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Executive Summary

The State of Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), the State Rehabilitation Council (SRC) and the Interwork Institute at San Diego District University jointly conducted an assessment of the vocational rehabilitation needs of persons with disabilities residing in the State of Idaho. The purpose of the assessment was to provide planners with information pertinent to the allocation of resources, to inform changes to IDVR’s Combined State Plan for fiscal years 2016-2020, and to comply with the needs assessment mandate in the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended.

The process that was developed for conducting the needs assessment involved four primary data-gathering approaches:

- Electronic surveys conducted with four stakeholder groups (individuals with disabilities, representatives of organizations that provide services to persons with disabilities, businesses, and IDVR staff) and hard copy surveys with a random sample of former, and current consumers in Idaho;
- Focus groups conducted with three stakeholder groups (individuals with disabilities, representatives of organizations that provide services to persons with disabilities, and IDVR staff);
- Key informant interviews conducted with individuals with disabilities, IDVR staff, individuals identified as knowledgeable about the needs of individuals with disabilities in Idaho, and businesses;
- Analysis of a variety of existing demographic and case service data relevant to individuals with disabilities.

Through the data collection efforts, researchers solicited information from four primary stakeholder groups: (a) former, current or potential consumers located throughout Idaho; (b) community partners (i.e., the SRC, educational institutions,) and representatives of organizations that provide services to individuals who are potential or actual consumers of IDVR; (c) IDVR staff; and (d) representatives of businesses operating in Idaho.

The approach was designed to capture input from a variety of perspectives to acquire a sense of the multi-faceted needs of persons with disabilities in Idaho. Efforts were made to gather information pertinent to the following seven main categories:
1. General agency performance;
2. Barriers to employment and accessing services for individuals with the most significant disabilities, including their need for supported employment;
3. Needs of individuals with disabilities from different ethnic groups, including needs of individuals who may have been unserved or underserved by the VR program;
4. Needs of individuals with disabilities served through other components of the statewide workforce development system;
5. Needs of youth with disabilities in transition;
6. Need to establish, develop or improve community rehabilitation programs (CRPs) that serve individuals with disabilities in Idaho;
7. Business relations and services, including IDVR’s ability to meet the needs of businesses in Idaho regarding recruiting, hiring, accommodating and retaining employees with disabilities.

The following summary highlights the results of the most commonly cited needs and themes derived from the surveys, focus groups, and key informant interviews in the seven main areas of investigation.

**Overview**

The overall results from this CSNA point to an agency that is deeply committed to serving all segments of its consumer population. As with most VR agencies in the country, IDVR has experienced dramatic increases in the percentages of individuals with mental health issues. The Division has also increased its level of involvement with other agencies. With the 2014 passage of The Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), IDVR has taken significant and strategic steps to implement the requirements and intent of the law and subsequent regulations. IDVR’s implementation of Pre-Employment Transition Services (Pre-ETS) has created a fundamental shift in the relationship between the agency and the school system. IDVR has developed a model approach to implementation of Section 511 and will be piloting a Customized Employment program that serves both students and youth.

As with all state VR agencies in the country, WIOA has posed challenges for IDVR at both the administrative and direct service level. New data requirements have increased the data entry requirements for counselors, further diverting them from engaging with the community and
providing in-depth guidance and counseling. On the administrative side, the Division has a small cadre of staff responsible for implementing several key components of WIOA. IDVR is currently revamping its Supported Employment policy to align with WIOA requirements.

IDVR was a key part of a cross-workforce agency team that wrote the Combined State Plan. The Division continues to be actively engaged with partners in integrating VR into the workforce system. IDVR is active on the State Workforce Development Board. The Administrator of the Division is the One-Stop Subcommittee chair.

A prevalent issue with IDVR is the Division’s relationship between the agency and Idaho’s Community Rehabilitation Programs (CRPs). There are currently around 32 CRPs in 40 locations in Idaho. Key informants feel there is an adequate number of CRPs but question the level of the quality of services and in some cases the professionalism of staff. High turnover significantly impacts the quality and consistency of services. Other informants indicate a need for more effective communication between IDVR and CRPs.

IDVR faces many new challenges in meeting the needs of an increasingly diverse population in Idaho. At the same time, historic challenges continue such as serving individuals in rural areas and transportation systems that create significant barriers statewide for individuals with disabilities accessing employment and agency services. These challenges impact many facets of life in Idaho, beyond vocational rehabilitation. They impact employment, education, access to community services and general quality of life. Addressing these issues will require effort from a community of diverse entities with a stake in the welfare of Idahoans. Because these issues heavily impact VR, IDVR is rightfully engaged in these efforts.

Serving a state with a sizeable rural area (Idaho is comprised of 44 counties – seven urban and 37 rural – as classified by the Idaho Department of Labor) is a commonly expressed barrier to accessing services and employment. Forty-two percent of Idahoans live in rural communities. (For a concise overview of Idaho’s rural/urban composition see: https://idaholabor.wordpress.com/2017/01/18/defining-rural-idaho-presents-challenges/).
Regarding education in rural communities, a 2014 report by the Rural School and Community Trust states (see http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED556045.pdf) “Growth in rural school enrollment continues to outpace non-rural enrollment growth in the United States, and rural schools continue to grow more complex with increasing rates of poverty, diversity, and students with special needs.”

Overwhelmingly, transportation is the major barrier to employment and accessing services. Also listed were low family involvement and low expectations, accessibility of One-Stop services, access to job training, lack of education and lack of job search skills. The Idaho Policy Institute published a paper entitled “2016 Assessment of Idaho’s Transportation Infrastructure and Funding” (see Appendix D). A conclusion of this paper is as follows: “Finally, one of the main challenges for Idaho, aside from the actual financial shortfall dilemma, is helping the citizenry recognize transportation infrastructure funding is a major problem. Recent surveys statewide and in the Treasure Valley have identified jobs, the economy and education as the main issues facing Idaho. Those surveys also noted those issues as the top priorities that the Idaho legislature should address. Transportation barely registered on either of these scales. However, jobs, economy, and education are inexorably linked to transportation and the infrastructure needed to support them. As Idaho 2020 considers the alternatives listed in this report, we recommend that at least part of the effort be devoted to informing the public on the state of Idaho’s transportation system, and how transportation and jobs work together to make Idaho’s economy strong.”

According to the Idaho Business Review (http://idahobusinessreview.com/2017/02/10/2-boise-struggles-with-limited-public-transit-options/): “The bus routes [in Boise] themselves are largely baffling, in no way decipherable without a map. If the routes don’t turn away potential riders, the fact that buses stop running before 7 p.m. rules out a large segment of the service sector that works later into the evening.”

Regarding transportation in rural areas, a 2015 study by a national transportation research group concluded (see http://www.tripnet.org/docs/Rural_Roads_TRIP_Report_May_2015.pdf) “The nation’s rural transportation system, particularly its roads and bridges, faces significant challenges. The rural transportation network carries
increasing levels of traffic, fails to provide adequate connectivity for many communities, has significant deficiencies and has significantly higher rates of serious traffic crashes than other roads. …The potential for additional economic growth in many rural areas is being impeded by the failure to significantly modernize the nation’s rural transportation system and provide for adequate connectivity. This lack of connectivity is preventing economic growth and reducing quality of life for rural residents.”

The number of individuals with mental health disabilities are trending upward as a percentage on caseloads. In addition, the increase in individuals with criminal backgrounds are presenting significant job placement challenges. IDVR has wisely chosen to engage agency partners to blend and braid services to both these populations. The Division also recognizes the need for and challenges of providing long term supports to individuals with the most significant disabilities. A 2015 gap analysis conducted by the Idaho Regional Mental Health Board (see Appendix E) reached many of the same conclusions mentioned in this CSNA. Prominent issues include lack of resources in rural communities and lack of adequate transportation.

Accessing the Internet, particularly in rural areas, was another common theme. According to the Idaho Department of Labor (see https://idaholabor.wordpress.com/2017/04/13/demographics-contribute-to-idahos-digital-divide/) “With lower income, education and an aging demographic, it is no surprise that computer ownership rates are lower and internet infrastructure is slower to develop in rural Idaho…In Idaho, despite the growth of information and communications technology, there still remains notable geographic variation in physical access across the state. For example, Latah County in northern Idaho, home of the University of Idaho, has the largest percentage of its population (close to 70 percent) using high-speed internet at home while in counties like Lincoln County, less than half of the population have access to high-speed internet.”

Overall, IDVR is diligent in addressing the issues confronting the agency as well as strategically looking at potential. This agency takes a data driven and strategic approach to service delivery. The Division relies heavily on its Program Evaluation Unit for support and policy development. This agency actively seeks partnerships in addressing long-standing and emerging issues. If populations in Idaho can be said to be underserved it is due to the complexity of issues and resources needed to adequately serve
them. IDVR is heavily invested and active in the workforce system, the Division maintains a positive and productive relationship with the state legislature, and IDVR is creating programs that are national models that will meet the needs of individuals with the most significant disabilities.
The following is a summary, by section, of the highlights of informant interviews, surveys and a review of agency data.

**Section One: General Agency Performance**

There are several factors that could potentially impact the performance of IDVR:

- IDVR regional managers’ perception is that VR is too cumbersome and that counselors are ‘crushed by paperwork requirements.’ Managers would like to see a more streamlined VR process.
- Meeting the Pre-ETS 15 percent reserve requirements are placing budgetary stress on services to other segments of the customer population.
- Travel time to visit consumers in rural areas is ‘excessive’ presenting a major challenge providing in-depth services.
- The perception of managers is that VR is a complex process with more ‘players’ [community, agency and workforce partners] than ever before.
- Because of the ‘paperwork’ and data-entry requirements counselors have little time for guidance and counseling and community/business engagement.
- There are ‘soft caps’ for counselors in the hours of services they can authorize.
- In the last year of RSA’s Standards and Indicators, IDVR met all standards and has positioned itself to meet the new Common Performance Measures under WIOA.
- IDVR has improved its performance in time from application to eligibility determination and from eligibility determination plan development.
- The Division expends over $2000 per case for cases that are closed unsuccessfully. This is an opportunity to explore ways of reducing unsuccessful closures freeing funds for more productive outcomes.
- The number of referrals from Workforce partners significantly increased in 2016.
Section Two: Barriers to Employment and Accessing Services

The following are listed as barriers to employment and accessing agency services:

- Transportation is widely viewed as the most significant barrier to employment and accessing services. Transportation, even in the urban Boise area, is perceived to be not reliable or affordable. Para-transit options are limited as well. As a result, individuals with disabilities in Idaho have limited access to training and other community services. Public transportation in rural Idaho is virtually non-existent. The accessibility of alternative transportation options such as Uber and Lyft is an issue.

- Online applications present a significant barrier to accessing employment opportunities for individuals with disabilities.

- Low expectations of individuals and families for employment.

- Work disincentives [SSI/SSDI] associated with the pursuit of work was frequently mentioned as a barrier to pursuing employment.

- Especially in rural areas, access to the Internet is a barrier to accessing community services and investigating employment options. Lack of Internet access also limits self-employment options that are often a viable employment option for individuals living in rural locales.

- Any individual with a ‘glitch’ in availability to work such as child care, medical care or transportation has difficulty in accessing sustainable employment.

- Access to other mental health services.

- Survey data from customers indicated that employer reluctance to hire people with disabilities is a barrier.

- Access to affordable health care, particularly for customers who do not qualify for SSI/SSDI or health care provided through subsidies from the Affordable Care Act (ACA) [Idaho does not have ‘Expanded Medicaid’ coverage through ACA].

- Especially in rural areas, generational poverty and reliance on SSI/SSDI is seen as a barrier to individuals with disabilities seeking employment.
Section Three: Unserved /Underserved Populations

The most common themes that emerged in this area were:

- In general, a case can be made that individuals living in rural areas, with less access to services, support, training and education are underserved.
- Language and culture are barriers to certain populations accessing services or seeking employment, including a growing refugee population in parts of Idaho. Translation services are not readily available.
- Native American tribes live in isolated locales in Idaho with limited employment options.
- IDVR has increased outreach efforts and coordination with partner agencies; however, there is a continued need for outreach to potentially unserved populations.
- Ex-offenders with a high rate of substance abuse issues require services from multiple agencies and face resistance from the employment community.

Section Four: Needs of Individuals with the Most Significant Disabilities

The most common themes that emerged in this area were:

- In general, the availability of long-term supports provides challenges in serving individuals with the most significant disabilities and often is a determinant of available VR services.
- In general, there is a perceived lack of services and supports for individuals with developmental and mental health disabilities.
- Financial literacy and access to benefits planning to make informed choices around pursuing employment.
- Training and support from Community Rehabilitation Programs that address the complexity of needs of individuals with the most significant disabilities.
- Agency policies that reflect an understanding of the needs of individuals with the most significant disabilities that require a variety of services and supports over an extended period.
Section Five: Needs of individuals with disabilities served through other components of the statewide workforce development system

The most common themes that emerged in this area were:

- IDVR has increased the number of individuals served through the workforce system.
- American Job Centers (AJCs) in this state need to improve the frequency and the quality of service to individuals with disabilities trying to access their services.
- Lack of accessibility is cited as a barrier for individuals with disabilities.
- Lack of training and capacity of frontline staff in working with individuals with disabilities limits the scope of services provided at One-Stops.
- Lack of transportation is cited as a significant barrier to accessing One-Stops.
- The Disability Employment Initiative (DEI) provides an opportunity to expand career pathways counseling for youth with disabilities.

Section Six: Needs of youth with disabilities in transition

The most common themes that emerged in this area were:

- VR has seen a spike of referrals because of the Pre-ETS summer work experience initiatives.
- VR’s relationship with schools is more productive when there are dedicated counselors in the school.
- VR’s summer work experience initiatives are viewed as highly successful.
- Pre-ETS has positively changed the relationship between teachers and VR. Teachers are now in a better position to explain in concrete terms what services VR offers.
- There is a strong connection between parental involvement and student success.
- There is a need for more cross training between teachers and VR.
• There is need for benefits counseling for parents and students who fear loss of benefits if the youth pursues employment.
• There should be more emphasis on career pathways for youth and students.
• The perception of VR counselors is that many students with disabilities do not leave school academically prepared to pursue post-secondary options.
• Many out-of-school youth need strong encouragement to engage with VR. They will not ‘walk through VR doors’ on their own.
• Emphasis on academics generally supersedes other activities such as Pre-ETS, including mentoring in schools.
• Youth leaving the juvenile justice system need multiple and coordinated services from education and community programs.

