Supported Employment Outcomes for the State of Ohio

June 28, 2012

= Ohio Average: 36% (as of 9/2011).
Range = 7% to 100%

= JJ average (for sites implementing Supported Employment in 13 states): 37% (as of 9/2011)
Range = 18% to 51%

Please see next page for additional information…
Supported Employment Outcomes for the State of Ohio

This information is based on the numbers that you submit directly to the Center for Evidence-Based Practices (CEBP).

- Each letter on this graph represents a unique organization in Ohio that is implementing Evidence-Based Supported Employment (SE); individual sites will likely know which letter corresponds to their organization based on their employment ratings during the identified time period.

- This graph reflects the percentage of people employed on the SE team in the fall and winter quarters of 2011 (July-September 2011 and October-December 2011). These are arranged from smallest to greatest number of people employed at each organization, with the last three organizations appearing at the far-right because only one quarter of data was available.

- The solid line is the average for the 23 Ohio sites shown here, which is 36% (as of 9/2011).

- The dashed line is the average number of people employed on SE teams reported for the sites participating in the Johnson & Johnson Dartmouth Community Mental Health Program, (a total of 13 states) which is 37% (as of 9/2011).

While a graph, by design, lends itself easily to comparison, the CEBP would like to caution you that there are several limitations to conclusions that might be drawn about the outcomes shown here. Additional context must be considered.*

- Differences between sites such as caseload size, definition (of when someone is ‘open’ in SE), and composition (of people at various phases in the service) should be noted. For example, one of the sites on this graph that exceeds a 90% employment rate is serving a total of 4 people on their SE team.

- Organizational transition in areas such as leadership, staff, policy, and technology to name a few may also be a factor in the quarterly outcomes achieved.

- State-level changes effecting SE, such as available funding streams and mechanisms, can additionally influence outcomes from one quarter to the next.

*Based upon your experiences in implementation and service provision, you may know of other possible contextual explanations [or interpretations]. The CEBP welcomes these ideas in the process of refining data analysis efforts.

We also encourage you to share your thoughts about alternate or additional information that would be helpful for us to present to you.

Thank you!
**Employment Rate:**  
(Number of People Employed divided by the Number of People on SE Team)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Lowest: 7%</td>
<td>Lowest: 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest: 100%</td>
<td>Highest: 75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**
- Half of the sites had employment rates greater than 35% (for July-Sept.) and greater than 21% (for Oct-Dec)
- 13 Teams reported lower employment rates for the Oct-Dec quarter compared to July-Sept (of the 19 Teams that reported both quarters)

**Team Size:** (Number of people on the SE team)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Lowest: 1</td>
<td>Lowest: 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest: 141</td>
<td>Highest: 163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Caseload Size:**  
(Number of People on SE Team divided by the Number of Employment Specialists (FTEs))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>24 per ES</td>
<td>21 per ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Lowest: 3 per ES</td>
<td>Lowest: 4 per ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest: 50 per ES</td>
<td>Highest: 46 per ES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>