as 39,331,000" (Del Orto & Marinelli, 1995, p. 701). For this group, which represents over 15% of the U.S. population, the vocational options that are available have greatly increased since the passing of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. With the increase in choices comes a new debate over the vocational value of sheltered versus supported employment. Overwhelmingly in the media today there is a negative bias towards the sheltered workshop that is seen as degrading and of little vocational benefit to individuals with disabilities. Supported employment is perceived as the greatest vocational option for all persons with disabilities regardless of their limitations. Studies suggest however that although there is a media and professional movement towards supportive employment there is still a recognized need for sheltered employment that is often not discussed. In fact, most state agencies with supported employment programs also house a sheltered component that serves a larger population.

The purpose of this research was to conduct a study that focused on rehabilitation facilities that contain both a community supported employment program and a sheltered workshop component and take a closer look at the numbers of persons, types of disabilities, and services being provided through both arenas.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Title Page .....	i
II.	Abstract .....	ii
III.	List of Tables .....	v
IV.	Chapter I .....	1
	A. Statement of the Problem .....	2
	B. Purpose of the Research .....	4
	C. Research Questions .....	5
	D. Definition of Terms .....	5
	E. Limitations to Research.....	7
V.	Chapter II .....	9
VI.	Chapter III .....	18
VII.	Chapter IV .....	22
VIII.	Chapter V .....	34
IX.	References .....	38
X.	Appendices .....	40
	A. Consent Form .....	40
	B. Letter to Participant .....	41
	C. Questionnaire .....	42

## LIST OF TABLES

I.	Total Clientele Served within the Facility.....	22
II.	Primary Employment for Individuals with Developmental Delay .....	23
III.	Primary Employment for Individuals with Mental Illness .....	24
IV.	Primary Employment for Individuals with a Traumatic Brain Injury .....	24
V.	Primary Employment for Individuals who are Hearing Impaired .....	25
VI.	Primary Employment for Individuals who are Visually Impaired .....	25
VII.	Primary Employment for Individuals with Cerebral Palsy .....	26
VIII.	Vocational Information for Individuals in Supported Employment.....	26
IX.	Client-workers Need for a Job Coach in Supported Employment .....	27
X.	Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week in Supported Employment ....	27
XI.	Average Hourly Wages for Individuals in Supported Employment .....	28
XII.	Vocational Information for Individuals in Sheltered Employment .....	28
XIII.	Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week in Sheltered Employment .....	29
XIV.	Average Hourly Wage for Individuals in Sheltered Employment .....	29
XV.	Proportion of Client-Workers that Transition from Sheltered to Supported Employment Each Year .....	29

## CHAPTER ONE

"In 1993, the NHIS estimated the number of persons in the United States with a disability as 39,331,000" (Del Orto & Marinelli, 1995, p. 701). For this group, that represents over 15% of the U.S. population, what vocational options are available to them, and how have they been improved upon in the twelve years since the passing of the Americans with Disabilities Act? In the past two decades, there has been a major movement towards the inclusion of individuals with even the most severe disabilities into competitive employment through supported employment. "Supported employment originated with federal and state funded demonstration projects in the late 1970's and early 1980's that showed that persons with mental retardation could work competitively if given the opportunity and support" (Rusch, F. & Mithaug, D. (1980); Wehman, P. Hill, & Koehler (1979) as cited in Del Orto & Marinelli, 1995, p. 708). Unlike its most common predecessor, the sheltered workshop, which "is perceived as a segregated program which offers minimum opportunity for persons who are served to achieve integration in employment" (Whitehead, 1987, p. 23). Supported employment is considered an integration opportunity that procedural standards emphasize

- 1) inclusion of persons with the most severe disabilities
- 2) job placements based on individualized goals, needs, and interests
- 3) optimum consumer outcomes such as earnings, integration, and long-term job retention
- 4) consumer satisfaction with supported employment outcomes

(Del Orto & Marinelli, 1995, p. 713).

## STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In a period in which "freedom of choice" is such a major issue, the passing of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 created a renewed belief in the world of rehabilitation that persons with disabilities were being severely underutilized in the competitive world of employment. This belief has strong backing, which is supported by the significant numbers of persons who are now successfully working competitively. "From 1986 through 1993 the number of participants (in supported employment) expanded from 10,000 to more than 105,000 persons with severe disabilities (Parent & Kregel, Winter 1996, p. 208).. With these positive changes, however, has also come the strong belief that sheltered workshops are a very negative aspect of employment for persons with disabilities. It is the belief of many, such as Melissa Hall, the executive director of Arise in her response to a supporter of sheltered workshops in the New York Post, that sheltered workshops should be eliminated. She wrote, "The practice of the sheltered workshop must stop...To claim that people with disabilities can find meaningful, steady work in the community is not naïve, utopian, or unrealistic; it is simply a fair expectation that people with disabilities have the same rights to pursue the careers of their choice like everyone else" (Hall, July 27, 2001, p. A-9).

What has developed in this movement towards competitive employment for all persons with disabilities is the realization that although there were 140,000 persons with disabilities working through supported employment in 1995, NIHS estimated that in 1993 "the number of persons in the United States with a disability as 39,331,000" (Del Orto & Marinelli, 1995, p. 701). These numbers support the idea that many persons with disabilities are not being served through supported employment. In fact, research suggests that many community-supported

employment organizations have a sheltered workshop component to them that is often overlooked and definitely overshadowed by its community counterpart. For example,

...in 1986 there were 324 known supported employment provider agencies, but in 1990 there were 2,647, most of which were rehabilitation facilities, sheltered workshops, or segregated day programs, and ...while vocational rehabilitation agencies are increasing statewide capacity through provider agreements, few providers are converting from segregated services to supported employment to any appreciable degree (Del Orto & Marinelli, 1995, p. 712).

This suggests that although community supported employment is a huge step for individuals with disabilities, professionals in the field and persons with disabilities themselves are still finding a need for sheltered workshops. Recent publications however suggest this is the furthest thing from the truth.

Evelyn Tileston, a rehabilitation teacher in rural northwest Colorado, writes of her workshop experience in the April 1990 issue of the *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*,  
As an inexperienced, visually impaired teenager, I found no opportunities for employment in the city where I lived, except at the sheltered workshop. For three summers, I assembled decorative decanter tops for fancy liquor bottles. I gained self-esteem and self-confidence. That job was for me what a job in a fast food place is for today's beginning workers...Persons not having disabilities have a wide variety of choices for employment, whereas disabled persons do not. Abolishing the sheltered shop is abolishing a choice.

(Miller, Spring 1993, p. 28)



Overwhelmingly, for the disabled population that it serves, supportive employment is seen as a very positive choice. For example, a study conducted by Wendy Parent and John Kregel that appeared in the "Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities" in the Winter of 1996 indicated that individuals with disabilities in Virginia who were competitively employed and receiving supportive employment services were "overwhelmingly satisfied with their jobs" (p. 214). It is important to understand, however, that numbers indicate that research supports the findings that although professionals would like all persons with disabilities to be competitively employed, at this point in time, these are unrealistic expectations. This is where sheltered workshops provide employment opportunities for individuals who are not yet ready for competitive employment or have decided that this option is not the right one for them at this time.