Section Seven: Need to establish, develop or improve CRPs

The most common themes that emerged in this area were:
• VR staff and managers indicate there is an adequate number of CRPs in Idaho.
• There are varying levels of service quality delivered by CRPs.
• There is minimal standardized training for CRP staff.
• CRPs are faced with high turnover and this instability of staff affects the quality of services.
• The perception is that low pay of many CRP staff is the major cause of turnover.
• The quality of job coaches is highly questionable. Many have little more in the way of credentials than a high school diploma.
• There is a need for more effective and standardized quality assurance monitoring and evaluation of CRPs.
• CRPs have a questionable capacity to serve individuals with language barriers.
• There is a need for increased communication between VR and CRPs to gain clarity on expectations and coordination of services.
• CRPs should devote more time in training individuals with disabilities on life skills such as hygiene, budgeting, etc.
• There are no incentives for CRPs to efficiently serve individuals.
• Facility-based CRP services are perceived as less effective than those that offer community-based services.
• VR contracts with specific CRPs in each locale are often perceived by field staff as limiting options for counselors and individuals with disabilities.

Section Eight: Business Relations and Services
The most common themes in this area are:
• Major employers such as HP (formerly Hewlett-Packard) have made significant commitments to diversify their workforce. This presents an opportunity for IDVR to partner with large employers and contribute to their diversity efforts.
• Employers perceive the difficulty in learning job skills to be a barrier in hiring/retaining individuals with disabilities.
• Employers would like assistance in the following areas:
  o Information regarding On-the-Job Training (OJT)
  o Identifying accommodations
  o Incentives for hiring individuals with disabilities
• Idaho ranks in the bottom quartile of average wages in the
• Participants in this CSNA perceive there is a lack of a variety of options for employment in Idaho. This is particularly true in rural locales.
• VR staff site lack of information and feedback from employers as a barrier to increasing employment opportunities.
• CRPs are perceived as repeatedly approaching a limited number of employers which impacts employment options.
• Employers were NOT perceived as having a negative attitude about hiring individuals with disabilities.
The Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Comprehensive Statewide Needs Assessment

Impetus for Needs Assessment

Title IV of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) contains the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, and requires all state vocational rehabilitation agencies to assess the rehabilitation needs of individuals with disabilities within the respective State and relate the planning of programs and services and the establishment of goals and priorities to those needs. According to Section 102 of WIOA and Section 412 of the Rehabilitation Act, each participating State shall submit a Unified or Combined State Plan every four years, with a biannual modification as needed. In addition, title 34 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 361 indicates that the State Plan must include the “results of a comprehensive, statewide assessment, jointly conducted by the designated State unit and the State Rehabilitation Council (SRC) every three years describing the rehabilitation needs of individuals with disabilities residing within the State, particularly the vocational rehabilitation service needs of (I) individuals with the most significant disabilities, including their need for supported employment; (II) individuals with disabilities who are minorities and individuals with disabilities who have been unserved or underserved by the vocational rehabilitation program; (III) individuals with disabilities served through other components of the statewide workforce development system; (IV) youth with disabilities and students with disabilities including their need for pre-employment transition services or other transition services, and (V) the need to establish, develop or improve community rehabilitation programs within the State.” In response to this mandate and to ensure that adequate efforts are being made to serve the diverse needs of persons with disabilities in Idaho, the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR), in partnership with the State Rehabilitation Council, entered into a contract with the Interwork Institute at San Diego State University for the purpose of jointly developing and conducting a comprehensive statewide needs assessment of the vocational rehabilitation needs of individuals with disabilities residing in Idaho.
Purpose of Needs Assessment and Utilization of Results

The purpose of the comprehensive statewide needs assessment (CSNA) is to identify and describe the rehabilitation needs of individuals with disabilities residing within Idaho. In particular, the CSNA seeks to provide information on:

- The overall performance of IDVR as it relates to meeting the rehabilitation needs of individuals with disabilities in Idaho;
- The rehabilitation needs of individuals with the most significant disabilities, including their need for supported employment services;
- The rehabilitation needs of individuals with disabilities who are minorities, or who have been unserved or underserved by the vocational rehabilitation program;
- The rehabilitation needs of youth with disabilities in transition including their need for Pre-Employment Transition Services;
- The rehabilitation needs of individuals with disabilities served through other components of the statewide workforce development system;
- An assessment of the need to establish, develop or improve community rehabilitation programs serving individuals with disabilities within Idaho; and
- The effectiveness of IDVR’s business relations and services and the needs of businesses as it relates to recruiting, hiring, accommodating and retaining individuals with disabilities.

Data collection efforts solicited input from a broad spectrum of persons with disabilities, service providers, IDVR staff and some businesses. It is expected that data from the needs assessment effort will provide IDVR and the SRC with direction when modifying the VR portion of the Combined State Plan and when planning for future program development, outreach and resource allocation.

Description of Needs Assessment Process

The process that was developed for conducting the needs assessment involved four primary data-gathering approaches:
Electronic surveys conducted with four stakeholder groups (individuals with disabilities, representatives of organizations that provide services to individuals with disabilities, IDVR staff and businesses in Idaho). Hard copy surveys were sent to a random sample of 400 individuals with disabilities who were either former, current or potential consumers of IDVR, in addition to the electronic survey for this group;

- Focus groups conducted with four stakeholder groups (individuals with disabilities, community partners and representatives of organizations that provide services to individuals with disabilities, businesses, and IDVR staff);
- Key informant interviews conducted with individuals with disabilities, IDVR staff, and organizations that provide services to individuals with disabilities in Idaho;
- Analysis of a variety of existing demographic and case service data relevant to individuals with disabilities.

Through the data collection efforts, researchers solicited information from four primary stakeholder groups: (a) former, current or potential consumers of IDVR located throughout Idaho; (b) representatives of organizations that provide services to, advocate for, or represent the interests of individuals who are potential or actual consumers of IDVR; (c) IDVR staff; and (d) representatives of businesses operating in Idaho. In addition, the approach was designed to capture input from a variety of perspectives to acquire a sense of the multi-faceted needs of persons with disabilities in Idaho. Responses to the individual survey reflect the opinions of current, former and potential consumers of IDVR services. Efforts were made to gather information pertinent to the investigated categories through inquiries with individuals who serve a broad range of persons with disabilities in Idaho (whether they are affiliated with IDVR or not).

The needs assessment approach was designed to elicit quantitative and qualitative data about the needs of persons with disabilities. Focus group and key informant interview activities yielded qualitative data that may be used to complement and lend depth to the findings of the survey efforts and the analysis of extant data. The use of multiple data collection strategies, both quantitative and qualitative, facilitates data collection that captures both the breadth and the depth of concerns relevant to individuals with disabilities in Idaho.
Inherent in any type of research effort are limitations that may constrain the utility of the data that is generated. Therefore, it is important to highlight some of the most significant issues that may limit the ability to generalize the needs assessment findings to larger populations. Inherent in the methods used to collect data is the potential for bias in the selection of participants. The findings that are reported reflect only the responses of those who could be reached and who were willing to participate. Individuals who were disenfranchised, dissatisfied, or who did not wish to be involved with IDVR may have declined to participate. A second significant concern is that the information gathered from respondents may not accurately represent the broader concerns of all potential constituents and stakeholders. Data gathered from service providers, for example, may reflect only the needs of individuals who are already recipients of services, to the exclusion of those who are not presently served. Although efforts were made to gather information from a variety of stakeholders in the vocational rehabilitation process, it would be presumptuous to conclude with certainty that those who contributed to the focus groups, the key informant interviews, and the survey research efforts constitute a fully representative sample of all of the potential stakeholders in the vocational rehabilitation process in Idaho.

**Methodology**

The comprehensive statewide needs assessment was conducted using qualitative and quantitative methods of inquiry. The specific methods for gathering the data used in this assessment are detailed below.

**Analysis of Existing Data Sources**

The project team at SDSU reviewed a variety of existing data sources for the purposes of identifying and describing demographic data within Idaho including the total possible target population and sub-populations potentially served by IDVR. Data relevant to the population of Idaho, the population of persons with disabilities in Idaho, ethnicity of individuals, the number of Veterans, income level, educational levels and other relevant population characteristics were utilized in this analysis.

**Key Informant Interviews**
Instrument. The instruments used for the key informant interviews (see Appendix B for a summary of the interviews) were developed by the researchers at SDSU and reviewed and revised by IDVR.

Interview population. The key informant population consisted of IDVR staff, community partners, individuals with disabilities and business professionals.

Data collection. Key informant interviews were conducted from January-March. Most of the interviews were conducted face-to-face or through the agency’s teleconferencing system. Three interviews were conducted by telephone. The general format of the interviews was consistent between IDVR staff and representatives of agencies/organizations that provide services to, advocate for, or represent the interests of individuals with disabilities. First, participants were asked questions to ascertain their personal and professional expertise and their experience with IDVR. Participants were then asked open-ended questions about their perceptions of the needs of individuals with disabilities in Idaho. Finally, participants were asked to share their perceptions of how IDVR could improve their ability to help meet those needs, especially as it relates to helping consumers obtain and retain employment.

Efforts to ensure respondent confidentiality. Names and other identifying characteristics were not recorded by the interviewer. Participants were informed that their responses would be treated as confidential information, would not be reported with information that could be used to identify them, and would be consolidated with information from other respondents before results were reported.

Data analysis. The interviewers took notes on the discussions as they occurred. The notes were transcribed and analyzed by the researchers at SDSU. Themes or concerns that surfaced with consistency across interviews were identified and are reported as common themes in the report narrative.

Survey of Individuals with Disabilities

Instrument. The instrument used for the electronic survey of individuals with disabilities (Appendix A) was developed by the project team and reviewed and revised by IDVR and the SRC.
**Survey population.** Individuals identified for participation in this survey effort can be described as individuals with disabilities who are potential, former or current consumers of IDVR. The project team, in coordination with IDVR and community programs serving individuals with disabilities, broadly dispersed the electronic survey via an e-mail invitation. The hard copy surveys were mailed to IDVR consumers using a random sample of former or current consumers. A second notice was sent out by IDVR staff to increase the response rate. Potential customers were a separate subset of interest for the CSNA and were referred to the survey by other workforce and disability related agencies based on an appeal email disseminated to these agencies by IDVR.

**Data collection.** Data was gathered from this population using an Internet-based survey and by mail. In partnership with the SRC, IDVR identified individuals with disabilities and invited them to participate in the electronic survey effort via e-mail. Once the survey was active, IDVR sent an invitation and link to the survey by e-mail. IDVR also distributed printed copies of the survey instrument (along with self-addressed, postage-paid return envelopes) to individuals with disabilities. Survey responses collected through the electronic survey approach were then exported to the software program SPSS by the project team at SDSU for analysis. Printed surveys returned by mail were collected and entered in SPSS for further analysis by the project team at SDSU.

**Efforts to ensure respondent confidentiality.** Respondents to the individual survey were not asked to identify themselves when completing the survey. In addition, responses to the electronic and printed surveys were aggregated by the project team at SDSU prior to reporting results, which served to further obscure the identities of individual survey respondents.

**Accessibility.** The electronic survey was designed using an accessible, Internet-based survey application. On the printed and electronic versions of the individual survey, respondents were provided with the name and contact information of the research director at SDSU in order to place requests for alternate survey formats.

**Data analysis.** Data analysis consisted of computing frequencies and descriptive statistics for the survey items with fixed response options.
Open-ended survey questions which yielded narrative responses from individuals were analyzed by the researchers for themes or concepts that were expressed consistently by respondents.

**Partner Survey**

*Instrument.* The instrument used for the electronic survey of community partners (Appendix A) was developed by the project team and reviewed and revised by IDVR and the SRC.

*Survey population.* Individuals identified for participation in this survey effort can be described as representatives of organizations that provide services, coordinate services, or serve an advocacy role for persons with disabilities in Idaho.

*Data collection.* Data was gathered from this population using an Internet-based survey. IDVR, in partnership with the SRC, identified partners for participation in the survey effort. Once the survey was active, IDVR sent an invitation and link to the survey by e-mail. Approximately two weeks after the distribution of the initial invitation, another electronic notice was sent as both a “thank you” to those who had completed the survey and a reminder to those who had not. A third and final invitation was sent two weeks after the second invitation. Survey responses collected through the electronic survey approach were then exported to SPSS by the project team at SDSU for analysis.

*Efforts to ensure respondent confidentiality.* Respondents to the partner survey were not asked to identify themselves or their organizations when completing the survey. In addition, responses to the electronic surveys were aggregated by the project team at SDSU prior to reporting results that served to further obscure the identities of individual survey respondents.

*Accessibility.* The survey was designed using an accessible, Internet-based survey application. Respondents were also provided with the name and contact information for the research director at SDSU to place requests for alternate survey formats.

*Data analysis.* Data analysis consisted of computing frequencies and descriptive statistics for the survey items with fixed response options.
Open-ended survey questions, which yielded narrative responses from individuals, were analyzed by the researchers for themes or concepts that were expressed consistently by respondents.

**Number of completed surveys.** These surveys were completed electronically by representatives of partner organizations. It was apparent from our conversations with provider agencies that they are committed to advancing opportunities for individuals with disabilities in Idaho.

**IDVR Staff Survey**

**Instrument.** The instrument used for the electronic survey of IDVR staff (Appendix A) was developed by the project team at SDSU and reviewed and revised by IDVR and the SRC.

**Survey population.** Individuals identified for participation in this survey effort can be described as all staff working for IDVR.

**Data collection.** Data was gathered from IDVR staff through the use of an Internet-based survey. Staff was sent an electronic invitation and link to the survey. A subsequent notice was sent as both a “thank you” to those who had completed the survey and as a reminder to those who had not. A third and final invitation was sent out. Survey responses collected through the electronic survey approach were then exported to SPSS by the project team at SDSU for analysis.

