**Blueprint**

**Recommendation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation Title:** | Places on the Path Revisited |
| **Sub-Committee** | ADS Non-Work |
| **Recommendation #** | Identification Number |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Function/Service** | **Statutory / Rule Change Ohio Revised Code Cite** | **Driver Impact** | **Priority Status H=High, M=Medium, L=Low** |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key Finding** | All four of the “Paths to Employment” talk about employment ONLY, which makes the planning process less person-centered. The places on the Path need to relate more to a person’s current situation, as opposed to only employment. Path 4 is especially confusing. What exactly does it mean? “I don’t think I want to work but I may not know enough about it?” What if you *do* know you don’t want to work? And you want to explore and discover other possibilities? It’s difficult to develop possible outcomes for the possibility to be communicated and for the team to plan properly. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation Proposal** | We recommend revising the places on the Path to Employment to include a place that signifies the choice not to work, will make planning more honest and effective, and will help people being supported and their teams to develop better outcomes outside of “supported employment.” Place 4 on the current Path to Employment should be: “I don’t want to work in the community but need help in discovering other ways to contribute and be a part of my community.” |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rationale for Change** | The intent supporting this recommendation is to support better planning and service provision by honing in on real choices and outcomes based on those choices, specifically referencing System Driver 2, “The system needs to help individuals lead a fulfilled life with flexible, quality supports. This includes individual choices and control.” |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Concisely bullet the recommendation’s positives/upside & negative/downside or list critical questions to debate** | **Pros** | * More honest planning, with an emphasis on what people truly are interested in * Specific to many people’s visions of their futures * Opens up the conversation to more ideas and opportunities outside of “employment” |
| **Cons** | * Allows teams a “way out of” discussing one of the most important aspects of being an adult: most people must work to have lives * May allow for less intensive planning around “informed choice” * May make it easier to NOT have involved conversations |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fiscal Implications** | No financial implication. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Measure of Success** | More impactful and beneficial outcomes related to community membership. Part of this change to Place 4 is an indication that ADS Non-Work supports are not just about “not working,” but figuring out what it means not to work and still accessing the community and connecting in a way each person chooses to. A measure of success would be Ads Non-Work providers developing capabilities and capacities to support community integration because we now are focused on each person’s chosen outcomes. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Implementation Tip** | A major part of this revision to the Places on the Path to Community Employment is the recognition that people sometimes choose not to work, but that doesn’t mean they are choosing to isolate/segregate themselves. So the main implementation tip would be to develop more meaningful ADS Non-Work supports and the capacity of providers who deliver these services. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Note / Reference Material** | Things to think about:   * What if people who say they “don’t want to work” change their minds? * How do we currently plan for people who don’t want to work? * Should we discriminate against people who choose not to work? If so, why? |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Projected Implementation** | | | | |
| **2021** | **2022** | **2023** | **2024** | **Dependency / Sequencing Factor** |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Threshold Question Check** | |
| *Please vet the recommendation against these questions. Please check the left-hand column if the answer is “yes, this recommendation addresses this question.” While few recommendations will meet all threshold points, it is important to ensure that the recommendation is appropriately aligned with consensus system change drivers and advancing the vision.* | |
|  | 1. Does the recommendation address one or more of the identified system change drivers? |
|  | 1. Does the recommendation improve the client experience? Lead to better outcomes for people? |
|  | 1. Does the recommendation advance the delivery of better services for work, non-work or transportation? |
|  | 1. Does the recommendation advance community employment? |
|  | 1. Does the recommendation facilitate serving more clients? Reducing waiting lists? |
|  | 1. Does the recommendation reduce administrative burden? Simplify? |
|  | 1. Does the recommendation unify or standardize approaches across State agencies? County Boards? Multiple providers or settings? |
|  | 1. Does the recommendation represent a modern approach? Embrace technology? |
|  | 1. Is the recommendation affordable – an efficient and effective use of limited resources? |
|  | 1. Does the benefit of the recommendation balance with the cost of implementation/ongoing capacity? |
|  | 1. Does the recommendation help the system serve individual with more severe disabilities or who have medically complex issues? |
|  | 1. Does the recommendation deliver public value? Would most taxpayers feel this recommendation is worthy of the taxpayer’s time, money and trust? |
|  | 1. Does the recommendation move the system toward quality, dependable, equitable service regardless of where an individual lives in Ohio? |
|  | 1. Does the recommendation address racial bias? |
|  | 1. Is this recommendation “necessary to meet the charge” and not just “nice to have”? |

**Instructions:**

Each sub-committee will fill out completely one Blueprint Recommendation Form for each recommendation. Be concise. Report what is needed for the full membership to understand the context of the recommendation, the recommendation itself, and how the recommendation can impact expected outcomes.