The question then becomes what is the state of community employment and sheltered workshops? How are persons with disabilities being served, and are the services that are being provided right for them at this time in their lives?

## PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

The purpose of this research is to conduct a study that focuses on rehabilitation facilities that contain both a community supported employment program and a sheltered workshop component and take a closer look at the number of persons, types of disabilities, and services being provided through both arenas. Recent publications in the last decade strongly suggest that supported employment is an opportunity for even the most severely disabled to work in the community, yet actual numbers in these surveyed organizations may show that although this may be the belief, this is not what is actually happening for a variety of reasons that go far beyond

"freedom of choice." This study will consist of a survey that will be sent out to directors of organizations that continue both community and supported employment services as well as a sheltered workshop. It will investigate the numbers of persons being served through these organizations, the types of disabilities that are being represented, the longevity of their employment in the community as well as the sheltered program, and the number of hours they work and the wage they earn at their respective places of employment each week.

## RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What is the disability classification and level of severity of individuals involved in supported employment and sheltered workshops?
2. What is the ratio between client workers served through sheltered employment, supported employment or a combination of both sheltered and supported?
3. Are there differences in the work schedules, wages/paychecks, and benefits of client-workers involved in supported employment versus sheltered workshops?
4. What type of transition period occurs for individuals moving into competitive employment?

## DEFINITION OF TERMS

**Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990:** Prohibited disability discrimination in employment, public services, and public accommodations operated by private entities; requires that telecommunication services be made accessible (Del Orto & Marinelli, 1995, p. 263).

**Commensurate Wage:** A special minimum wage (SMW) based on the individual productivity of the worker with a disability in proportion to the productivity of experienced workers who do

not have disabilities performing essentially the same type, quality, and quantity of work in the vicinity where the worker with a disability is employed (Harles & Associates, 2001, p. Appendix 88).

**Disability:** Status of diminished function based on the anatomic, physiologic, or mental impairment that has reduced the individual's actual or presumed ability to engage in any substantial gainful activity. Depending upon the individual's age, education, work experience, and other personal factors, disability status that is legally determined on the basis of medically evaluated impairment (Eisenberg, 1995, p. 68).

**Developmental Disability:** A chronic disability due to a mental and/or physical impairment present at birth of which is manifested before the person attains the age of 22 years (Eisenberg, 1995, p. 68).

**NISH:** National Health Interview Survey. It is sponsored by the National Center for Health Statistics and ad hoc cosponsors from other federal agencies [Benson & Marano, 1994]. Because it has been in continuous operation since 1957 and has produced annual statistics on disability throughout its history, it is the single most important source of U.S. national disability statistics (Del Orto & Maranelli, 1995, p. 701).

**Piece Rate:** The amount of money paid per task performed or piece produced. A piece rate used to determine the commensurate wages, when properly established, must include consideration of quantity and quality of production. A proper piece rate, when multiplied by the standard of the worker who does not have a disability, should equal at least the prevailing wage rate (Harles & Associates, 2001, p. Appendix 91).

**Rehabilitation Act of 1973:** Established service priority for people with severe disabilities; required Individualized Written Rehabilitation Plan, established Rehabilitation Administration in Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Del Orto & Marinelli, 1995, p. 263).

**Supported Employment:** As defined by the 1986 amendments to the Rehabilitation Act, requires that employment take place in a competitive setting and the workers with disabilities be integrated with workers who are not disabled.

**Sheltered Workshop:** A place of work in which people with various disabilities may be able to fulfill productive jobs, thanks to the selection of occupations and the help provided. The disabilities may stem from mental and emotional disorders and retardation as well as deafness, blindness, and other physical impairments. The work is generally obtained by subcontracting with manufacturers. Wages and salaries are usually below minimum federal rates (Eisenberg, 1995, p. 222).

## LIMITATIONS TO RESEARCH

The researcher has identified several limitations to this study. They include:

1. The information provided by the organization is self-reported. This may cause there to be some distortions with regards to the information given.
2. Each organization has its own set of criteria for its employment that may lead to discrepancies in what is deemed "community employment." For example, one organization may consider Wayside clean up as a community job, whereas another organization may consider this a sheltered component to the organization.

3. The directors/supervisors reporting the information in the survey have his/her own beliefs about community employment/versus sheltered employment and what he/she wants the organization to represent. This may cause recorded information to be slanted.
4. Information was collected from organizations in a very limited geographic area (Minnesota and Wisconsin), that may not accurately depict organizations in other regions of the United States.

## CHAPTER TWO

In order to have a better understanding of the benefits and shortcomings in the movement from sheltered workshops to competitive employment it is necessary to look at the history of both, how they have evolved, the misconceptions and stereotypes that have been created, as well as the strengths and weaknesses that have been discovered during the years of research into the study of rehabilitation for persons with disabilities.

Before a comparison is done between sheltered and supported employment it is important to understand the broad picture of employment for persons with disabilities. Below are some employment facts:

- Currently, half of the 29 million disabled Americans aged 21 to 64 are working. The participation rate is lower, at one-fourth, for those who are severely disabled (Mergenhagen, July 1997, p. 36).
- Since many disabilities appear with age, disabled workers are older than other workers. One in five mildly disabled and one in four severely disabled workers are aged 55 and older, compared with one in ten nondisabled employees, according to the 1991-92 SIPP (Mergenhagen, July 1997, p. 37).
- Only 18 percent of individuals with mental retardation/developmental disabilities were working in 1990, as were 23 percent of the mentally ill (Mergenhagen, July 1997, p. 37).
- Approximately one-third of those with cancer, spinal-cord injuries, heart and respiratory diseases, and arthritis had jobs (Mergenhagen, July 1997, p. 37).
- Almost half of those with bad backs and visual impairments were employed, as were nearly two-thirds of those with hearing impairments (Mergenhagen, July 1997, p. 37).

- Disabled workers are more likely than others to work part-time, which explains some of the earning differences between them and other workers. The average monthly earnings of severely disabled workers in 1991-92 were \$1,400 compared with \$1,800 for mild disabled, and \$2,000 for nondisabled (Mergenhagen, July 1997, p. 37).
- While only 15 percent of nondisabled workers have less than 12 years of schooling, 21 percent of mildly disabled, and 29 percent of severely disabled workers did not complete high school (Mergenhagen, July 1997, p. 37)
- Between 1986 and 1995 the percentage of companies that have hired people with disabilities edged up from 62 percent to 64 percent according to surveys by Louis Harris and Associates, Inc. for the National Organization on Disability (Mergenhagen, July 1997, p. 38).