**Efforts to ensure respondent confidentiality.** Respondents to the staff survey were not asked to identify themselves by name when completing the survey. Responses to the electronic surveys were aggregated by the project team at SDSU prior to reporting results. This served to further protect the identities of individual survey respondents.

**Accessibility.** The survey was designed using an accessible, Internet-based survey application. Respondents were also provided with the name and contact information for the research director at SDSU to place requests for alternate survey formats.

**Data analysis.** Data analysis consisted of computing frequencies and descriptive statistics for the survey items with fixed response options. Open-ended survey questions which yielded narrative responses from
individuals were analyzed by the researchers for themes or concepts that were expressed consistently by respondents.

**Business Surveys**

In designing the CSNA, it was decided by IDVR and the project team to try and identify businesses to participate in the survey process. IDVR was interested in getting the perspective of businesses in Idaho regarding recruiting, hiring and retaining employees with disabilities. The electronic survey link was sent to IDVR’s business database and 36 responses were received. The business survey is in Appendix A. It is not unusual for the response rate of businesses to be low for the CSNA, and the project team has some recommendations to more effectively engage businesses in the next CSNA conducted by IDVR. These recommendations are found in the Business section of the Findings area of the report.

**Focus Groups**

*Instrument.* The focus groups were conducted based on a protocol developed by the researchers at SDSU. The protocol was reviewed and revised by IDVR. The central question raised in each of the focus group meetings was the following: “What are the most important employment-related needs encountered by people with disabilities?” When appropriate the moderator introduced additional questions prompting respondents to discuss needs associated with preparing for, obtaining and retaining employment, and increasing the employment of persons with disabilities. Participants in the IDVR staff and partner agency staff groups were also asked to discuss the needs of individuals from cultural, racial, or ethnic minority groups; and the needs of students with disabilities transitioning from high school, as well as the need for establishing, developing or improving CRPs.

*Data collection.* The focus groups were held at the IDVR offices in Boise. Remote locations were accessed via video teleconference from the Boise office. A few minutes were devoted to introductions, personal background, and rapport building to establish a productive focus group environment. The focus group moderator explained the purpose of the focus group and provided a brief description of the larger needs assessment effort. The moderator explained the role of San Diego State
University in the needs assessment effort and assured participants of the confidentiality of their statements. The focus group sessions were recorded and used only for creating this report. The recordings will be erased at the end of this project.

Efforts to ensure respondent confidentiality. Names and other identifying characteristics were not recorded by the note-taker. Focus group participants were informed that their responses would be treated as confidential information, would not be reported with information that could be used to identify them, and that information from multiple focus groups would be consolidated before results were reported. In addition, IDVR staff did not attend the focus groups consisting of individuals with disabilities and partner agencies to ensure an open dialogue amongst participants.

Accessibility. IDVR included a request for reasonable accommodation in their electronic invitations to all the focus groups. There were no requests for accommodations received by the project team.

Data analysis. Notes were transcribed and analyzed by the researchers at SDSU. Results were organized according to the seven main categories under investigation in the assessment. Themes or concerns that surfaced with consistency across groups were identified and reported as consensual themes in the report narrative.

Analysis and Triangulation of Data

The data gathered from the national and agency-specific data sets, key informant interviews, surveys and focus groups were analyzed by the researchers on the project team. The common themes that emerged regarding needs of persons with disabilities from each data source were identified and compared to each other to validate the existence of needs, especially as they pertained to the target populations of this assessment. These common themes are identified and discussed in the Findings section.

Dissemination Plans

The CSNA report is delivered to IDVR and the SRC. The project team received several requests by consumers and partner agencies to share the
results of the CSNA. We recommend that IDVR publish the report on their website for public access and that they notify the public of the availability of the report by e-mail.
CSNA Findings

Section 1
Overall Agency Performance

This section of the CSNA reports on areas of general performance by IDVR. General performance refers to how well IDVR is fulfilling its mission of assisting people with disabilities to increase their independence and employment. The area of general performance also refers to how effectively IDVR performs the processes that facilitate case movement through the stages of the rehabilitation process and how well IDVR adheres to the timelines for this case movement identified in the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, and IDVR’s policies and procedures. Finally, overall performance also refers to how effectively IDVR provides placement services to individuals with disabilities in Idaho as this process significantly impacts IDVR’s ability to fulfill their mission.

The structure of this section, as well as subsequent sections, will include the following:

1. Data that pertains to the section in question, including observations based on the data.
2. Electronic and hard copy survey results pertaining to the section.
3. Recurring/consensual themes that emerged during the individual interviews and focus groups.
4. Recommendations to address the findings in each area of the assessment.

The timeframe covered by this comprehensive statewide needs assessment is the three-year period from 2014-2016. Federal RSA data is for the federal fiscal year and agency-specific data is by federal fiscal year as well. The timeframe was determined by the requirement found in the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, that VR programs perform a CSNA every three years at a minimum. The Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, and its subsequent reauthorization of the Rehabilitation Act indicate that the Combined
State Plan will be completed every four years by the core partners, with a biennial update. Consequently, IDVR may wish to consider gathering and analyzing this data every two years, or at least conducting an update every two years with a full CSNA performed every four years. The data on agency performance included in this section comes from the case management system used by IDVR and is compared to the available RSA 911 data submitted by IDVR.

**Agency Specific Data Related to Overall Agency Performance**

Tables 1 and 2 below identify various data elements that illustrate IDVR’s overall program performance for the three-year period of this assessment.

**Table 1**

*General Data Elements for IDVR: source RSA 911*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ALL CONSUMERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications</td>
<td>5584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of applicants found eligible</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. days for eligibility determination</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of Disability*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant</td>
<td>1360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most significant</td>
<td>3420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% closed prior to IPE development</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plans developed</td>
<td>3523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. time from eligibility to plan (days)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of consumers in training by type**</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. length of open case (days) for cases closed other than rehabilitated</td>
<td>847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. length of open case (days) for cases closed rehabilitated</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of cases closed rehabilitated</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation rate (successful closures/all plans closed)</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median annual earnings of those closed as successfully rehabilitated</td>
<td>$15808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of cases served</td>
<td>11990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave cost of all closed cases</td>
<td>$1933.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave cost of cases closed rehabilitated</td>
<td>$2599.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. cost per case closed unsuccessful</td>
<td>$2067.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. cost per case closed prior to plan</td>
<td>$365.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Definitions of D, SD and MSD are addressed at the beginning of Section 2 of this document.

** (1) Vocational training refers to occupational, vocational, or job skill training provided by a college and/or business, vocational/trade or technical school. Vocational training does not lead to an academic degree. This data also includes OJT. (2) Undergraduate training includes training above the secondary school level with the goal of a 2-year or 4-year associates or bachelor’s degree. (3) Graduate
training refers to training recognized as beyond an undergraduate degree such as a masters or doctorate.

### Table 2
**Agency Expenditures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship Training</td>
<td>$720.00</td>
<td>$2,972.50</td>
<td>$6,495.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>$1,094,537.09</td>
<td>$1,043,690.97</td>
<td>$1,152,836.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic remedial or literacy training</td>
<td>$11,876.50</td>
<td>$16,290.74</td>
<td>$15,210.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customized Employment Services</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$2,394.25</td>
<td>$3,813.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis and treatment of impairments</td>
<td>$315,359.29</td>
<td>$386,406.89</td>
<td>$285,519.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability related augmentative skills training</td>
<td>$2,950.00</td>
<td>$2,634.33</td>
<td>$779.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Year College or University Training</td>
<td>$944,533.85</td>
<td>$920,858.09</td>
<td>$923,259.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate College or University Training</td>
<td>$37,188.58</td>
<td>$111,340.86</td>
<td>$144,992.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpreter services</td>
<td>$31,999.64</td>
<td>$20,833.24</td>
<td>$26,787.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job placement assistance</td>
<td>$735.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job readiness training</td>
<td>$75,930.55</td>
<td>$86,313.85</td>
<td>$33,617.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job search assistance</td>
<td>$880,669.95</td>
<td>$1,015,463.72</td>
<td>$1,208,005.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior or Community College Training</td>
<td>$185,435.31</td>
<td>$188,605.20</td>
<td>$172,215.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>$353,996.76</td>
<td>$329,322.18</td>
<td>$301,865.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Training</td>
<td>$136,169.39</td>
<td>$126,288.67</td>
<td>$148,531.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational/vocational training</td>
<td>$998,139.90</td>
<td>$901,481.47</td>
<td>$885,745.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-the-job Supports - Short Term</td>
<td>$448,831.31</td>
<td>$555,154.68</td>
<td>$501,563.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-the-job Supports - Supported Employment</td>
<td>$124,638.50</td>
<td>$259,219.40</td>
<td>$371,656.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-the-job Training</td>
<td>$91,223.18</td>
<td>$124,116.75</td>
<td>$151,554.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services*</td>
<td>$653,495.35</td>
<td>$631,272.32</td>
<td>$665,434.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal attendant services</td>
<td>$792.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation technology</td>
<td>$1,084,089.57</td>
<td>$1,161,121.13</td>
<td>$1,113,310.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance services</td>
<td>$4,666.00</td>
<td>$4,934.31</td>
<td>$6,851.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation services</td>
<td>$518,396.07</td>
<td>$508,475.94</td>
<td>$490,589.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Services that cannot be recorded elsewhere

**Observations Based on the Data:**

- The largest cluster of IDVR expenditures are in areas related to employment or preparation for employment (tuition and work experiences).
- It appears that IDVR is able to access other resources for medical and psychological services as they represent a modest percentage of expenditures.
• Transportation expenditures appear to be a significant expenditure, reflecting the tremendous need regarding transportation options for individuals with disabilities in Idaho.

• Assessment expenditures are significant. This is an area that IDVR might want to evaluate concerning return on investment--do the expenditures significantly contribute to positive employment outcomes? If not, these expenditures could be diverted to other activities such as work experiences, internships, job coaching, etc.

• Expenditures for rehabilitation technology is another area that may warrant evaluation to determine if comparable benefits are available.

**IDVR Staff Survey Results**

The staff survey was created using an Internet-based survey application; invitations to complete the survey were distributed internally by staff. A total of 126 of 149 valid staff surveys were completed.

Questions appearing on the staff survey addressed four general areas:

- Services readily available to persons with disabilities
- Barriers to achieving employment
- Barriers to accessing services
- Desired changes in services

**Respondent Characteristics**

The first survey question was an open-ended question asking respondents to indicate their job title. Forty-seven of the 93 respondents indicated that they were Vocational Rehabilitation Counselors (I, II, or III) while 32 identified as Vocational Rehabilitation Assistants. A smaller portion of respondents identified other titles including Managers, Vocational Rehabilitation Specialists, Extended Employment Services Assistant, School to Work Transition Assistant, and Transition Coordinator.
Of the 110 staff who responded to the question on length of service, the majority have worked in the department for over 10 years (n=39), while a substantial amount has been with the department between 1-5 years (n=38). The remaining staff respondents have been employed between 6-10 years (n=21) and less than 1 year (n=12).

Respondents were provided with a list and asked to identify which consumer populations they worked with on a regular basis. There were 107 respondents. Table 3 below illustrates the client populations indicated by staff survey respondents.

Table 3  
Consumer Populations Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consumer Populations</th>
<th>N(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals with the most significant disabilities</td>
<td>94(88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals that need long-term supports and extended services to maintain employment</td>
<td>74(70%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition-aged youth</td>
<td>61(57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals from unserved or underserved populations</td>
<td>59(55%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals served by American Job Centers</td>
<td>44(41%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consumer populations served regularly by staff

A substantial majority of the respondents reported working with individuals with the most significant disabilities; individuals that need long-term supports and extended services to maintain employment, and transition-aged youth. Less than half of the respondents indicated that they worked regularly with individuals served by American Job Centers.

Barriers to Achieving Employment Goals

Staff respondents were given a list of 21 barriers and asked to identify the top three barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers specific to the following groups of consumers: General Population, Individuals with the Most Significant Disabilities, Youth in Transition, and Consumers who are Racial or Ethnic Minorities. Table 4 lists the barriers along with the number of times each of the
barriers was mentioned as one of the top three barriers by staff survey respondents.

**Table 4**  
*Barriers to Achieving Employment Goals for Consumers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top three barriers to achieving employment goals – General</th>
<th>Times identified as a barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convictions for criminal offense</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health issues</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other transportation issues</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Social Skills</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having job skills</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having education or training</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse issues</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or no work experience</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having job search skills</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers perceptions about employing persons with disabilities</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability-related transportation issues</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions regarding impact of income on Social Security benefits</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough jobs available</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing issues</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other health issues</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare issues</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having disability-related accommodations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of help with disability-related personal care</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Convictions for criminal offense (n=47), mental health issues (n=40), and other transportation issues (n=40) were the barriers most frequently mentioned among the top three barriers to achieving employment goals for the General Population.

Staff survey respondents were presented with an open-ended question asking if there was anything else that should be known about the primary barriers to achieving employment goals for
consumers. Thirty responses were provided expressing a variety of needs including lack of support systems, individual barriers primarily related to personal issues and client motivation, and lack of job opportunity or limited employment outlooks.

Respondents were presented with questions that prompted them to indicate the top three reasons that people with disabilities might find it difficult to accessing services. There were 10 response options. Table 5 below lists the barriers to access along with the number of times each of the barriers was mentioned as one of the top three barriers by the staff survey respondents.

