**Blueprint**

**Recommendation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation Title:** | Incentivized Service Array |
| **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** |
| Voc Hab, BEST, Group Employment, Benefits Analysis, Integrated Employment Supports | Pre-vocational, Supported Employment and Competitive Integrated Employment supports that incentivize a job seeker and their provider to help advance on the path to employment. |  | 1,2,3,5,6,7 | H |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Key Finding** | -Our current service and reimbursement structure does not incentivize or fully support jobseekers and providers to help people progress towards competitive, integrated employment.  -Reimbursement system for Group Employment and Individual Employment Supports are not structured to support more integrated employment options.  -Community employment and workforce development services require more intense staffing ratios, individualized services and staff expertise to help jobseekers gain and keep employment. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 Rule. * 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 (20 hours/week, minimum wage or higher). * Implement outcome-based payments (informed by real data) for employment services. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Concisely bullet the recommendation’s positives/upside & negative/downside or list critical questions to debate** | **Pros** | * Right-size’ of employment services to reflect the staff intensity, experience and needed incentives to help people progress. * Employment support options to meet people ‘where they are at’ on their path to employment. * Outcome-based payments that increase employment placements and retention. |
| **Cons** | * Services still possibly competing with other adult services in individual budgets. * Possibilities for people to get ‘stuck’ in services. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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, especially for outcome/milestone payments.  -Increased flexibility should lead to decreased administrative burden and activity. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Measure of Success** | -System sees ‘output’ of increased use of BEST and IES supports over ‘traditional’ services.  -System sees ‘outcome’ of increased employment placements for jobseekers.  -Increased system knowledge and capacity of quality employment service providers.  -Ultimate ‘success’ of 50% employment.  -‘Output’ of better relationships between team partners.  -Increased satisfaction of job seekers and their families.  -Increase in ‘career’ retention for people with DD. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Implementation Tip** | -Shared training on service updates for providers and CBs.  -Thorough materials/resources for jobseekers and families developed.  -Emphasis must be made to ensure stakeholders understand these services are not linear. You can move through and among the services at any time based on what services are needed to assist the person to progress towards their outcome. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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 | 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.