In research today it would appear that there is overwhelming positive support in the movement towards supported employment as the best opportunity for persons with disabilities of every type and severity. Sheltered workshop environments are often portrayed very negatively as segregation and not supportive of enabling individuals but hindering them by limiting their opportunities for community involvement, job variety, better wages, and greater self-image that many individuals report they experience in successful supported employment.

The problem this has created is the depiction among rehabilitation professionals that there is a need to choose one type of vocational rehabilitation over the other, and that by eliminating a choice we will be better serving persons with disabilities as a whole. A concept that gets very little attention, but is being used with increasing frequency, is that perhaps the greatest service that can help the largest population is a combination of both the sheltered workshops and

supportive employment. This approach is largely being used by state agencies as a stepping-stone process for rehabilitation growth.

Only slightly better than one-third of agencies (37.2% of 385 supported employment providers located in 40 states) offering both facility-based programs and supported employment indicated that they had down-sized their segregated programs and expanded supported employment services, with almost two-thirds of agencies maintaining or increasing their levels of facility-based services.

(West, Revel, & Wehman, 1998, p. 244)

Before the passage of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, the programs and opportunities for competitive employment were less accessible, especially for those individuals with severe disabilities.

A sheltered workshop is a place of work in which persons with a variety of disabilities are employed and given additional supports to help them be successful and develop work and socialization skills. Most individuals are paid at a sub-minimal wage in accordance with the industrial percentage at which he/she is performing the work.

Under Section 14(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), persons with various physical or mental disabilities can be employed at wage rates below the otherwise applicable federal minimum wage. Under certificates issued by the Secretary of Labor, their wages are set at a level commensurate with their productivity and reflective of rates found to be prevailing in the locality for essentially "the same type, quality, and quantity of work." For these workers, under current law, there is no statutory minimum wage rate.

(Whittaker, 2001, Summary)



Minimum wage certificates granted to rehabilitation facilities have certain very specific guidelines that must be met and regulated by the Department of labor. When a client/ worker begins employment at a sheltered workshop he/she must be informed of the terms of the certificate program. In instances in which the client worker has a legal guardian, he/she must also be made aware of the terms.

When a disabled worker is hired, an "initial evaluation" of his/her productivity "shall be made within the first month after employment begins in order to determine the worker's commensurate wage rate." Further, the employer must agree (a) to review the wage rates paid to such workers at least once every 6 months and (b) to review the wages of all Section 14(c) employees at least once each year to insure that the Section 14(c) wages "reflect changes in the prevailing wage paid to experiences nondisabled individuals employed in the locality for essentially the same type of work."

(Whittaker, 2001, p. 3)

Below is an example of an actual job piece-rate of a job at a sheltered workshop. The job involves putting six pieces of make-up into a mesh bag and zipping it up.

Job Number: 705406

Job Description: Collating 6 pieces into mesh bag

Piece Rate: .04654

Industrial Norm: 6.98

Pieces per hour: 150

This information indicates that the industrial norm (100%) for this job is \$6.98 an hour and the completion of 150 pieces. The industrial norm is developed by conducting a series of piece rate

time studies on non-disabled workers performing this job and taking the average amount of work that they are able to complete in a measured period of time. In the past, sheltered workshops saw themselves using their 'conditioned' or 'protected' factory settings as transitional, even though it was recognized that some of the clientele might take months or even years to make the shift to the regular world of work. The sheltered workshops and industrial therapy associations included nondisabled persons as well as clients/patients, a very necessary requirements for production and sales that were most often in the open competitive market.

(Black, 1992, p. 87)

Sheltered workshops have come under a lot of scrutiny in the last two decades as the movement towards supportive employment has flourished. People outside the field as well as rehabilitation professionals have often encouraged the criticisms and stereotypes of these shops as being dead-ends for individuals rather than stepping-stones into competitive employment through social and work skill development. Sheltered workshops are often depicted as places in which workers are paid low wages to perform meaningless tasks that are of limited value to anyone, an idea that is far from reality.

Below is the fourth quarter (October-December) production quantities for a workshop that employs approximately 80 individuals with disabilities in the state of Wisconsin. These client workers

1. Assembled 62,857 cable locks (for garage door assembly)
2. Collated 61,131 5 piece make-up bags for a nationally publicized magazine promotion (141,669 units total)
3. Spent 373 hours boxing and labeling US flags for a credit card promotional mailing

4. Boxed 324,900 cookbooks
5. Spent 122 hours cleaning plastic tubes for a pharmaceutical company
6. Packaged 68,145 envelopes for a variety of mailings

Sheltered employment for many is used as the first stage of the rehabilitation process.

For example, workshops "can offer 'protective' services for people who have serious mental illness early in the treatment process, and can continue services to people who may take a long time to acquire abilities to survive in more open settings" (Black, 1992, p. 88). This can be especially beneficial when psychotropic drugs are being introduced and there is potential for side effects that may alter an individual's state of reasoning. Many client workers are simply not ready to jump from being unemployed to competitive employment in one leap. This is especially true in the mentally disabled and developmentally disabled populations who often find even the smallest changes in routine extremely stressful.

Perhaps the need for sheltered workshops is best described by the President of the New York State Rehabilitation Association, Michael Fox, who wrote this in his editorial comments in the May 13, 2001 Syracuse Newspaper.

Sheltered workshops are one option available to people with disabilities—one of many offered by community providers of rehabilitation services. For those whose disabilities are severe enough to make imminent employment unlikely in a supported or competitive situation, it is a chance to learn job skills and earn a wage. It is their choice over unemployment—which, according to a recent Harris poll, is over 70 percent among people with disabilities. Quite simply, if you take away an opportunity for 16,000 people now working in sheltered workshops in New York State to earn a wage—and you swell the ranks of the unemployed. New York State must continue to expand community-based

employment for people with disabilities, but the "safety net" of sheltered employment must remain intact for those individuals who need and want it.

In the last two decades supported employment has become an increasingly positive option for individuals with a variety of disabilities and severity levels to promote independence and community and social integration.

Supported employment emerged to give persons with disabilities an opportunity to access employment options that had previously been unavailable to them. Through supported employment, individuals with severe disabilities are able to work in real businesses in the community with persons without disabilities, earn competitive wages, and receive individualized, ongoing support services to help them successfully maintain their employment.

(Parent & Kregel, Winter 1996, p. 207)

When looking at the research on supported employment it is easy to see why it is usually regarded as the optimum choice. Studies indicate that "on average, individuals with disabilities increase their annual earnings by up to 500% through participating in supported employment" (Kregel, July/August, 1997, p. 195). Supported employment agencies have worked with nearly 150,000 individuals with severe disabilities to successfully enter competitive employment.

Research also indicates that in the long run

Supported employment costs less than other day-support options for individuals with significant disabilities. The average cost of the time-limited component of a supported employment placement in the federal/state vocational rehabilitation program is \$4,000, with half of all placements costing less than \$3,000. Similarly, the costs of extended

services for supported employment participants are from 40% to 80% of the cost of other day-service options such as sheltered workshops or activity centers.