Table 5
Reasons Individuals Find It Difficult to Access Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to Accessing IDVR Services – General</th>
<th>Times Identified as a Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited accessibility of public transportation</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties accessing training or education program</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties completing the Individualized Plan for Employment</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow service delivery</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of options for use of technology to communicate with staff such as Skype, text, etc.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties completing application</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDVR staff do not meet clients in the communities where the client lives</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate assessment services</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate disability-related accommodations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limited accessibility of public transportation (n=57), Difficulties accessing training or education program (n=32), and “Other” (n=27) were the most frequently identified barriers to accessing services for the General Population. When asked to please describe the “Other” selection, respondents provided barriers such as lack of knowledge of services and lack of motivation on part of the consumer.
Staff survey respondents were presented with an open-ended question that asked them if there was anything else that could help identify why individuals with disabilities find it difficult to access services. Forty-five individuals provided narrative response to this question, although some responses indicated “No comment.” There were several themes evident across multiple responses including the following:

- **Lack of Transportation, Other Services (n=12)**
  - Transportation cost and availability, rural transportation difficulties
- **Difficulty of Process, Lack of Options (n=9)**
  - IPE requirements and expectations, need more technology options like digital signatures
- **Misunderstanding of Program and Services (n=7)**
  - Don’t understand level of participation needed, misinformation in the community
- **Individual Issues (n=2)**
  - Fear and anxiety about the process, lack of motivation

**Desired Changes**

Staff survey respondents were presented with an open-ended question that asked them to describe the most important change the Division could make to support consumers’ efforts to achieve their employment goals. Fifty-nine individuals provided narrative response to this question, although some responses indicated “No comment.” There were several themes evident across multiple responses including the following:

- **Increased Access to Services (n=20)**
  - Place VRC’s in the community, more community vendors and assessment sites, increase funding, improve use of technology, improve transportation options.
- **Decreased Bureaucracy (n=16)**
  - Decrease paperwork/documentation, reduce caseloads, implement population-specific caseloads, increase counseling contact.
• **Increased Client Accountability (n=10)**
  o Provide more information to increase understanding, more realistic vocational goals, support more active participation to increase personal motivation.

• **Improved Employer Partnerships and Community Resources (n=5)**
  o Increase On-the-Job opportunities, engage larger corporate employers, increase performance standards for vendors.

**Individual Survey Results**
Surveys were distributed electronically (via a Web-based survey application) and by mail. One thousand three-hundred valid surveys were returned, with (400 mailed) surveys completed electronically and printed surveys returned by mail. *(TP Comment: I’m not sure what is trying to be stated here....1300 surveys were completed? There were a total of 9100 e-mailed, 400 mailed. Of the 9100 e-mailed 849 were rejected e-mails, which should be eliminated from the total count. 39 of the mailed were completed.)*

**Respondent Demographics**
Table 6 summarizes the self-reported gender of the 1,300 respondents to the individual survey.

**Table 6**
*Gender of Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Respondent Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slightly more males (52.3%) than females (47.6%) responded to the survey; with 251 individuals declining to indicate gender.

Individuals were asked to report their primary race or ethnic group. Responses to this question are detailed in Table 6a.
Table 6a
Individuals Survey: Ethnicity of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Respondent Race or Ethnic Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>964</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The primary race/ethnicity groups identified most frequently were Not Hispanic/Latino (94.1%) and Hispanic/Latino (5.8%). Respondents were also asked to identify their region of residence, which is detailed in Table 7.

Table 7
Individuals Survey: Region of Residence of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Region of Residence</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern Idaho</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Idaho</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Idaho</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Idaho</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the respondents (38.6%) indicated that they resided in Southwestern Idaho, with a substantial proportion (23%) indicating that they lived in Northern Idaho.
Respondents were presented with a checklist and asked to identify their primary disabling condition. Table 8 summarizes the primary disabling conditions reported by the individual survey respondents.

**Table 8**
**Individuals Survey: Primary Disability of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Disability</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf and Hard of Hearing</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/Mobility</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Disability (ID)/developmental disability (DD) or cognitive</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blindness or visually impaired</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf-Blind</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mental Health (24.2%) was the most frequently reported primary disabling condition, followed by Deaf and Hard of Hearing (19.6%), and Physical/Mobility (19%). Respondents were also asked to identify their secondary disabling condition, if they had one. Table 9 details the secondary conditions reported by respondents.

**Table 9**
**Individuals Survey: Secondary Disability of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Disability</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impairment</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/Mobility</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Disability (ID)/developmental disability (DD) or cognitive</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf and Hard of Hearing</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Blindness or visually impaired | 15 | 1.6
Deaf-Blind | 1 | 0.1

Approximately 330 respondents reported no secondary disabling conditions, while another 14.1% stated they were unsure. Of those who reported secondary disabling conditions, Mental Health (13.3%) was the most frequently mentioned category of disabling condition.

Association with IDVR

Individuals who responded to the survey were presented with a question that asked them to identify the statement that best described their association. Their responses to this question appear in Table 10.

Table 10
Individuals Survey: Association with IDVR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association with (Agency)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am a current client of IDVR</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>51.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a previous client of IDVR, my case has been closed</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have never used the services of IDVR</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not familiar with IDVR</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 1,257

Most respondents (51.7%) indicated they were current clients of IDVR with fewer individuals indicating that they were previous clients whose cases had been closed (35.5%).

Receipt of Social Security Disability Benefits

Respondents were presented with a checklist and asked to indicate whether they received Social Security disability benefits. Table 11 summarizes the responses to this series of questions. It should be noted that individuals could select more than one response in the series of items (for example, in the case of an individual who received both SSI and SSDI).
Table 11
Individuals Survey: SSA Benefit Status of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicate Whether You Receive Social Security Benefits</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not receive Social Security disability benefits</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive SSDI (Social Security Disability Insurance. SSDI is provided to individuals that have worked in the past and is based on the amount of money the individual paid into the system through payroll deductions)</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive SSI (Supplemental Security Income)</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know if I receive Social Security disability benefits</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive a check from Social Security Administration every month, but I do not know which benefit I get</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most commonly invoked response was “I do not receive Social Security disability benefits”, which was selected by 820 of the respondents (65.6%). A much smaller proportion (15.9%) indicated that they received SSDI, while 13.9% indicated that they received SSI.

Employment-Related Needs

Respondents were presented with a series of yes/no questions about potential barriers to achieving their employment goals and were asked to indicate whether each was a barrier to achieving their employment goals. Table 12 summarizes the number of individuals who identified each barrier as an obstacle to achieving their employment goals.

Table 12
Individual Survey: Barriers to Achieving Employment Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Survey: Barriers to Achieving Employment Goals</th>
<th>Identified as barrier N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not having education or training</td>
<td>120(43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having job skills</td>
<td>86(36%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most commonly identified barriers to achieving employment goals were not having education or training (43.4%), not having job skills (35.7%), mental health issues (35.3%), not having job search skills (33.3%), and other health issues (32.5%). Other barriers, such as not enough jobs available (29.1%), other transportation issues (23.8%), and employers’ perceptions about employing persons with disabilities (19.9%), were identified less frequently as barriers to achieving employment goals.

Individuals were presented with an open-ended question asking them to identify the most significant barrier to achieving their employment goals. Two hundred and eighty-seven individuals provided narrative responses to this question. Content analysis of the responses yielded the following six themes that were evident in two or more of the responses:

- *Disability-related issues including recovery, managing disability conditions, and workplace accommodations (n=64)*
- *Lack of training, education, experience, and updated skills (n=58)*
• Financial constraints related to transportation, housing, school, and initiating small business (n=31)
• Insufficient service provision from and lack of support from CRP’s (n=27)
• Workplace discrimination including age and disability (n=23)
• Personal issues related to home life, relationships, and anxiety/fear (n=18)

Barriers to Accessing Services

Respondents were presented with several questions describing potential barriers to accessing services and asked to indicate whether the barriers had made it difficult for the respondents to access services. **Table 13 summarizes the responses of the estimated one thousand and seventy individuals to the questions about barriers to accessing IDVR services.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual Survey: Barriers to Accessing IDVR Services</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of information about services</td>
<td>48(20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties scheduling meetings with your counselor</td>
<td>34(14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other difficulties working with staff</td>
<td>24(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited accessibility to IDVR via public transportation</td>
<td>21(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDVR's hours of operation</td>
<td>19(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties completing the Individualized Plan for Employment</td>
<td>19(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other challenges related to the physical location of the office</td>
<td>177%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of disability-related accommodations</td>
<td>10(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties completing the application</td>
<td>7(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers</td>
<td>2(1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most commonly cited barriers to accessing services were lack of information about services (20.1%), difficulties scheduling
meetings with their counselor (14.1%) and other difficulties working with staff (10.2%).

Respondents were presented with an open-ended question asking them to describe desired changes to services that would improve their experience with IDVR and help them to achieve their employment goals. Four hundred and seventy-nine individuals provided narrative responses to this question. Sixty-two respondents expressed that they were satisfied with the services they received. Content analysis of the responses resulted in four prevalent themes:

- **Improved working relationships and accessibility to counselors including communication/contact, approval of training and vocational goals, hours of operation, and more effective interpersonal contact** (n=139)
- **More streamlined processing such as decreased wait time between appointments and assistance with required paperwork** (n=42)
- **Improved service coordination with Partners to include more options, job coaching, and job search assistance** (n=33)
- **Increased options and opportunities for employment through more employer partners and better job matching** (n=25)
Section 2
Needs of Individuals with the Most Significant Disabilities Including their need for Supported Employment

Who are individuals with the most significant disabilities? In general Idaho customers who meet the category of individuals with the most significant disabilities (MSD) must have a severe physical, mental or sensory impairment that seriously limits three or more functional capacities, such as mobility, work skills, self-care, interpersonal skills, communication, self-direction, or work tolerance, in terms of an employment outcome. Individuals eligible under the category of significant disability (SD) must have a severe physical, mental or sensory impairment that seriously limits two or more functional capacities listed above. Individuals who are eligible for the program, but do not meet the requirements for SD or MSD are classified as D (disability).

- During federal fiscal years (FFY) 2014 through FFY2016, 87% of eligible individuals were categorized as MSD or SD.
- Of the 87% who met the MSD or SD categories, 14,008, or 63%, were individuals with an MSD.
- Note: Individuals receiving Social Security Supplemental Income (SSI) or Social Security Disability Income (SSDI) are presumptively eligible for the VR program and will be categorized at least as SD (or MSD) per federal regulation.

Survey Results by Type

Partner Survey: Barriers to Employment for Individuals with Most Significant Disabilities

Respondents were asked if the barriers to achieving employment goals for individuals with the most significant disabilities were different from the overall population of persons with disabilities.
Of the 245 respondents, 88.1% (n = 216) indicated that the barriers to achieving employment goals were different for individuals with the most significant disabilities. Respondents were then asked to indicate the top three barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers with the most significant disabilities from a list of 20 barriers. Table 14 lists the barriers along with the number of times each of the barriers was mentioned as one of the top three barriers for consumers with the most significant disabilities by partner survey respondents.

**Table 14**

*Partner Survey: Top Barriers to Achieving Employment Goals for Consumers with Most Significant Disabilities – Partner Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Barriers to Achieving Employment Goals - MSD</th>
<th>Times Identified as a Barrier N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employers' perceptions about employing persons with disabilities</td>
<td>94 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having job skills</td>
<td>70 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or no work experience</td>
<td>68 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor social skills</td>
<td>60 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having education or training</td>
<td>56 (23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability-related transportation issues</td>
<td>53 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough jobs available</td>
<td>51 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having disability-related accommodations</td>
<td>42 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health issues</td>
<td>38 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions regarding impact of income on Social Security benefits</td>
<td>34 (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having job search skills</td>
<td>25 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of help with disability-related personal care</td>
<td>23 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other transportation issues</td>
<td>23 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers</td>
<td>18 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>13 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convictions for criminal offenses</td>
<td>10 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse issues</td>
<td>7 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare issues</td>
<td>7 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employers’ perceptions about employing persons with disabilities (n = 94), not having job skills (n = 70), and little or no work experience (n = 68) were identified most frequently as among the top three barriers to employment for individuals with most significant disabilities.

**Staff Survey: Barriers to Achieving Employment Goals for Individuals with the Most Significant Disabilities.**

Staff survey respondents were asked if the barriers to achieving employment goals by individuals with the most significant disabilities were different from the overall population. Seventeen individuals responded to this question and 17 (100%) indicated that the barriers were not different. Those 17 individuals were asked to identify the top three barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers with the most significant disabilities. Table 15 details their responses to this question.

**Table 15**
*Top Three Barriers to Achieving Employment Goals for Individuals with Most Significant Disabilities, Staff Survey*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff Survey: Top Three Reasons Consumers Find it Difficult to Achieve Employment Goals – MSD</th>
<th>Times Identified as a Barrier N(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor social skills</td>
<td>39(16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers' perceptions about employing persons with disabilities</td>
<td>38(16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having job skills</td>
<td>35(14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health issues</td>
<td>35(14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or no work experience</td>
<td>30(13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other transportation issues</td>
<td>24(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability-related transportation issues</td>
<td>22(9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions regarding impact of income on Social Security benefits</td>
<td>18(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convictions for criminal offenses</td>
<td>15(6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most commonly identified barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers with most significant disabilities were poor social skills (n=39), employers’ perceptions about employing persons with disabilities (n=38), not having job skills (n=35), and mental health issues (n=35).

### Partner Survey: Barriers to Accessing IDVR Services for Individuals with Most Significant Disabilities

Partner survey respondents were asked if the reasons for finding it difficult to access IDVR services by individuals with most significant disabilities were different from the general population of persons with disabilities. Of the 219 respondents, 59.8% (n = 131) indicated that the reasons for finding it difficult to access services by individuals with most significant disabilities were different from the general population of persons with disabilities. These respondents were then asked to indicate the top three reasons for finding it difficult to access services by individuals with the most significant disabilities. Table 16 lists the reasons along with the number of times each was mentioned as one of the top three barriers for individuals with most significant disabilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Number of Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse issues</td>
<td>14(6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having education or training</td>
<td>13(5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having disability-related accommodations</td>
<td>10(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having job search skills</td>
<td>7(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough jobs available</td>
<td>5(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing issues</td>
<td>4(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of help with disability-related personal care</td>
<td>3(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other health issues</td>
<td>2(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers</td>
<td>1(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare issues</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Difficulties Accessing IDVR Services for Individuals with Most Significant Disabilities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to Accessing IDVR Services - MSD</th>
<th>Times Identified as a Barrier N(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited accessibility of IDVR via public transportation</td>
<td>58(24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties completing the application</td>
<td>48(20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties accessing training or education programs</td>
<td>44(18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow service delivery</td>
<td>31(13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties completing the Individualized Plan for Employment</td>
<td>26(11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>26(11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other challenges related to the physical location of the office</td>
<td>25(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate disability-related accommodations</td>
<td>21(9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate assessment services</td>
<td>19(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDVR staff do not meet clients in the communities where the clients live</td>
<td>16(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers</td>
<td>13(5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDVR staff are not responsive to communication from clients or potential clients</td>
<td>12(5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of options for use of technology to communicate with staff such as Skype, text, etc.</td>
<td>9(4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limited accessibility of IDVR via public transportation (n = 58), difficulties completing application (n = 48), and difficulties accessing training or education programs (n = 44) were the items most commonly cited as presenting barriers to accessing services for persons with most significant disabilities.

