**Blueprint**

**Recommendation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation Title:** | Employment Package |
| **Sub-Committee** | Work Services |
| **Recommendation #** | Identification Number |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Function/Service** | **Statutory / Rule Change Ohio Revised Code Cite** | **Driver Impact** | **Priority Status H=High, M=Medium, L=Low** |
| Career Planning | Services for job seekers to prepare for and obtain competitive employment. | [OAC 5123-9-13](https://dodd.ohio.gov/wps/portal/gov/dodd/waivers-and-services/services/career-planning/!ut/p/z1/04_Sj9CPykssy0xPLMnMz0vMAfIjo8zi_SzdHQ0NvQ383H383QwCgwN93cLMzYy9PI31w7Eq8Db1dDEJMA0INdOPIka_AQ7gaEBIvxchBUAfGBX5Ovum60cVJJZk6GbmpeXrRxSnFpVlJqcW60ckJxalphbpFuQk5uVl5qUDHRSF1UhkL4EV4HFzQW5oRJWPh0Gmo6IiAFSxu-w!/?1dmy&urile=wcm%3apath%3a%2Fohio%2Bcontent%2Benglish%2Fdodd%2Fforms-and-rules%2Frules-in-effect%2F5123-9-13) – Career Planning  [OAC 5123:2-2-05](https://dodd.ohio.gov/wps/portal/gov/dodd/waivers-and-services/services/career-planning/!ut/p/z1/04_Sj9CPykssy0xPLMnMz0vMAfIjo8zi_SzdHQ0NvQ383H383QwCgwN93cLMzYy9PI31w7Eq8Db1dDEJMA0INdOPIka_AQ7gaEBIvxchBUAfGBX5Ovum60cVJJZk6GbmpeXrRxSnFpVlJqcW60ckJxalphbpFuQk5uVl5qUDHRSF1UhkL4EV4HFzQW5oRJWPh0Gmo6IiAFSxu-w!/?1dmy&urile=wcm%3apath%3a%2Fohio%2Bcontent%2Benglish%2Fdodd%2Fforms-and-rules%2Frules-in-effect%2F5123_2-2-05) Employment First | 1,2,6,7 | M |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key Finding** | Career Planning services, language and reimbursement model is cumbersome and overly complicated for teams to work through.  Career Planning services need to be simplified to help jobseekers access waiver-funded career development services. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation Proposal** | * Change the title of Career Planning services to be the Employment Package, consisting of the former services organized under Career Planning, including Discovery, Career Exploration, Employment/Self Employment Plan, Self-Employment Launch, Situational Observation and Assessment and Job Development. * Simplified, uniform reimbursement rate for all pre-employment supports listed above at 1:1 reimbursement rate. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rationale for Change** | The rationale for this change is to address several issues in the Blueprint charter including;   * Full compliance with the Home and Community-Based Services Rules. * Substantially increased capacity of private providers to deliver community-based day and employment services. * Fully operationalized the Transition Framework and Vision, substantially increasing employment outcomes for transition youth. * Achieve at least 50% community/competitive employment   at on average 20 hours/week paying minimum wage or higher with the understanding that some will work more and others will work less that the average. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Concisely bullet the recommendation’s positives/upside & negative/downside or list critical questions to debate** | **Pros** | * Streamlining and combining multiple different services previously under career planning. * Prevent multiple authorizations of different CP services. * Incentivize community employment placement and retention. |
| **Cons** | * Move away from outcome-based Discovery, which may have been helpful for providers. * Services still possibly competing with other adult services in individual budgets. * Need for robust system and provider training and education. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Fiscal Implications** | -New rate methodology will need analyzed for potential impact.  -Increase in service delivery will lead to more funding in short term.  -Achievement of employment and independence will lead to system savings in long term.  -Training, education of system partners including providers, SSAs, DODD compliance, etc.  -DODD IT systems will need to be updated for EP services.  -Increased flexibility should lead to decreased administrative burden and activity.  -Employment Rate Structure should not compete with other day array services. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Measure of Success** | -System sees ‘output’ of increased use of Employment Package over Career Planning services.  -System sees ‘outcome’ of increased employment placements for jobseekers.  -Ultimate ‘success’ of 50% employment as measured through the Outcome Tracking System.  -‘Output’ of better relationships between team partners.  -Increased satisfaction of job seekers and their families. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Implementation Tip** | -Shared training on service updates for providers and County Boards.  -Thorough materials/resources for jobseekers and families developed.  -Development of Employment Package service ‘calculator’ to help with informed decision making.  -Provide regional experts/training/and technical assistance to all stakeholders to move system forward. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Note / Reference Material** | -Improve skill level of staff providing employment services through competency based training. Competencies listed are based on ACRE and CESP certification and are attached. |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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.* | |
| X | 1. Does the recommendation address one or more of the identified system change drivers? |
| X | 1. Does the recommendation improve the client experience? Lead to better outcomes for people? |
| X | 1. Does the recommendation advance the delivery of better services for work, non-work or transportation? |
| X | 1. Does the recommendation advance community employment? |
| X | 1. Does the recommendation facilitate serving more clients? Reducing waiting lists? |
| X | 1. Does the recommendation reduce administrative burden? Simplify? |
| X | 1. Does the recommendation unify or standardize approaches across State agencies? County Boards? Multiple providers or settings? |
| X | 1. Does the recommendation represent a modern approach? Embrace technology? |
| X | 1. Is the recommendation affordable – an efficient and effective use of limited resources? |
| X | 1. Does the benefit of the recommendation balance with the cost of implementation/ongoing capacity? |
| X | 1. Does the recommendation help the system serve individual with more severe disabilities or who have medically complex issues? |
| X | 1. Does the recommendation deliver public value? Would most taxpayers feel this recommendation is worthy of the taxpayer’s time, money and trust? |
| X | 1. Does the recommendation move the system toward quality, dependable, equitable service regardless of where an individual lives in Ohio? |
| X | 1. Does the recommendation address racial bias? |
| X | 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.