(Kregel, July/August, 1997, p. 195)

Supported employment began with the passage of the Developmental Disabilities Act of 1984 and was better defined and outlined by the amendments of the Rehabilitation Act of 1986. The federal definition of supported employment contains the following provisions.

1. The work for persons with severe disabilities is paid in accordance with the Fair Labor Standards Act.
2. The work is performed on a full-time or part-time basis and averages at least 20 hours per week for each pay period.
3. The work settings are integrated with coworkers who are not handicapped and have regular contact with the supported employees.
4. There is a limit of no more than eight individuals with disabilities who can be placed at any one-job site.
5. Ongoing support services are provided continuously or at least twice monthly at or away from the job site.
6. Transitional employment for individuals with mental illness can be provided on a time-limited basis when appropriate. (Lavin, 1990, p. 9-10)

For client-workers and their families one of the greatest benefits of supported employment is that it gives the individual a chance to integrate into the community through the process of work. It is a way to increase financial and social independence, but still have additional support when it is needed. The findings of one supported employment study conducted in the state of Virginia discovered "the lives of individuals with severe disabilities get

better once they receive supported employment services and enter the competitive labor force" (Parent & Kregel, Winter 1996, p. 215).

## CHAPTER THREE

This was a descriptive study with information gathered through a survey format with an instrument that was created by the investigator in order to better analyze the population of client-workers employed through county, state, or non-profit rehabilitation organizations.

The population for this investigation is made up of directors of either sheltered workshops or community supported employment components of the rehabilitation organizations. The 189 organizations that were selected for this study were randomly selected from the states of Minnesota and Wisconsin with the only criteria being that the facilities be either state, county, or non-profit funded and be composed of both a sheltered workshop and community supported employment program. The survey was sent to the directors/presidents of these organizations for he or she to fill out. No organizational identification techniques are in the survey, nor were there any questions/responses other than Likert and yes/no answers. There were no controls used in this study, nor were any directors or organizations identifiable by the investigator upon response to the survey. Directors were asked to estimate the persons with disabilities served by the agency, the types of disabilities, the severity of the disability, and employment data of those persons.

The instrument for gathering data was designed by the investigator based on research previously conducted on this subject as well as informational gaps that have been cited by the investigator as a current working professional in an organization similar to those that are the focus of this study. The survey consisted of three pages of questions regarding the current population of client-workers that are employed at the given facility.

The survey begins by asking general questions concerning the population of the organization including how many client/workers they currently serve, how many participate in

either sheltered employment, community supported employment, or a combination of both sheltered and community supported employment (See Appendix C for a copy of the survey instrument). The survey then separates the next section of questions by the client/workers disability diagnosis. Specific diagnoses include developmental delay, mental illness, traumatic brain injury, hearing impaired, visually impaired, and cerebral palsy. Under these diagnoses the survey asks the participant to: Answer the following employment questions for client/workers under the primary disability they are diagnosed with: (using a number value to represent the number of client/workers). The questions include the type of employment the client/worker is involved in and the number of years he/she has been employed. These questions are presented on a Likert scale ranging from 0-1 years, 1-3 years, and 3+ years of employment.

The final two sections of the survey are broken down by those client/workers employed primarily through sheltered employment versus community supported employment. Questions involve the severity of the disability, the average hours worked per week, the average hourly wage, and (for community supported employment) the amount of supervision that is needed/provided by a job coach.

The data for this study was collected by mailing the survey to 189 rehabilitation organizations located in the states of Minnesota and Wisconsin which engage in both sheltered and community supported employment services. These facilities were selected randomly from county, state, and non-profit funded programs. The survey, consent form, and a letter explaining the purpose of the research and the investigator's intentions with the information, as well as contact information for the investigator and the university were addressed to the directors/coordinators of the organizations. Enclosed with the three forms was a self-addressed stamped envelope that could be mailed back to the investigator upon completion of the survey.



A descriptive analysis was performed on the information provided by the organizations. The mean/average was calculated for the responses concerning the number of client/workers the organization serves, the number of client/workers representing sheltered, community supported employment, or a combination of both sheltered and community employment. The means for the average hourly rates, average hours worked per week, and the severity of disability classification between client workers in sheltered employment versus community supported employment were also calculated. A Chi Square was performed between the disability classifications regarding the type of employment the client/workers were engaged in to determine significant differences at a .05 level. This Chi Square and the calculations of means provided a foundation of information to help address the research questions proposed in this study.

As with all studies conducted there are some strengths and weaknesses in the investigation and the designed survey. The strengths involve the basic make-up of the survey in that it is designed in a straightforward manner that allows participants to fill it out in approximately ten minutes or less provided they have the necessary information concerning their organization. The investigator designed the survey so that the particular facilities' directors/supervisors and client/workers can not be identified in any way, this promotes accuracy of the information being reported. The data analysis of the information involves a Chi Square and the mean/averages that eliminates the risk of error that can be involved with more complex analysis.

The weaknesses in the methodology for this study involve the way in which information for the study is gathered. The survey relies on the self-recorded information provided by the directors/supervisors of the facilities. This type of information gathering can lead information to be skewed or exaggerated based on the "image" that the organization wants to represent.

Another weakness in this study is the limited geographic area and number of organizations that are involved. The investigator only focused on two states in the same geographic region. This could limit the generalizations that can be made regarding organizations in different parts of the country. The sample size of 189 and the return rate also make the survey less reliable.

This investigation although relatively small in stature may be very useful in providing preliminary information regarding how the population in rehabilitation organizations is employed. It opens the door for more in-depth studies involving the needs and roles that sheltered workshops and community supported employment play as dual partners in creating independent and successful individuals who have a "choice of vocational options at his/her disposal.

## CHAPTER FOUR

On hundred and eighty-nine surveys were sent to rehabilitation facilities in Wisconsin and Minnesota from a compilation of known facilities listed by the Research and Training Center at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. The survey was designed to address the research questions developed by the researcher that included: the disability classification and level of severity of the client-workers involved in supported and/or sheltered employment; the ratio between client-workers served through sheltered employment, supported employment, or a combination of both; the possible differences in work schedules and hourly wages to client-workers involved in supported employment versus sheltered employment; and the type of transition period that occurs for individuals moving from sheltered to supported employment. To answer these research questions the following questions were directed to the directors/coordinators of the rehabilitation facilities (see Appendix C).