**Staff Survey: Barriers to Accessing IDVR Services for Individuals with Most Significant Disabilities.**

Staff survey respondents were asked if the reasons for finding it difficult to access IDVR services by individuals with most significant disabilities were different from the general population of persons with disabilities. Of the 100 respondents, 37% (n = 37) indicated that the
reasons for finding it difficult to access services by individuals with most significant disabilities were different from the general population of persons with disabilities. These respondents were then asked to indicate the top three reasons for finding it difficult to access services by individuals with most significant disabilities. **Table 17 lists the reasons along with the number of times each was mentioned as one of the top three barriers for individuals with most significant disabilities.**

**Table 17**  
*Difficulties Accessing IDVR Services for Individuals with Most Significant Disabilities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to Accessing IDVR Services - MSD</th>
<th>Number of Times Identified as a Barrier N(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited accessibility of IDVR via public transportation</td>
<td>27(11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties completing the application</td>
<td>16(6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties accessing training or education programs</td>
<td>12(5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>10(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other challenges related to the physical location of the office</td>
<td>8(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of options for the use of technology to communicate with staff such as Skype, text, etc.</td>
<td>6(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate disability-related accommodations</td>
<td>5(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties completing the Individualized Plan for Employment</td>
<td>5(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate assessment services</td>
<td>5(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers</td>
<td>4(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow service delivery</td>
<td>4(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDVR staff do not meet clients in the communities where the clients live</td>
<td>4(2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limited accessibility of IDVR via public transportation (n = 27), difficulties completing the application (n = 16), and difficulties accessing training or education programs (n = 12) were the items
most commonly cited as presenting barriers to accessing services for persons with most significant disabilities. Transportation is a significant barrier in this largely rural state. Access to applications (we assume this refers to online applications in particular) and training programs were noted as significant barriers. Staff also commented on the lack of training programs as a barrier to employment.
Survey Results by Type

Partner Survey: Barriers to Employment for Consumers who are Racial or Ethnic Minorities

Respondents were asked if the barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities were different from the overall population of persons with disabilities. Of the 226 respondents, 48.6% (n = 110) indicated that the barriers to achieving employment goals were different for consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities. Respondents were then asked to indicate the top three barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities from a list of 20 barriers. Table 18 lists the barriers along with the number of times each of the barriers was mentioned as one of the top three barriers for consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities by partner survey respondents.

Table 18
Top Three Barriers to Achieving Employment Goals for Consumers who are Racial or Ethnic Minorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Three Barriers to Achieving Employment Goals - Racial or Ethnic Minorities</th>
<th>Times Identified as a Barrier N(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers</td>
<td>68 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having education or training</td>
<td>44 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers' perceptions about employing persons with disabilities</td>
<td>28 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or no experience</td>
<td>27 (12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reason</td>
<td>count (percentage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having job skills</td>
<td>22 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor social skills</td>
<td>16 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other transportation issues</td>
<td>16 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough jobs available</td>
<td>15 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>15 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having job search skills</td>
<td>11 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability-related transportation issues</td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having disability-related accommodations</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing issues</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare issues</td>
<td>6 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convictions for criminal offenses</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health issues</td>
<td>5 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse issues</td>
<td>4 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions regarding impact of income on Social Security benefits</td>
<td>4 (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of help with disability-related personal care</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other health issues</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language barriers (n = 68), not having education or training (n = 44), employers’ perceptions about employing persons with disabilities (n = 28), and little or no work experience (n=27) were the items most frequently mentioned in the top three barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities.

**Partner Survey: Barriers to Accessing Services for Consumers who are Racial or Ethnic Minorities**

Partner survey respondents were asked if the reasons for finding it difficult to access services by consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities were different from the general population of persons with disabilities. Of the 208 respondents, 39.4% (n = 82) indicated that the reasons for finding it difficult to access services by consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities were different from the general population of persons with disabilities. Respondents were then asked to indicate the top three reasons for finding it difficult to access services by consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities. Table 19 lists the reasons along with the number of times each was
mentioned as one of the top three reasons for consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities.

**Table 19**

*Difficulties Accessing Services for Consumers who are Racial or Ethnic Minorities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to Accessing IDVR Services - Racial or Ethnic Minorities</th>
<th>Times identified as a Barrier N(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers</td>
<td>54(26%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties completing the application</td>
<td>29(14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited accessibility of public transportation</td>
<td>24(12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties accessing training or education programs</td>
<td>23(11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow service delivery</td>
<td>15(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>15(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties completing the Individualized Plan for Employment</td>
<td>12(6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of options for the use of technology to communicate with staff such as Skype, text, etc.</td>
<td>12(6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDVR staff do not meet clients in the communities where the clients live</td>
<td>11(5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate assessment services</td>
<td>9(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDVR staff are not responsive to communication from clients or potential clients</td>
<td>9(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other challenges related to the physical location of the office</td>
<td>7(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate disability-related accommodations</td>
<td>5(2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language barriers (n = 54) and difficulties completing the application (n = 29) were identified by partners as the most prevalent barriers to accessing services.

Partner survey respondents were presented with an open-ended question asking if there was anything else that should be known about why individuals with disabilities might find it difficult to access services. Eighty responses were provided which outlined a variety of additional considerations associated with accessing
services. Three themes were mentioned by two or more respondents: insufficient or inconsistent support from counselors (n = 12), potential clients are unaware of services (n = 10), and lack of parent or family participation and support (n = 9).

**Staff Survey: Barriers to Employment for Consumers who are Racial or Ethnic Minorities**

Staff survey respondents were asked if the barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities were different from the overall population of persons with disabilities. Of the 102 staff respondents, 54.9% (n = 56) indicated that the barriers to achieving employment goals were different for consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities. These 56 respondents were then asked to indicate the top three barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities from a list of 20 barriers. **Table 20 lists the barriers along with the number of times each of the barriers was mentioned as one of the top three barriers for consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities by staff survey respondents.**

**Table 20**

*Top Three Barriers to Achieving Employment Goals for Consumers who are Racial or Ethnic Minorities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Three Barriers to Achieving Employment Goals - Racial and Ethnic Minorities</th>
<th>Times Identified as a Barrier N (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers</td>
<td>41(40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having education or training</td>
<td>21(20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>15(15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little or no work experience</td>
<td>12(12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having job search skills</td>
<td>11(11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers' perceptions about employing persons with disabilities</td>
<td>10(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor social skills</td>
<td>8(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other transportation issues</td>
<td>6(6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having job skills</td>
<td>5(5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health issues</td>
<td>5(5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing issues</td>
<td>4(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convictions for criminal offenses</td>
<td>2(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse issues</td>
<td>2(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions regarding impact of income on Social Security benefits</td>
<td>2(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having disability-related accommodations</td>
<td>1(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other health issues</td>
<td>1(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough jobs available</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of help with disability-related personal care</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability-related transportation issues</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare issues</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language barriers (n = 41), not having education or training (n = 21), Other, please describe (n = 15) and little or no work experience (n = 12) were the items most frequently mentioned as among the top three barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities. Fourteen respondents provided narrative responses for Other (please describe) with the prevalent theme being employer bias, misperceptions, and discrimination (n=11).

**Staff Survey: Barriers to Accessing Services for Consumers who are Racial or Ethnic Minorities**

Staff survey respondents were asked if the reasons for finding it difficult to access services by consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities were different from the general population of persons with disabilities. Of the 99 respondents, 32.3% (n = 32) indicated that the reasons for finding it difficult to access services by consumers who were racial or ethnic minorities were different from the general population of persons with disabilities. Respondents were then asked to indicate the top three reasons for finding it difficult to access services by consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities. Table 21 lists the reasons along with the number of times each was mentioned as one of the top three reasons for consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities.

**Table 21**

*Difficulties Accessing Services for Consumers who are Racial or Ethnic Minorities*
Language barriers (n = 30), difficulties completing the application (n = 17), and limited accessibility of public transportation (n = 11) were the most commonly identified barriers to accessing services identified for consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities.
Section 4
Needs of Individuals with Disabilities
Served Through Other Components of the
Workforce Development System

Survey Results by Type: Individual Survey

Respondents to the individual survey were presented with several questions pertaining to their experiences with American Job Centers (AJCs). The first question asked respondents if they ever tried to use the services of AJCs. Of those who replied to the question 863, (80.6%) indicated that they had not tried to use services of AJCs and 207 (19.3%) indicated that they had tried to use services.

Respondents were asked if they experienced any difficulties with the physical accessibility of the building. Of those who responded, 201 (96.6%) indicated that they did not experience difficulties with the physical accessibility, while 7 (3.3%) indicated that they did experience difficulties. Respondents were asked if they had any difficulty accessing the programs at the center. Of those who responded to the question, 183 (89.2%) indicated that they did not have any difficulty accessing programs at the center and 22 (10.7%) indicated that they did experience difficulties. Respondents were asked if they went to the center to get training. Of those who responded, 166 (79.8%) indicated that they did not go to the center for training and 42 (20.1%) indicated that they did go to the center for training.

Respondents were asked if they got the training that they were seeking at AJCs. Forty-three individuals responded to this question, with 28 (65.1%) indicating that they did receive the training they were seeking. Respondents were then asked if the training resulted in employment. Forty-three individuals responded to this question, with 32 (74.4%) indicating that the training they received did not result in employment and 11 (25.5%) indicating that the training did result in employment.
Respondents were asked if they went to AJCs for find a job. Two hundred and seven individuals responded to this question, with 148 (71.5%) indicating that they did go to AJCs to find a job and 59 (28.5%) indicating that they did not go to AJCs to find a job. Respondents were then asked if AJCs helped them to find employment. One hundred and forty-five individuals responded to this question, with 102 (70.3%) indicating that the AJC did not help them find employment and 43 (29.6%) indicating that the AJC did help them find employment.

Two hundred respondents answered a question asking them to describe their opinion of the helpfulness of the staff at the AJCs. Ninety (45%) described the staff as “somewhat helpful”, 82 (41%) described the staff as “very helpful”, and 28 (14%) described the staff as “not helpful”.

One hundred and ninety-nine respondents answered a question asking them to describe their opinion of the value of the services at the center. Eighty-eight (44.2%) described the services as “somewhat valuable”; 79 (39.7%) described the services as “very valuable”; and 32 (16%) described the services as “not valuable”.
Section 5
Needs of Youth with Disabilities in Transition

IDVR’s Pre-employment Transition Services (Pre-ETS) Fiscal Forecasting
The Pre-Employment Transition Services Fiscal Forecasting was completed by IDVR staff with technical assistance from the WINTAC. The template used to develop the Fiscal Forecasting was approved by RSA.

Step I: Estimate of Potentially Eligible Students with Disabilities
Provide an estimate of the number of students with disabilities in the State to get the total number of potentially eligible students with disabilities across Idaho. Identify the source(s) for this number.

The Idaho State Department of Education provided the following information: 6,822 Idaho Special Education Students ages 15-21 have an Individualized Education Plan. No data was available for students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended. The latest stratified age data was from FFY 2014. Idaho uses 15 as the introductory age for engagement with Title IV State Vocational Rehabilitation programs.

Step II: Methods of Assessing Pre-ETS Need
Identify the method you used to determine the need for Pre-ETS in Idaho. These needs should be described in the most recent CSNA. If the CSNA was done prior to WIOA, then the VR program should indicate that the needs will be identified in the next CSNA and articulate how they are identifying the needs in the meantime.

Overview
The most current completed CSNA (published 2014) does not provide the necessary information to answer Step II. Preliminary data from this CSNA (published 2018) for program years 2015-2017 has
been incorporated into this forecast. To complement this CSNA data, and to develop and implement Pre-ETS across Idaho, IDVR’s Transition Coordinator engaged in the following needs assessment related activities:

**WIOA Pre-ETS Needs Assessment Year 1**

The Transition Coordinator employed a multifaceted approach for determining the need for pre-employment transition services in Idaho. Initially the Transition Coordinator visited with numerous Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in all eight administrative regions. These visits included an assessment to determine what transition services were currently being provided by the LEA, and to determine the need for additional pre-employment transition services. During these visits, the Transition Coordinator also provided technical assistance regarding changes to WIOA.

While making LEA visits the Transition Coordinator also met with VR staff to provide updates regarding pre-employment transition services, to brainstorm the needs for the region, and to discuss ways to assist the staff in the implementation of these services.

Using the assessment information provided by the LEAs and Regional VR staff, the Transition Coordinator developed statewide programs based on the evidence-based predictors that lead to increased postsecondary success in education and employment, and were aligned to the five authorized Pre-ETS categories. The Transition Coordinator also worked with LEAs, institutions of higher education, state and federal programs serving students, and employers to enhance pre-employment transition services provided around the state.

**WIOA Pre-ETS Assessment Year 2**

Following program implementation, the Transition Coordinator assessed and evaluated the effectiveness of service provision of pre-employment transition services. The Transition Coordinator identified service delivery gaps and facilitated the systematic development of innovative strategies for improvement. LEAs and regional VR staff were again asked to assess the current state of Pre-ETS service delivery. The provision of pre-employment transition services was
modified based on these assessments. The number of programs and number of slots available for students in each program were determined through collection of stated needs for additional pre-employment transition services in each region.

The Transition Coordinator identified effective marketing strategies and developed materials to reach students and youth in transition and school district personnel to inform parents, educators, administrators, and others about the Vocational Rehabilitation program. The coordinator collected and disseminated information and materials that fosters best practices among counselors who serve transition customers as well as potentially eligible students. Materials include various brochures for each program and a newly designed website directed to students. You can view the website at: https://vr.idaho.gov/site/students.