As mentioned previously, the researcher mailed out a total of 189 surveys with a requested response period of two weeks. After three weeks, 25 surveys were returned. Of these 25, nineteen were completed. Six were returned with information indicating that the facility did not meet the specifications of the survey. An example of this was an independent living center and a facility providing only residential-care services. Below are the total responses the researchers received from the nineteen facilities that elected to participate in the study:

**Table I**  
**TOTAL CLIENTELE SERVED WITHIN THE FACILITY**

How many individuals with disabilities does your organization currently serve?	<b>1678</b>
How many participate in sheltered employment?	<b>1118</b>
Supported employment?	<b>244</b>
A combination of both sheltered and supportive?	<b>152</b>

The results of the survey indicate that 1678 individuals are currently being served within the 19 facilities. A total of 1118 of these individuals are employed through sheltered employment, 244 are employed through community supported employment, 152 individuals are employment through a combination of both sheltered and supported employment, and the remaining 164 individuals were not accounted for. One facility did indicate that they had individuals that were involved in “day activities” instead of vocational services.

**Table II**  
**PRIMARY EMPLOYMENT FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DEVELOPMENTAL DELAY**

Type of employment:

Community only	0-1 year	1-3 years	3+years
	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>
Part-time community only	<b>18</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>92</b>
Sheltered only	<b>28</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>641</b>
Part-time sheltered only	<b>4</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>31</b>
Combination of both sheltered and Community	<b>9</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>128</b>

Overwhelming, developmental delay was the primary diagnosis of the client-workers in the 19 rehabilitation facilities (1193 of 1678) who responded to the survey. Four client-workers worked in community employment only. Respondents indicated that 141 client-workers worked part-time in the community only, 750 worked in sheltered employment only, 47 worked part-time in sheltered employment only, and 151 worked in a combination of both sheltered and supported employment. Results indicate that the majority of client-workers have been employed for 3 or more years within the programs at the facility.

**Table III****PRIMARY EMPLOYMENT FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH MENTAL ILLNESS**

Type of employment:

	0-1 year	1-3 years	3+years
Community only	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Part-time community only	<b>3</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>11</b>
Sheltered only	<b>19</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>209</b>
Part-time sheltered only	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Combination of both sheltered and Community	<b>0</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8</b>

Two hundred and ninety-one of the 1678 client-workers were diagnosed with mental illness as their primary disability. Of these 291, the majority (209) have been working entirely in sheltered employment for three or more years. Twenty-six client-workers were employed part-time in the community only, and 12 worked in a combination of sheltered and supported employment.

**Table IV****PRIMARY EMPLOYMENT FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY**

Type of employment:

	0-1 year	1-3 years	3+years
Community only	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Part-time community only	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Sheltered only	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>17</b>
Part-time sheltered only	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Combination of both sheltered and Community	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>

Results indicate that 23 client-workers were reported as having a traumatic brain injury as his/her primary disability. Of these 23, 1 was employed through community supported employment only, 1 in part-time community only, 20 through sheltered employment only, and 1 through a combination of both sheltered and community supported employment. Nineteen of the client-workers had been employed for three years or more.

**Table V**  
**PRIMARY EMPLOYMENT FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE**  
**HEARING IMPAIRED**

Type of employment:

Community only	0-1 year	1-3 years	3+years
	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Part-time community only	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Sheltered only	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>15</b>
Part-time sheltered only	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Combination of both sheltered and Community	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>

Findings indicate that 20 client workers were described as having a hearing impairment as his/her primary disability. One was employed through community supported employment only, 18 were employment in sheltered employment only, one was in part-time sheltered only, and 3 were employed in a combination or both sheltered and community supported employment.

**Table VI**  
**PRIMARY EMPLOYMENT FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO ARE**  
**VISUALLY IMPAIRED**

Type of employment:

Community only	0-1 year	1-3 years	3+years
	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Part-time community only	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Sheltered only	<b>1</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>27</b>
Part-time sheltered only	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
Combination of both sheltered and Community	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>

As the table shows, 58 client-workers were described as having a visual impairment as his/her primary disability. The majority of these individuals (51) were working in sheltered employment only, with 27 client-workers employed there for 3 years or more. One individual had been working in the community only for over 3 years, and one had been part-time in the community

only for 3 or more years. Three client workers were employed part-time in sheltered only, and two worked a combination of both sheltered and community employment.

**Table VII**  
**PRIMARY EMPLOYMENT FOR INDIVIDUALS DIAGNOSED WITH CEREBRAL PALSY**

Type of employment:

Community only	0-1 year	1-3 years	3+years
	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Part-time community only	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Sheltered only	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>18</b>
Part-time sheltered only	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>
Combination of both sheltered and Community	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>

As reported, 32 client-workers were described with cerebral palsy as their primary diagnosis. Of these individuals, 27 were employed full or part-time in a sheltered employment setting. Five were employed through a combination of both sheltered and community supported employment.

**Table VIII**  
**SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT**

ESTIMATED PROPORTION (%) OF DISABILITY CLASSIFICATION OF CLIENT-WORKERS EMPLOYED THROUGH SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT

Disability classification is considered:	Mild	Moderate	Severe	Very Severe
	22%	51%	25%	2%

Response to this question represented 19 facilities and 341 client-workers. Of these 341 who were employed primarily through supported employment, 22% were considered mildly disabled, 51% were moderate, 25% severe, and 2% were diagnosed as very severely disabled. There were several limitations to this question. The researcher phrased the question by asking for those individuals who worked “primarily” in supported employment, yet some of the numbers recorded by the facilities represented individuals employed in supported employment and a

combination of both supported and sheltered work. There was also one incident in which information was recorded for supported employment, although the previous information stated by the facility indicated that they did not have any client-workers participating in supported employment. It is important to note that although 19 facilities participated in this survey, not all of them had both a sheltered and a supported employment component.

**TABLE IX**

**SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT**

**ESTIMATED PROPORTION (%) OF CLIENT-WORKERS' NEED OF A JOB COACH/SUPERVISION IN SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT**

Client-worker uses the supervision of a job coach	Works 100% independently	Part-time job coach	Sporadic job coach visits	100% supervision needed
	11%	32%	20%	37%

Of the 18 facilities that participated in this question, 320 client-workers were represented. Of these individuals, 11% worked completely independently, 32% had a part-time job coach, 20% had sporadic visits from a job coach, and 37% needed 100% supervision from a job coach.

**TABLE X**

**SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT**

**AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED BY INDIVIDUALS IN SUPPORTED EMPLOYEMENT**

Average hours worked per week	Under 10	10-19	20-29	30+
	42%	29%	25%	4%

In response to this question, 228 client-workers were represented. Of these 228, 42% worked ten hours or less per week, 29% worked 10-19 hours, 25% worked 20-29 hours, and 4% worked more than a 30 hour week at his/her place of employment.



**TABLE XI****SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT****AVERAGE HOURLY WAGES FOR INDIVIDUALS IN SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT**

Average hourly wage	Minimum wage	\$.25-.50 over minimum wage	\$.51-.75 over minimum wage	\$1.00 + over minimum wage
	51%	10%	11%	28%

In response to this question, 278 client-workers were represented. Of these 278, 51% were at minimum wage. There was a limitation to this question because the researcher did not have a response line for those individuals who were earning less than minimum wage. As a result, one facility responded that 64% of their individuals were at minimum wage or below. Another facility indicated that 80% of their client-workers were at an average hourly rate of \$3.50. Therefore this information would suggest that of the 51%, many were below this wage. For those client-workers earning above minimum wage, results indicate that 10% were \$.25 to .50 above, 11% were \$.51 to .75 above, and 28% were \$1.00 or more over the minimum wage.

**Table XII****SHELTERED EMPLOYMENT****ESTIMATED PROPORTION (%) OF DISABILITY CLASSIFICATION OF CLIENT-WORKERS EMPLOYED THROUGH SHELTERED EMPLOYMENT**

Disability classification is considered:	Mild	Moderate	Severe	Very Severe
	39%	20%	28%	13%

In response to this question, 746 client-workers were represented. Of these 39% were diagnosed as mildly disabled, 20% as moderately, 28% as severe, and 13% as very severely disabled. As discussed previously, of the 19 facilities represented, not everyone had a sheltered component to their facility.

**TABLE XIII****SHELTERED EMPLOYMENT****AVERAGE NUMBER OF HOURS WORKED BY INDIVIDUALS IN SHELTERED EMPLOYMENT**

Average hours worked per week	Under 10	10-19	20-29	30+
	16%	12%	24%	48%

In response to this question there were 1002 client-workers represented. Of these, 16% worked for ten or fewer hours per week, 12% worked for 10-19 hours, 24% worked for 20-29 hours, and 48% worked 30 or more hours per week.

**TABLE XIV****SHELTERED EMPLOYMENT****AVERAGE HOURLY WAGES FOR INDIVIDUALS IN SHELTERED EMPLOYMENT**

Average hourly wage	Minimum wage	\$.25-.50 over minimum wage	\$.51-.75 over minimum wage	\$1.00 + over minimum wage
---------------------	--------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------

A major limitation to this question involved not having a “piece-rate” represented. With the exception of one facility that responded to this question, the respondents indicated that their client-workers were paid on a piece-rated system and therefore the facility had a below-minimum wage certification. One facility indicated that their average hourly rate was at \$3.19 an hour based on a \$7.21 base rate. There was another facility that indicated that 56% were paid below minimum wage (at \$4.73 average hourly rate), 29% were @ minimum wage, and 15% were \$.25 or more over minimum wage. One facility responded that all 29 of their sheltered employees were paid at a wage of \$.51-.75 above minimum wage.

**Table XV**

**PROPORTION (%) OF CLIENT-WORKERS THAT TRANSITION FROM SHELTERED TO SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT EACH YEAR?**

0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
-------	--------	--------	---------

There were only 8 facilities that chose to respond to this question. Of those eight, seven indicated that 0-25% of their client-workers transitioned from sheltered to supported employment each year. The eighth facility responded that in 2002 they closed their workshop and now offer only supported employment services. Of the individuals that they were serving 80% are transitioning to supported employment and 20% are no longer participating in work services due to a stated desire not to work in the community by the individual, or his/her parent or guardian.

There were four research questions that were proposed in this study by the researcher. In response to the first research question: “What is the disability classification and level of severity of individuals involved in supported employment and sheltered workshops?” Responses generated by this survey indicate that 65% of the client-workers in these rehabilitation facilities were diagnosed as having a developmental delay, which was by far the largest diagnosis represented. Mental illness was reported as the second largest diagnosis at seventeen percent. Combined together, visual impairment, cerebral palsy, hearing impairment, and traumatic brain injury represented only 7% of the client-workers. There were 14% of the client-workers that were not represented by the specific diagnosis that were listed on the questionnaire. In terms of severity, the majority of facilities indicated that their client-workers were in the mild to moderate range. In supported employment client-worker percentages suggested that 22% were diagnosed as mild, 51% moderate, 25% severe, and less than 2% very severe. In sheltered employment 39% were described in the mild range, 20% in the moderate, 28% in the severe, and 13% in the

very severe. Not all of the 1678 client-workers in this study were represented in this question due to some individuals at the facilities not being involved in vocational services within the facility. One facility indicated that some of their clientele were involved in “day activities” rather than paid work.

In response to the second research question “What is the ratio between client-workers served through sheltered employment, supported employment, or a combination of both sheltered and supported employment?” Results indicated that of the 1678 client-workers represented, 67% were employed through sheltered employment. This was more than four times that of any other form of employment. The facilities indicated that 14% of client-workers were employed through supported employment, and 9% were employment through a combination of both supported and sheltered employment. Of the 1678 client-workers, 164 or 10% were not represented by any form of employment, participating in other services provided by the facilities. The response to this question suggests that the majority of individuals overwhelming utilized sheltered work services, however, this may be due to the particular facilities that responded to the survey and not an actual vocational trend. Due to a very small response to this survey it is difficult to make any broad statements related to the overall pattern of rehabilitation facilities in regards to sheltered versus supported employment.

In response to the third research question posed, “Are there differences in the work schedules, wages/paychecks, and benefits of client-workers involved in supported employment versus sheltered employment?” Results suggest that when comparing work schedules between client-workers in supported employment and client-workers in sheltered employment, workers in supported employment work fewer hours. Results indicate that 42% of supported employees worked 10 or less hours per week, whereas only 16% worked ten or fewer hours in sheltered

employment. In supported employment, the majority of workers worked under 29 hours a week, with only 4% working more than a 30 hour work week. In sheltered employment, the majority of workers worked at least 20 hours a week, with 48% working 30 plus hours per week.

When looking at the wages of client-workers involved in supported employment versus sheltered employment, supported employment finds more individuals at minimum wage or above. Of the given responses, 100% of client-workers were recorded as being at minimum wage or above, with 24% of client-workers earning \$1.00 or more over minimum wage. When responding to the question two facilities filled in the box for minimum wage, but indicated that this meant minimum wage or below. This suggests that there are some individuals who are earning below minimum wage, but exact numbers could not be determined in the results provided from this survey.

The final research question “What type of transition period occurs for individuals moving into competitive employment?” Was hard to determine due to the limited responses to the final question from facilities. For the facilities that did answer this question, responses indicated that 0-25% of client-workers transitioned from sheltered to supported employment each year. As indicated, one facility had 80% of their client-workers transition, but this was because they eliminated their sheltered workshop at the facility. Overall, of the facilities that participated in this survey, very few client-workers were transitioning into supportive employment. This suggests that many client-workers start immediately in supported or part-time supported employment, rather than transitioning into it.

The results of this survey, although very limited because of the survey response rate, did produce some unanticipated results with regards to the large number of individuals who are being served through a sheltered work-type setting. The directors/coordinators from the sampled

facilities in their responses also suggested that the face of the sheltered workshop is changing.

One individual stated,

We do not have any supported employment going on (at our facility). The main reason for that is because we have worked with a fortune 500 company for over 15 years.

During that time, we have evolved as a company that looks and acts like a manufacturing outfit. Therefore, we feel that this company runs much like a competitive work place.