The new CSNA highlights perceived barriers to achieving employment for students in transition as viewed from internal and external stakeholder perspectives. While all reported barriers to employment should be considered, the surveys highlighted common themes across both stakeholder groups including:

- Little to no work experience
- Not having job skills
- Not having education or training
- Poor social skills
- Transportation issues (accessing training/education programs)

While Pre-ETS required activities can address the first four barriers, lack of access to transition services in rural areas is being addressed, in part, through the creation of online, self-paced modules targeted toward Pre-ETS participants.

**Section III: Demonstration of the Availability of Required Services**

The five required Pre-ETS services are provided statewide to eligible and potentially eligible students across Idaho.
Over the past two years, regional contracts for services are allocated based on needs and projected goals as determined by IDVR’s Transition Coordinator. Furthermore, projections for need are refined by actual service utilization, continued conversations with LEAs and any unique issues experienced during or as a result of the launch of these initiatives (e.g., a late launch of WIOA year one summer Pre-ETS experiences negatively impacted utilization of those services due to a lack of marketing ahead of time).

The provision and evaluation of various Pre-ETS activities are ongoing. The most recent CSNA results are preliminary; therefore the Division is currently highly reliant on feedback from field staff to determine that the need for Pre-ETS has been addressed. As a result, IDVR anticipates increased utilization of Pre-ETS moving into PY 2017.

It is difficult to estimate the anticipated increase in the utilization of the required Pre-ETS: First, initial launch programs are currently being evaluated, modified, or supplanted. Second, solid baselines for student utilization of services do not yet exist: as marketing efforts take root, knowledge of an interest in Pre-ETS programs will expand.

The division believes a 10% increase in the number of students engaged in Pre-ETS activities should meet or outpace year-over-year utilization of services and is therefore inserting the 10% projection as a conservative estimate with the intention of ensuring the projected Pre-ETS required budget will be more than sufficient to meet the statewide need.

Idaho is a large rural state. It is the 14th largest state and 39th in population. There are approximately 150 districts in Idaho serving students with disabilities, with approximately 280,000 students enrolled in Idaho public schools and approximately 27,000 students with disabilities. Therefore, it is very important for Idaho to develop strategies to support rural communities. Idaho has addressed this issue using multiple approaches.

First, the Transition Coordinator developed Memorandums of Agreement (MOAs) with rural school districts to have teachers provide a self-advocacy curriculum to students outside of the school.
day. The curriculum was developed as a partnership between the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, the Idaho State Department of Education, the Blaine County School District (an LEA), and National Technical Assistance Center for Transition (NTACT). The curriculum emphasizes self-advocacy in employment and is also linked to the Common Core standards.

Next, the Transition Coordinator directed outreach visits to rural districts in year 2 of implementation. Through these visits additional MOAs were developed to collaboratively provide paid work experiences during the school day. Additionally, IDVR has been working with Boise State University to increase the utilization and understanding of technology by developing a digital literacy training program. The College and Career Digital Literacies Training Program is being designed as a flexible blended learning solution. The modules are a combination of e-learning with facilitated teacher materials. The 10 online and facilitated modules are being developed to teach students digital literacy skills. Five modules teach the digital literacy skills needed for accessing employment and five modules teach the digital literacy skills needed for accessing higher education. These modules will be made available to LEAs for students with disabilities at no cost during the 2017-2018 school year. The Division plans to develop 10 additional modules in the future, five directed at digital literacy skills for independent living and five for self-advocacy. Offering online options will help to bring services to all our rural locations. Finally, Idaho VR has developed numerous face-to-face programs. A majority of these programs occur in the summer and are residential programs. This allows students from across the state to attend these weeklong programs.

The Division has also dedicated significant effort to providing both group and individual services. Students have taken part in career pathways searches, completed vocational inventories, received information on in-demand and non-traditional employment specifically in the Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) fields, and participated in job shadows. IDVR also provided outreach to students regarding transition to higher education and/or additional training, taught financial literacy and soft skills, as well as requesting accommodations. In addition, students have participated in
leadership training, paid work experiences, driver’s education, on-the-job training, and received individual counseling on careers of interest.

While numerous individualized Pre-ETS activities are taking place, IDVR is offering the following reoccurring Pre-ETS for the upcoming program year. Additional information on these activities is available in Appendix A:

- **Tools for Life: Secondary Transition and Technology Fair.** Throughout the two-day event, there will be keynote speakers and presentations around employment, assistive technology, post-secondary education, independent living, and self-advocacy/self-direction.

- **Boise State University PREP Academy:** Students spend one week on the BSU campus to experience college life, learn how to take notes in college, visit the Educational Access Center, understand financial aid, etc.

- **Lewis-Clark State College Crew experience:** Students spend three days on the LCSC campus to experience college life, learn how to take notes in college, visit the Educational Access Center, understand financial aid, etc.

- **McCall Outdoor Science School Camp:** Students spend one week learning skills that will lead to successful employment. Students will be exposed to jobs that focus on natural resources and participate in hands-on programs that teach scientific and ecological principles.

- **Idaho State University Academy NeXT:** Is a summer transition program for students with disabilities interested in learning skills to help find a job. The Academy offers high school students ages 15-21 who are working with Vocational Rehabilitation the opportunity to participate in a five-day, four-night on-campus college experience. This experience focuses on career readiness, job exploration, self-advocacy, and independent living skills. Students use a simulated learning environment to practice advocacy and efficacy skills. Students practice using Avatars to learn these important skills. The focus of the
program is for students with more significant communication needs.

- **Idaho State University Bengal Project**: Students spend three consecutive days on the ISU campus to experience college life, learn how to take notes in college, visit the Educational Access Center, understand financial aid, etc.

- **Paid Summer Work Experience**: Students participate in one-week non-paid job readiness training to prepare for work. Students then participate in a part-time paid work experience for five weeks. On-the-job worksite trainers are available to students as support is needed.

- **Idaho School for the Deaf and Blind (ISDB) Work Camp and Paid Work Experience**: Summer camp that includes four weeks of paid work experience. The camp includes interpreters for all students needing one.

- **Idaho Parents Unlimited Summer Experience**: Youth with disabilities create an original piece of art under the guidance of a professional teaching artist. Students collaboratively determine the type of visual art produced with the teaching artist. They choose from photo mosaic interpretations of an organization’s products, word paintings using a generated word list of the client’s choice, or contemporary art utilizing the client’s materials or client portfolio samples.

- **Teacher Taught Self-Advocacy Curriculum**: Students participate in a group lecture with other students and gain exposure to instruction in self-advocacy and work readiness training. Teachers partner with VR to provide this information to students.

- **Job Shadows**: Students work with a VRC or CRP to identify potential areas of postsecondary career interest. Students spend periods of time at places of interest arranged by the VRC or CRP. Students have the opportunity to ask questions of employers within the related field of interest.
• Work Based Learning Experiences: Services may include: in-school or after school paid or unpaid work experiences, apprenticeships, internships, short-term employment, on-the-job trainings located in the community, informational interviews, worksite tours, and mentoring.

• Career Exploration and Counseling: May include activities such as: discussions on in-demand occupations, nontraditional employment, administration of vocational interest inventory and results, career pathways, or local labor market information that applies to the student’s areas of interest.

• Workplace Readiness Training: May include services to develop social skills and independent living skills necessary to prepare for eventual employment, including: communication and interpersonal skills, financial literacy, job-seeking skills and understanding employer expectations for punctuality and performance, other “soft” skills necessary for employment, or driver’s education training or training on how to use public transportation.

• Instruction in Self-Advocacy: This service includes working one on one with students or in a group setting in order to teach students about their rights and responsibilities, how to request accommodations or services and supports, communicate their thoughts, concerns, and needs in order to prepare them for peer mentoring opportunities with individuals working in their area of interest. Students can also participate in informational interviews.

• Counseling on Postsecondary Opportunities: May include counseling on opportunities for enrollment in postsecondary educational programs at institutions of higher learning, including: counseling on course offerings and career options, types of academic and occupational training needed to succeed in the workplace and postsecondary opportunities associated with career fields or pathways. It can also include advising students and parents or representatives on academic curricula,
providing information about college applications and the admissions process, assistance with completing the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA), or providing resources that may be used to support individual student success (i.e., disability support services).

**Section IV: Identify the amount of reserve funds that will be necessary to provide the required pre-employment transition services to students with disabilities**

A. Identify the number of students with disabilities you are currently providing pre-employment transition services to.

B. Determine average cost per student.

IDVR provided 1,047 distinct Pre-ETS in PY 2016 at an average cost of $1,529.80.

C. Project number or increased number of students with disabilities that you think you will be able to provide pre-employment transition services to this year

IDVR estimates a 10% increase in Pre-ETS expenditures for this year, which would result in delivering 1,152 Pre-ETS services in PY 2017.

D. Project the average cost per student/total projected required Pre-ETS expenditures.

E. Coordinated cost adjustment.

IDVR is assuming flat costs for Pre-ETS from PY 2016 to PY 2017. This cost is $1,529.80. Applying the projected 1,152 services to be rendered to this estimated cost per service yields projected total required Pre-ETS expenditures of $1,761,870.66. This cost incorporates coordinated services, so no further adjustments to this amount are necessary.
F. Projected required and coordinated costs adjusted for anticipated growth in Pre-ETS activities for PY 2017.

**Table 22**

*Agency Funds Available for Authorized Pre-employment Transition Services*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Year</th>
<th>Pre-ETS Reserve</th>
<th>PY Pre-ETS Required and Coordinated Expenditures</th>
<th>Average cost</th>
<th>Estimated # Served</th>
<th>Percent Increase Anticipated</th>
<th>Available for Authorized Pre-ETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FFY 16</td>
<td>2,250,000</td>
<td>1,601,704.34</td>
<td>1,529.80</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 17</td>
<td>2,478,600</td>
<td>1,761,870.66</td>
<td>1,529.80</td>
<td>1,152</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>716,729.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 6
Need to Establish, Develop or Improve Community Rehabilitation Programs in Idaho

Partner Survey Results:

The partner survey was created using an Internet-based survey application and invitations to complete the survey were distributed to representatives of partner organizations. A total of 308 valid partner surveys were completed. Questions appearing on the partner survey addressed four general areas:

- Services readily available to persons with disabilities
- Barriers to achieving employment goals
- Barriers to accessing services
- Desired changes in services

Respondent Characteristics

The first question was an open-ended question asking respondents to indicate their job title. Many respondents provided job titles associated with Administration (e.g. director, department chair, manager, principal) or Direct Service Provision (e.g. special education teacher, vocational rehabilitation counselor, school counselor, social worker, transition coordinator, disability resource, employment services, career planner). There was also a significant portion of respondents who identified within the Support Services field (e.g. workforce consultant, administrative assistant).

Respondents were provided with a list and asked to identify which consumer populations they worked with on a regular basis. Table 23 illustrates the client populations indicated by the 308 survey respondents.

Table 23
Almost all the respondents reported working with transition-aged youth. A much smaller portion, less than a quarter, indicated that they worked regularly with individuals served by American Job Centers.

### Barriers to Achieving Employment Goals

Partner survey respondents were given a list of barriers and asked to identify the top three barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers. Table 24 below lists the barriers along with the number of times each of the barriers was mentioned as one of the top three barriers by partner survey respondents.

#### Table 24

*Top Three Barriers to Achieving Employment Goals for Consumers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Three Barriers to Achieving Employment Goals – General</th>
<th>Times Identified as a Barrier N(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Little or no work experience</td>
<td>105(34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Social Skills</td>
<td>104(34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having job skills</td>
<td>102(33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having education or training</td>
<td>88(29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers’ perceptions about employing persons with disabilities</td>
<td>84(27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough jobs available</td>
<td>65(21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having job search skills</td>
<td>53(17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health issues</td>
<td>53(17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability-related transportation issues</td>
<td>50(16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other transportation issues</td>
<td>47(15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions regarding impact of income on Social Security benefits</td>
<td>34(11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convictions for criminal offense</td>
<td>33(11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having disability-related accommodations</td>
<td>25(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing issues</td>
<td>22(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse issues</td>
<td>22(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of help with disability-related personal care</td>
<td>21(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>20(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers</td>
<td>19(6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other health issues</td>
<td>10(3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childcare issues</td>
<td>9(3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Little or no work experience (n=105), poor social skills (n=104), and not having job skills (n=102), were the items most frequently mentioned in the top three barriers to achieving employment goals.

Partner agency respondents were presented with an open-ended question asking if there was anything else that should be known about the primary barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers. Fifty-four responses were provided expressing a variety of needs. Common themes or issues that appeared in four or more of the responses were the following:

- Lack of jobs, opportunities, and options such as On-the-Job Training (OJT) (n=10)
- Insufficient counseling contact/support and continuity of services (n=8)
- Lack of job and community supports (n=6)
- Lack of training and skills (n=5)

**Difficulties in Accessing Services**

Respondents were presented with a question that prompted them to indicate the top three reasons that people with disabilities might find it difficult to access IDVR services. There were fourteen response options. Table 25 below lists the barriers to accessing IDVR services along with the number of times each of the barriers was mentioned as one of the top three barriers by the 207 respondents.
Table 25

*Top Three Reasons People find it Difficult to Access IDVR Services*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to Accessing IDVR Services – General</th>
<th>Times Identified as a Barrier N(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited accessibility of public transportation</td>
<td>84(41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties completing application</td>
<td>68(33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties accessing training or education program</td>
<td>68(33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow service delivery</td>
<td>66(32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>59(29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties completing the Individualized Plan for Employment</td>
<td>34(17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other challenges related to the physical location of the office</td>
<td>31(15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDVR staff do not meet consumers in the communities where the client lives</td>
<td>30(14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDVR staff are not responsive to communication from consumers or potential consumers</td>
<td>28(14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate assessment services</td>
<td>22(11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers</td>
<td>21(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of options for use of technology to communicate with staff such as Skype, text, etc.</td>
<td>17(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate disability-related accommodations</td>
<td>17(8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limited accessibility of public transportation (n=84), difficulties in completing application (n=68), difficulties accessing training or education program (n=68), and slow service delivery (n=66) were the most frequently identified barriers to accessing services.