Also, we are located in a very small town, where the employment opportunities are extremely seasonal and limited.

Also somewhat unanticipated were the limited number of hours client-workers worked per week in their supported employment jobs. From a very positive standpoint most of these individuals have been in their employment for three or more years and are earning minimum wage or above, however many, for unknown reasons, are working ten or fewer hours per week.

## CHAPTER FIVE

When looking at the broad spectrum of rehabilitation facilities based on the finding from this survey it suggests that when looking at the vocational options for individuals with a disability there may not be one “best” solution. Despite the increasing amount of professional literature published in some of the most prestigious rehabilitation journals that propose community employment is the best choice for all individuals with a disability, this survey suggests that this may not be the preferred choice or available opportunity for many individuals. The results also indicate that although it is rarely highlighted or discussed amongst the literature, sheltered employment is still a much utilized and potentially valuable vocational option.

Another possible explanation from these results may be that many individuals would like to transition from sheltered to supported employment but are unable to obtain services and are therefore spending significant periods of time in sheltered facilities. This conclusion may be supported by the results that indicate that many client-workers currently involved in supported employment work on a very limited schedule of less than part-time, with many working fewer than 10 hours per week. This suggests that in supported employment, especially in certain geographic locations, the jobs and hours are not available for client-workers.

Another alternative explanation for the results may involve the changing face of sheltered employment facilities. There is evidence that sheltered workshops are contracting better jobs and greater job variety than in the past, hence providing quality work with the added supports many client-workers, parents, and guardians feel are needed. It should also be taken into consideration that, although inclusion into the community is extremely important and desirable, relationships among ones peer group is also a major component that can be met at a sheltered facility. The facility is able to provide an environment where many client-workers are on the

same social and intellectual level as one another enabling strong friendships to form that are often different than those in the working community where coworkers often act more as “mentors” than friends.

The impact of conducting a study such as this one is very significant when looking at the field of rehabilitation as a whole. First, when focusing the survey on a specific type of rehabilitation facility, it becomes increasingly evident just how many different types of services are provided for individuals with disabilities and the numerous ways these facilities all operate to achieve a common goal of increasingly an individual’s independence, quality of living, vocational skills, and self-worth. With this information, however, it also makes it increasingly clear why it is so difficult to devise one survey, system, or instrument to study one specific aspect of rehabilitation when so many different techniques are being utilized.

In many ways this small-scaled survey asked a lot more questions than it was able to answer. It would be beneficial for future research to investigate the reasons why individuals remain in sheltered facilities for such long periods of time when numerous research such as that of Parent indicates “It’s (supported employment) growth and impact in the last decade have been phenomenal. From 1986 through 1993, the number of participants expanded from 10,000 to more than 105,000 persons with severe disabilities” (Parent, 1996, p. 207-208). It would be significant to discover what the social, vocational, and life-quality issues are that play such an important role in this choice. It would also be significant to look at how the disability diagnosis plays a role in this decision. For many years the research has pined one form of employment for individuals with disabilities against the other. This is highlighted by Miller in his article entitled “Sheltered workshops—Psychological aspects in which he wrote



Criticism about industrial workshop alternatives comes both from outside and within the field of blindness. *Getting Employed, Staying Employed: Job Development and Training for Persons with Severe Handicaps* (McLoughin, Garner, & Callahan, 1987), a publication that provides excellent strategies for job development and training, entitles the initial chapter “Sheltered Work Environment: A Dinosaur in our Midst?” The rest of the chapter makes it clear that this is not a question, but rather a point of view (Miller, 1993, p. 27).

It may be time in the field of vocational rehabilitation to look at how the various types of employment can work together to provide the greatest number of services for the greatest number of individuals.

As indicated throughout this research, there were several limitations in the surveying methods of this study. First, the very low return rate of less than 10% makes the results very limited in terms of their ability to be generalized in the field of vocational rehabilitation. One component of this issue was the list of rehabilitation facilities that was used from the Research and Training Center from the University of WI-Stout for the states of Minnesota and Wisconsin. The field of rehabilitation is very broad and the list of facilities is constantly changing and in need of updating. There were many problems with the mailing of the survey which involved being unable to differentiate what services the various facilities provided, to having outdated addresses or names of facilities that were no longer in operation.

A second limitation was various components of the surveying instrument. The survey failed to ask about those individuals who did not participate in vocational services at the facility despite asking for the total number of individuals served by the facility. This left a significant group of individuals who were not accounted for when adding up the results of the survey. A

second issue was the failure to recognize individuals who were earning less than minimum wage. It is common knowledge in the field of vocational rehabilitation that client-workers in facilities are often paid at a piece-rate, yet this was not an option when answering the question regarding wages earned per hour.

A third limitation was found in the way in which the instrument was used by the participants. Many of the surveys that were returned were filled out incorrectly with key words being missed that altered the data that was collected. For example, one survey question asked for numbers related to client-workers employed “primarily” by supported/sheltered employment. On several surveys this question was answered with numbers that included individuals who split their time between supported and sheltered employment, hence flawing the data collected. In future studies it would be beneficial to highlight key words that are important or reword questions to make them clearer to the average participant who will hurry through a survey and not reread questions.

With regards to future studies in this area, this researcher strongly feels that some of the best information may be gathered by more of an interview format. This would allow the researcher to learn more about the facilities participating in the survey and their special circumstances. It was very evident in this survey that most facilities did not fit neatly into either a supported and/or sheltered facility. It also appeared that many directors/coordinators wanted to discuss what his/her facility offered for services and how they functioned on a daily basis. This was made evident by the numerous facilities who gave up their anonymity to write in a sentence or paragraph describing their facility, the services they provide, the population they serve, and the progress they have made in serving their clients.

## REFERENCES

- Black, Berttam J. (1992, April). A kind word for sheltered work. *Psychosocial Rehabilitation Journal*, Volume 15, Issue 4, 87-91.
- Del Orto, A. E., & Marinelli, R. P. (Eds.) (1995). *Encyclopedia of Disability and Rehabilitation*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Eisenberg, M. G. (Eds.) (1995). *Dictionary of Rehabilitation*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.
- Hall, M. (2001, July 27). Sheltered workshops exploitive should be shut down. *The New York Post*, p. A9.
- Harles & Associates (2001). *2001 Federal Wage-Hour Guide for Service Providers to Persons with Disabilities*. Washington DC: Department of Labor.
- Hoffman, L. (2001, October-December). Production Highlights. In C. Hammer (Eds.) *What's Happening- A Quarterly Newsletter of St. Croix Industries* (p.3). New Richmond, WI: St. Croix Industries.
- Fox, M. (2001, May 13). Sheltered workshops serve disabled society. *Syracuse Herald American*, p. C10.
- Kregel, J. (1997, July/August). Supported employment. *Remedial and Special Education*, Volume 18, Issue 4, 194-197.
- Lavin, D. (1990). An Introduction to Supported Employment. In B. Depoint (Eds.) *A Hands-on Training Program for Supported Employment Personnel*. Grant Publication: Medtronic Foundation.
- Mergenhausen, P. (1997, July). Enabling disabled workers. *American Demographics*, Volume 19, Issue 7, 36-42.
- Miller, G. (1993, Spring). Expanding vocational options. *View*, Volume 25, Issue1, 27-31.
- Parent, W. & Kregel, J. (1996, Winter). Consumer satisfaction: A survey of individuals with severe disabilities who receive supported employment services. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities*, Volume 11, Issue 4, 207-222.
- West, M., Revell, G., & Wehman, P. (1998, September). Conversion from segregated services to supported employment: A continuing challenge to the vocational rehabilitation service system. *Education and Training in Mental Rehabilitation and Developmental Disability*, Volume 33, Number 3, 239-247.