Partner survey respondents were presented with an open-ended question asking if there was anything else that should be known about why individuals with disabilities might find it difficult to access services. Thirty responses were provided which outlines a
variety of concerns associated with accessing services. Several themes were evident across the narrative response:

- Insufficient or inconsistent support from counselors (n=12)
- Potential consumers are unaware of services (n=10)
- Parent and family participation and support (n=9)

**Desired Changes**
Partner survey respondents were presented with an open-ended question that asked them to describe the most important change IDVR could make to support consumers’ efforts to achieve their employment goals. One hundred and eight individuals provided narrative responses to this question. Themes evident across two or more of the responses were the following:

- Outreach and early contact with high schools (n=18)
- Consistent and dedicated consumer-centered services from VRCs (n=16)
- Advertise and promote program services in the community (n=7)
- Partnership and coordination with community services and employers (n=7)
Section 7
Business Services and Relations

The need for the VR program to engage with the business community and provide services to employers has been included as a common performance measure for the core program partners in WIOA. The definition of “effectiveness in serving employers” has yet to be determined, but it is likely that this term will refer to the ability of VR agencies to provide qualified applicants in a timely manner. WIOA has moved the discussion from whether VR programs should serve the business community to how well VR programs are serving this community. Consequently, it will be important for every VR program to do a self-assessment of how well they are serving employers. The project team is hopeful that this section of the report will be useful to IDVR as they engage in the evaluation of how effectively they are providing services to employers.

SURVEY RESULTS
Business Survey Responses

A link to an Internet-based survey was distributed by staff to representatives of the business community. A total of 36 valid business surveys were completed and submitted. Questions appearing on the business survey addressed five general areas. The first pertained to disability in the workplace, the second section addressed applicants with disabilities, the third pertained to employees with disabilities, the fourth section prompted respondents to indicate their familiarity with IDVR, and the fifth section asked respondents to share general demographic information regarding their businesses.

With respect to the “Disability in the Workplace” section of the survey, business respondents were presented with eight questions about whether their business needed help with a variety of concerns related to disability and employment. The questions were structured in a yes/no response format. Table 26 summarizes the results of the responses to the eight questions according to the percentage of
respondents who indicated a need for help with respect to the need or needs indicated in the question.

**Table 26**  
Disability in the Workplace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your business need help</th>
<th>Yes N(valid %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining information about On-The-Job training programs available for workers with disabilities?</td>
<td>19(52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying job accommodations for workers with disabilities?</td>
<td>16(45.%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining incentives for employing workers with disabilities?</td>
<td>14(40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining training on the different types of disabilities?</td>
<td>13(37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting job applicants who are people with disabilities?</td>
<td>13(37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining training on disability awareness?</td>
<td>12(33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding disability-related legislation such as the Americans with Disabilities Act as amended, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act and the Rehabilitation Act as amended?</td>
<td>12(33%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining information such as mentoring opportunities or work experiences for students with disabilities?</td>
<td>10(29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping workers with disabilities to retain employment?</td>
<td>9(25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey items with the most prevalence by respondents indicated that their business needed help obtaining information about OJT programs available for workers with disabilities (52%), identifying job accommodations for workers with disabilities (45%), and obtaining incentives for employing workers with disabilities (40%). The items with the lowest prevalence of need pertained to obtaining information such as mentoring opportunities or work experiences for students with disabilities (n=7), and helping workers with disabilities to retain employment (25%).
Regarding assistance with applicants with disabilities, employers were asked to provide responses to six questions, each with a yes/no response format. Table 27 summarizes the results of the responses to the six questions according to the percentage of respondents who indicated a need for help with respect to the question.

**Table 27**

*Applicants with Disabilities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your business need help</th>
<th>Yes (valid %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting applicants who meet the job qualifications?</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting applicants with good social/interpersonal skills?</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting applicants with good work habits?</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing reasonable job accommodations with applicants?</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying reasonable job accommodations for applicants?</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing applicants’ skills?</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four survey items were identified by respondents indicating that their businesses are in need of recruiting applicants who meet the job qualifications (18%), recruiting applicants with good social/interpersonal skills (18%), recruiting applicants with good work habits (18%), and discussing reasonable job accommodations with applicants (18%). The item with the lowest percentage of business representatives indicating that their business had a need was assessing applicants’ skills (12%).

With respect to employees with disabilities, business survey respondents were presented with a list of 11 job-related challenges and asked to identify the top three barriers to job retention that they had experienced. Table 28 presents the percentage of business survey respondents who identified each challenge as among the top three barriers to job retention.
Table 28
Barriers to Job Retention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top three barriers to job retention</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Other (please describe)                             | 12(31.8%)
| Difficulty learning job skills                      | 513.6% |
| Poor social skills                                  | 513.6% |
| Mental health concerns                              | 513.6% |
| Poor attendance                                     | 39.1%  |
| Slow work speed                                     | 39.1%  |
| Physical health problems                            | 24.5%  |
| Communication barriers                              | 24.5%  |
| Poor work stamina                                   | 0       |
| Identifying effective accommodations                 | 0       |
| Lack of transportation                               | 0       |

The job retention barrier indicated most frequently among the top three barriers to job retention was ‘Other (please describe)’ (31.8%). None of the business survey respondents identified poor work stamina, identifying effective accommodations, or lack of transportation as among their top barriers to job retention. When asked to describe ‘Other’, respondents indicated that they had never hired anyone with a disability or that they weren't aware of any limitations.

Business survey respondents were asked to rate their knowledge of the services that IDVR can provide to businesses using a three-point scale. Five respondents selected “Very knowledgeable,” 11 respondents selected “Somewhat knowledgeable,” and nine respondents selected “Little or no knowledge.” Respondents were also asked if they had utilized any of the services that are provided to businesses. Seven respondents indicated that they had utilized business services while fourteen respondents had not utilized business services.

Those who indicated that they had utilized business services (seven respondents) were provided with a list of 15 business services and asked to identify the services that IDVR
provided to their business. Table 29 illustrates each service that was identified by the respondents.

Table 29  
*Business Services Utilized by Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which of the following services did IDVR provide to your business? (N=7)</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helping workers with disabilities to retain employment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance identifying job accommodations for workers with disabilities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting applicants who meet the job qualifications</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining information on training programs available for workers with disabilities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing applicants’ skills</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting job applicants who are people with disabilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining training on the different types of disabilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining incentives for employing workers with disabilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing reasonable job accommodations with applicants</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying reasonable job accommodations for applicants</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in understanding disability-related legislation such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act and/or the Rehabilitation Act</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining training on sensitivity to workers with disabilities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting applicants with good social/interpersonal skills</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting applicants with good work habits</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the business services listed, those utilized by the greatest number of respondents were helping workers with disabilities to retain employment (n=4), assistance identifying job accommodations for
workers with disabilities (n=3), and recruiting applicants who meet the job qualifications (n=3).

Those who indicated that they had utilized business services (eight respondents) were presented with a five-point response scale (with responses ranging from “very satisfied” to “very dissatisfied”) and asked to indicate how satisfied they were with the services they received. Two individuals indicated that they were “very satisfied”, four individuals indicated that they were “satisfied” and two individuals indicated that they were “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied”.

**Focus Group Results**

The following recurring themes emerged across all of the focus groups completed in Idaho for all groups as they relate to the need for business engagement in Idaho:

- Large, tech-based corporations moving to Boise are seeking to build diversity within their organizations. They are open to partnering with IDVR and other workforce agencies in accomplishing this.

**Recommendations**

The focus group for business had limited participation among businesses invited and therefore should be interpreted with caution. The following recommendations are offered based on the limited information gathered in the Business Services and Relations section:

- IDVR should leverage opportunities to partner with large corporations, such as HP, that are seeking to expand their diversity programs.
- While large companies can present many opportunities for VR, access to small businesses and their hidden job market is a strategy more aligned with serving individuals with the most significant disabilities.
Overall Conclusions

Overall, IDVR is a forward-thinking agency that is aware of the needs and challenges of individuals with disabilities in Idaho. It maintains productive relationships with the state legislature, the workforce system, education and community partners. IDVR has fully embraced WIOA and has proactively taken steps to comply with key tenets including Section 511 and Pre-Employment Transition Services.

By far, the biggest barriers to accessing services and employment for individuals with disabilities in Idaho are its rural nature and related transportation issue. These are long standing issues that confront every agency and service provider in Idaho. IDVR has demonstrated a determination to address this and other needs of individuals with disabilities in partnership with other community entities.

Other conclusions:

- IDVR faces challenges in building the capacity of Community Rehabilitation Programs (CRPs) throughout the state to meet WIOA requirements (e.g. Pre-ETS initiatives, Customized Employment, and community based assessments). Building the capacity of CRPs to do Customized Employment is a significant step in this direction.

- IDVR’s involvement of education partners in the Customized Employment pilot serves a national model.

- IDVR is actively involved with the workforce development system and is well positioned to leverage available resources.

- IDVR is taking proactive steps with community and partner agencies to deal with the growing number of consumers with mental health issues.

- IDVR’s focus on business engagement will position it to take advantage of a growing corporate presence in Boise and meet
the needs of employers in building diversity within their organizations throughout Idaho.

- IDVR is to be commended for its comprehensive implementation of Pre-ETS and Section 511 requirements of WIOA.
Appendices

Appendix A: CSNA Surveys

Partner Survey 2016-17

Q1 Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Community Partner Survey.
The Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR) is working collaboratively with the State Rehabilitation Council (SRC) and staff at the Interwork Institute at San Diego State University in order to conduct an assessment of the needs of individuals with disabilities who live in Idaho. The results of this needs assessment will inform the development of the State Plan for providing rehabilitation services and will help planners make decisions about programs and services for persons with disabilities. The following survey includes questions that ask you about the unmet, employment-related needs of persons with disabilities. You will also be asked about the type of work you do and whether you work with specific disability populations. We anticipate that it will take about 20 minutes of your time to complete the survey. Your participation in this needs assessment is voluntary. If you decide to participate, your responses will be anonymous; that is, recorded without any identifying information that is linked to you. You will not be asked for your name anywhere in this survey. If you have any questions regarding this survey or would like to request the survey in an alternate format, please contact Mark Tucker at San Diego State University at the following e-mail address or phone: mtucker@mail.sdsu.edu (619) 594-3498. Thank you for your time and input!

Q2 What is your job title?

Q3 How long have you worked in your agency?
○ Less than one year
○ 1-5 years
○ 6-10 years
○ Over 10 years
Q4 Please indicate which client populations you work with on a regular basis (please check all that apply).
- Individuals with most significant disabilities
- Individuals that need long-term supports and extended services to maintain employment
- Individuals that are racial or ethnic minorities
- Individuals from unserved or underserved populations
- Transition-aged youth (14 - 24)
- Individuals served by American Job Centers (formerly referred to as One-Stops or Career Centers funded through the Idaho Department of Labor)

Q5 Please indicate which of the following services are readily available in your community to the individuals you serve. By "readily available" we mean that services are available in the geographic area where you provide services (check all that apply).
- Job search services
- Job training services
- Other education services
- Assistive technology
- Vehicle modification assistance
- Other transportation assistance
- Income assistance
- Medical treatment
- Mental health treatment
- Substance abuse treatment
- Personal care attendants
- Health insurance
- Housing
- Benefit planning assistance
- Other (please describe) ____________________
- I do not know which services are readily available to individuals with disabilities who are served by
Q6 Services provided by vendors or other service providers: The next section asks you about services provided to consumers through vendors or other service providers.

Q7 In your experience, is the network of rehabilitation service providers in Idaho able to meet consumers' vocational rehabilitation service needs?
- Yes
- No

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Question 11: What would you say are the top three barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers (please select a maximum of three barriers to achieving employment goals)? Question 11

Q8 What service needs is the network of rehabilitation service providers in Idaho unable to meet?

Q9 What are the primary reasons that vocational rehabilitation service providers are generally unable to meet consumers' service needs?
- Not enough providers available in area
- Low quality of provider services
- Client barriers prevent successful interactions with providers
- Other (please describe) ____________________

Q10 Barriers to achieving employment goals: The next section asks you to identify some of the barriers that the individuals you serve experience in trying to achieve their employment goals.
Q11 What would you say are the top three barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers (please select a maximum of three barriers to achieving employment goals)?
- Not having education or training
- Not having job skills
- Little or no work experience
- Not having job search skills
- Convictions for criminal offenses
- Language barriers
- Poor social skills
- Not enough jobs available
- Employers’ perceptions about employing persons with disabilities
- Not having disability-related accommodations
- Lack of help with disability-related personal care
- Disability-related transportation issues
- Other transportation issues
- Mental health issues
- Substance abuse issues
- Other health issues
- Childcare issues
- Housing issues
- Perceptions regarding the impact of income on Social Security benefits
- Other (please describe) ____________________

Q12 Barriers for individuals with the most significant disabilities

Q13 Are the barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers with the most significant disabilities different from the overall population?
- Yes
- No

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Question16: Are the barriers to achieving employment goals for youth in transition consumers different from the overall population?
Q14 What would you say are the top three barriers to achieving employment goals for IDVR consumers with the most significant disabilities (please select a maximum of three barriers to achieving employment goals)?
- Not having education or training
- Not having job skills
- Little or no work experience
- Not having job search skills
- Convictions for criminal offenses
- Language barriers
- Poor social skills
- Not enough jobs available
- Employers’ perceptions about employing persons with disabilities
- Not having disability-related accommodations
- Lack of help with disability-related personal care
- Disability-related transportation issues
- Other transportation issues
- Mental health issues
- Substance abuse issues
- Other health issues
- Childcare issues
- Housing issues
- Perceptions regarding the impact of income on Social Security benefits
- Other (please describe) ____________________

Q15 Barriers for youth in transition

Q16 Are the barriers to achieving employment goals for youth in transition different from the overall population?
- Yes
- No

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Question 19: Are the barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities different from the overall population?
Q17 What would you say are the top three barriers to achieving employment goals for youth in transition (please select a maximum of three barriers to achieving employment goals)?
☐ Not having education or training
☐ Not having job skills
☐ Little or no work experience
☐ Not having job search skills
☐ Convictions for criminal offenses
☐ Language barriers
☐ Poor social skills
☐ Not enough jobs available
☐ Employers’ perceptions about employing persons with disabilities
☐ Not having disability-related accommodations
☐ Lack of help with disability-related personal care
☐ Disability-related transportation issues
☐ Other transportation issues
☐ Mental health issues
☐ Substance abuse issues
☐ Other health issues
☐ Childcare issues
☐ Housing issues
☐ Perceptions regarding the impact of income on Social Security benefits
☐ Other (please describe) ____________________

Q18 Barriers for racial or ethnic minorities

Q19 Are the barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities different from the overall population?
☐ Yes
☐ No
If No Is Selected, Then Skip TO Question 21. Is there anything else we should know about the primary barriers to achieving employment for IDVR consumers.
Q20 What would you say are the top three barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities
(please select a maximum of three barriers to achieving employment goals)?