Whitehead, C.W. (1987, July/August/September). Supported employment: Challenge and opportunity for sheltered workshops. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 23-28.

Whittaker, W. G. (2001, September, 14<sup>th</sup>). Treatment of Workers with Disabilities Under Section 14(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act. CRS Report for Congress. Congressional Research Service: Library of Congress.

## CONSENT FORM

I understand that by returning the/this questionnaire, I am giving my informed consent as a participating volunteer in this study. I understand the basic nature of the study and agree that any potential risks are exceedingly small. I also understand the potential benefits that might be realized from the successful completion of this study. I am aware that the information is being sought in a specific manner so that only minimal identifiers are necessary and so that confidentiality is guaranteed. I realize that I have the right to refuse to participate and that my right to withdraw from participation at any time during the study will be respected with no coercion or prejudice.

NOTE: Questions or concerns about the research study should be addressed to Jamie Cox at (715)247.2271, the researcher, or Dr. Robert Peters at the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation-University of Wisconsin-Stout (715)232.1983, the research advisor. Questions about the rights of research subjects can be addressed to Sue Foxwell, Human Protections Administrator, UW-Stout Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research, 11 Harvey Hall, Menomonie, WI, 54751, phone (715)232.1126.

Dear Potential Survey Participant:

My name is Jamie Cox and I am currently a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin-Stout. I am working on my Plan B Thesis, the last requirement to earn my Master's Degree in Vocational Rehabilitation. I am conducting a survey that will look at the population of individuals that work in rehabilitation facilities in Minnesota and Wisconsin. This is a comparison study that will look at those individuals served through sheltered workshops, supported community employment, or a combination of both. I am studying the population of individuals that are served by each program in relation to the type of severity of disability the person has been diagnosed with, the schedule they work, and the average hourly rate he/she is earning. The purpose of this study is to have a better understanding of the how individuals with disabilities are being served in rehabilitation facilities.

Information gathered in this survey will be confidential. There are no means by which your organization will be identifiable if you choose to participate in this survey. If you choose not to participate, simply discard the survey. If you choose to participate, fill out the information and return the survey using the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope.

If you have any questions regarding this survey, the investigator, or the information being gathered feel free to contact me, Jamie Cox- researcher, at (715) 247.2273 or my thesis advisor, Dr. Robert Peters, at the University of Wisconsin-Stout (715) 232.1983.

If you choose to participate in this survey, please respond within two weeks.

Thank you very much for your time in assisting me in fulfilling my Master's Degree requirements.

Sincerely,

Jamie E. Cox

# Questionnaire for Facilities serving Clients in Sheltered Work and Supportive Employment Programs

1. How many individuals with disabilities does your organization currently serve? \_\_\_\_\_  
 How many participate in sheltered employment? \_\_\_\_\_  
   Supported employment? \_\_\_\_\_  
 A combination of both sheltered and supportive? \_\_\_\_\_

**PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING EMPLOYMENT QUESTIONS FOR CLIENT/WORKERS UNDER THE PRIMARY DISABILITY THEY ARE DIAGNOSED WITH:  
 (USE A NUMBER VALUE TO REPRESENT THE # OF WORKERS )**

**DEVELOPMENTAL DELAY**

Type of employment:

Community only	0-1 years	1-3 years	3+years
Part-time community only			
Sheltered only			
Part-time sheltered only			
Combination of both sheltered and Community			

**MENTAL ILLNESS**

Type of employment:

Community only	0-1 years	1-3 years	3+years
Part-time community only			
Sheltered only			
Part-time sheltered only			
Combination of both sheltered and Community			

**TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY**

Type of employment:

Community only	0-1 years	1-3 years	3+years
Part-time community only			
Sheltered only			
Part-time sheltered only			
Combination of both sheltered and Community			

**HEARING IMPAIRED**

Type of employment:

Community only	0-1 years	1-3 years	3+years
Part-time community only			
Sheltered only			
Part-time sheltered only			
Combination of both sheltered and Community			

**VISUALLY IMPAIRED**

Type of employment:

Community only	0-1 years	1-3 years	3+years
Part-time community only			
Sheltered only			
Part-time sheltered only			
Combination of both sheltered and Community			

**CEREBRAL PALSY**

Type of employment:

Community only	0-1 years	1-3 years	3+years
Part-time community only			
Sheltered only			
Part-time sheltered only			
Combination of both sheltered and Community			

PLEASE ESTIMATE THE PROPORTION (%) FOR EACH CATEGORY THAT BEST REPRESENTS THE CLIENT-WORKER EMPLOYED THROUGH SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT

1.

Disability classification is considered:	Mild	Moderate	Severe	Very Severe
--	------	----------	--------	-------------



2.

Client-worker uses the supervision of a job coach	Works 100% independently	Parttime job coach	Sporatic job coach visits	100% supervision needed
---	--------------------------	--------------------	---------------------------	-------------------------

3.

Average hours worked per week	Under 10	10-19	20-29	30+
-------------------------------	----------	-------	-------	-----

4.

Average hourly wage	Minimum wage	\$.25-.50 over minimum wage	\$.51-.75 over minimum wage	\$1.00 + over minimum wage
---------------------	--------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------

PLEASE ESTIMATE THE PROPORTION (%) FOR EACH CATEGORY BOX THAT BEST REPRESENTS THE CLIENT-WORKERS EMPLOYED THROUGH SHELTERED EMPLOYMENT

1.

Disability classification is considered:	Mild	Moderate	Severe	Very Severe
--	------	----------	--------	-------------

2.

Average hours worked per week	Under 10	10-19	20-29	30+
-------------------------------	----------	-------	-------	-----

3.

Average hourly wage	Minimum wage	\$.25-.50 over minimum wage	\$.51-.75 over minimum wage	\$1.00 + over minimum wage
---------------------	--------------	-----------------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------------

4. WHAT PROPORTION (%) OF CONSUMER/CLIENTS TRANSITION FROM SHELTERED TO SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT EACH YEAR?

0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
-------	--------	--------	---------