- Not having education or training
- Not having job skills
- Little or no work experience
- Not having job search skills
- Convictions for criminal offenses
- Language barriers
- Poor social skills
- Not enough jobs available
- Employers’ perceptions about employing persons with disabilities
- Not having disability-related accommodations
- Lack of help with disability-related personal care
- Disability-related transportation issues
- Other transportation issues
- Mental health issues
- Substance abuse issues
- Other health issues
- Childcare issues
- Housing issues
- Perceptions regarding the impact of income on Social Security benefits
- Other (please describe) ____________________

Q21 Is there anything else we should know about the primary barriers to achieving employment goals for IDVR consumers?

Q22 Barriers to accessing services: The next section asks you to identify barriers that individuals with disabilities might experience in accessing IDVR services.

Q23 What would you say are the top three reasons that people with disabilities find it difficult to access services (please select a maximum of three reasons)?

- Limited accessibility of IDVR via public transportation
- Other challenges related to the physical location of the office
- Inadequate disability-related accommodations
- Language barriers
- Difficulties completing the application
- Difficulties completing the Individualized Plan for Employment
- Inadequate assessment services
- Slow service delivery
- Difficulties accessing training or education programs
- Staff do not meet clients in the communities where the clients live
- Lack of options for the use of technology to communicate with IDVR staff such as Skype, text, etc.
- Staff are not responsive to communication from clients or potential clients
- Other (please describe) ________________

Q24 Accessing services for individuals with the most significant disabilities

Q25 Are the reasons for finding it difficult to access IDVR services by individuals with the most significant disabilities different from the general population of people with disabilities?
- Yes
- No

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Questions 28: Are the reasons for finding it difficult to access services by youth in transition different from the general population of people with disabilities?
Q26 What would you say are the top three reasons that individuals with the most significant disabilities find it difficult to access services (please select a maximum of three reasons)?

- Limited accessibility of IDVR via public transportation
- Other challenges related to the physical location of the office
- Inadequate disability-related accommodations
- Language barriers
- Difficulties completing the application
- Difficulties completing the Individualized Plan for Employment
- Inadequate assessment services
- Slow service delivery
- Difficulties accessing training or education programs
- Staff do not meet clients in the communities where the clients live
- Lack of options for the use of technology to communicate with staff such as Skype, text, etc.
- Staff are not responsive to communication from clients or potential clients
- Other (please describe) ____________________

Q27 Accessing services for youth in transition

Q28 Are the reasons for finding it difficult to access services by youth in transition different from the general population of people with disabilities?

- Yes
- No

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Question 31 Are the reasons for finding it difficult to access IDVR services by consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities different from the general population of people with disabilities?
Q29 What would you say are the top three reasons that youth in transition find it difficult to access services (please select a maximum of three reasons)?

- Limited accessibility of IDVR via public transportation
- Other challenges related to the physical location of the office
- Inadequate disability-related accommodations
- Language barriers
- Difficulties completing the application
- Difficulties completing the Individualized Plan for Employment
- Inadequate assessment services
- Slow service delivery
- Difficulties accessing training or education programs
- Staff do not meet clients in the communities where the clients live
- Lack of options for the use of technology to communicate with IDVR staff such as Skype, text, etc.
- Staff are not responsive to communication from clients or potential clients
- Other (please describe) ____________________

Q30 Accessing services for racial or ethnic minorities

Q31 Are the reasons for finding it difficult to access IDVR services by consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities different from the general population of people with disabilities?

- Yes
- No

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Question 33: Is there anything else we should know about why individuals with disabilities find it difficult to access IDVR services?
Q32 What would you say are the top three reasons that consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities find it difficult to access IDVR services (please select a maximum of three reasons)?
- Limited accessibility of IDVR via public transportation
- Other challenges related to the physical location of the office
- Inadequate disability-related accommodations
- Language barriers
- Difficulties completing the application
- Difficulties completing the Individualized Plan for Employment
- Inadequate accessing assessment services
- Slow service delivery
- Difficulties accessing training or education programs
- Staff do not meet clients in the communities where the clients live
- Lack of options for the use of technology to communicate with IDVR staff such as Skype, text, etc.
- Staff are not responsive to communication from clients or potential clients
- Other (please describe) ____________________

Q33 Is there anything else we should know about why individuals with disabilities find it difficult to access IDVR services?

Q34 What is the most important change that IDVR could make to support consumers’ efforts to achieve their employment goals?

Q35 What is the most important change that the network or rehabilitation service providers in Idaho could make to support consumers' efforts to achieve their employment goals?

Q36 Your feedback is valuable to us, and we would like to thank you for taking the time to complete the survey! Please select the "NEXT" button below to submit your responses.

Staff Survey 2016-17

Q1 Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Staff Survey The Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR) is working collaboratively with the State Rehabilitation Council and staff at the Interwork
Institute at San Diego State University in order to conduct an assessment of the needs of individuals with disabilities who live in Idaho. The results of this needs assessment will inform the development of the State Plan for providing rehabilitation services and will help planners make decisions about programs and services for persons with disabilities. The following survey includes questions that ask you about the unmet, employment-related needs of persons with disabilities. You will also be asked about the type of work you do and whether you work with specific disability populations. We anticipate that it will take about 20 minutes of your time to complete the survey. Your participation in this needs assessment is voluntary. If you decide to participate, your responses will be anonymous; that is, recorded without any identifying information that is linked to you. You will not be asked for your name anywhere in this survey. If you have any questions regarding this survey or would like to request the survey in an alternate format, please contact Mark Tucker at San Diego State University at the following e-mail address or phone: mtucker@mail.sdsu.edu (610) 594-3498. Thank you for your time and input!

Q2 What is your job title?

Q3 How long have you worked with IDVR?
- Less than one year
- 1-5 years
- 6-10 years
- Over 10 years
Q4 Please indicate which populations you work with on a regular basis (please check all that apply).
- Individuals with the most significant disabilities
- Individuals that need long-term supports and extended services to maintain employment
- Individuals that are racial or ethnic minorities
- Individuals from unserved or underserved populations
- Transition-aged youth (14 - 24)
- Individuals served by American Job Centers (formerly referred to as One- Stops or Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) programs funded through the Idaho Department of Labor)

Q5 Please indicate which of the following services are readily available in your community to the individuals you serve. By "readily available" we mean that services are available in the geographic area where you provide services (check all that apply).
- Job search services
- Job training services
- Other education services
- Assistive technology
- Vehicle modification assistance
- Other transportation assistance
- Income assistance
- Medical treatment
- Mental health treatment
- Substance abuse treatment
- Personal care attendants
- Health insurance
- Housing
- Benefit planning assistance
- Other (please describe) ____________________

Q6 Services provided by vendors or other service providers: The next section asks you about services provided to IDVR consumers through vendors or other service providers.
Q7 In your experience, are vendors/service providers able to meet IDVR consumers' vocational rehabilitation service needs?

☑ Yes
☑ No

If Yes Is Selected, Then Skip To Question 10 : What services do you feel IDVR does the best job providing to its clients (either directly or through community partners)?

Q8 What service needs are vendors/service providers unable to meet?

Q9 What are the top three reasons that vendors/service providers are generally unable to meet consumers' service needs (Please check only three)?

☐ Not enough vendors/service providers available in area
☐ Low quality of vendor/service provider services
☐ Low rates paid for services
☐ Low levels of accountability for poor performance by vendors/service providers
☐ Client barriers prevent successful interactions with vendors
☐ Other (please describe) ____________________

Q10 What services do you feel IDVR does the best job providing to its clients (either directly or through community partners)?

Q11 Barriers to achieving employment goals: The next section asks you to identify some of the barriers that the individuals you serve experience in trying to achieve their employment goals.
Q12 What would you say are the top three barriers to achieving employment goals for IDVR consumers (please select a maximum of three barriers to achieving employment goals)?
- Not having education or training
- Not having job skills
- Little or no work experience
- Not having job search skills
- Convictions for criminal offenses
- Language barriers
- Poor social skills
- Not enough jobs available
- Employers’ perceptions about employing persons with disabilities
- Not having disability-related accommodations
- Lack of help with disability-related personal care
- Disability-related transportation issues
- Other transportation issues
- Mental health issues
- Substance abuse issues
- Other health issues
- Childcare issues
- Housing issues
- Perceptions regarding the impact of income on Social Security benefits
- Other (please describe) ____________________

Q13 Barriers for individuals with the most significant disabilities

Q14 Are the barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers with the most significant disabilities different from the overall population?
- Yes
- No

Q15 What would you say are the top three barriers to achieving employment goals for IDVR consumers with the most significant
disabilities (please select a maximum of three barriers to achieving employment goals)?

- Not having education or training
- Not having job skills
- Little or no work experience
- Not having job search skills
- Convictions for criminal offenses
- Language barriers
- Poor social skills
- Not enough jobs available
- Employers’ perceptions about employing persons with disabilities
- Not having disability-related accommodations
- Lack of help with disability-related personal care
- Disability-related transportation issues
- Other transportation issues
- Mental health issues
- Substance abuse issues
- Other health issues
- Childcare issues
- Housing issues
- Perceptions regarding the impact of income on Social Security benefits
- Other (please describe) ____________________

Q42[Question numbers are out of numerical sequence due to survey revisions] Barriers for youth in transition

Q15 Are the barriers to achieving employment goals for youth in transition different from the overall population?

- Yes
- No

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Question 17: Are the barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities different from the overall population?
Q16 What would you say are the top three barriers to achieving employment goals for youth in transition (please select a maximum of three barriers to achieving employment goals)?
- Not having education or training
- Not having job skills
- Little or no work experience
- Not having job search skills
- Convictions for criminal offenses
- Language barriers
- Poor social skills
- Not enough jobs available
- Employers’ perceptions about employing persons with disabilities
- Not having disability-related accommodations
- Lack of help with disability-related personal care
- Disability-related transportation issues
- Other transportation issues
- Mental health issues
- Substance abuse issues
- Other health issues
- Childcare issues
- Housing issues
- Perceptions regarding the impact of income on Social Security benefits
- Other (please describe) ____________________

Q43 Question numbers are out of numerical sequence due to survey revisions] Barriers for racial or ethnic minorities

Q17 Are the barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities different from the overall population?
- Yes
- No

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Question 19: Is there anything else we should know about the primary barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers?
Q18 What would you say are the top three barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities (please select a maximum of three barriers to achieving employment goals)?

- Not having education or training
- Not having job skills
- Little or no work experience
- Not having job search skills
- Convictions for criminal offenses
- Language barriers
- Poor social skills
- Not enough jobs available
- Employers’ perceptions about employing persons with disabilities
- Not having disability-related accommodations
- Lack of help with disability-related personal care
- Disability-related transportation issues
- Other transportation issues
- Mental health issues
- Substance abuse issues
- Other health issues
- Childcare issues
- Housing issues
- Perceptions regarding the impact of income on Social Security benefits
- Other (please describe) ____________________

Q19 Is there anything else we should know about the primary barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers?

Q20 Barriers to accessing services: The next section asks you to identify barriers that individuals with disabilities might experience in accessing IDVR services.
Q21 What would you say are the top three reasons that people with disabilities find it difficult to access services (please select a maximum of three reasons)?

- Limited accessibility of IDVR via public transportation
- Other challenges related to the physical location of the office
- Inadequate disability-related accommodations
- Language barriers
- Difficulties completing the application
- Difficulties completing the Individualized Plan for Employment
- Inadequate assessment services
- Slow service delivery
- Difficulties accessing training or education programs
- Lack of options for the use of technology to communicate with staff such as Skype, text, etc.
- Staff do not meet clients in the communities where the clients live
- Other (please describe) ____________________

Q44 Question numbers are out of numerical sequence due to survey revisions] Accessing services for individuals with the most significant disabilities

Q22 Are the reasons for finding it difficult to access services by individuals with the most significant disabilities different from the general population of people with disabilities?

- Yes
- No

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Question 24: Is there anything else we should know about the primary barriers to achieving employment goals for consumers?
Q23 What would you say are the top three reasons that individuals with the most significant disabilities find it difficult to access IDVR services (please select a maximum of three reasons)?
- Limited accessibility of IDVR via public transportation
- Other challenges related to the physical location of the office
- Inadequate disability-related accommodations
- Language barriers
- Difficulties completing the application
- Difficulties completing the Individualized Plan for Employment
- Inadequate assessment services
- Slow service delivery
- Difficulties accessing training or education programs
- Lack of options for the use of technology to communicate with IDVR staff such as Skype, text, etc.
- Staff do not meet clients in the communities where the clients live
- Other (please describe) ____________________

Q45 [Survey numbers not in numerical order due to revisions of survey] Accessing services for youth in transition

Q24 Are the reasons for finding it difficult to access IDVR services by youth in transition different from the general population of people with disabilities?
- yes
- no
If no Is Selected, Then Skip To Question 27: Are the reasons for finding it difficult to access IDVR services by consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities different from the general population of people with disabilities?
Q25 What would you say are the top three reasons that youth in transition find it difficult to access IDVR services (please select a maximum of three reasons)?
- Limited accessibility of IDVR via public transportation
- Other challenges related to the physical location of the office
- Inadequate disability-related accommodations
- Language barriers
- Difficulties completing the application
- Difficulties completing the Individualized Plan for Employment
- Inadequate assessment services
- Slow service delivery
- Difficulties accessing training or education programs
- Lack of options for the use of technology to communicate with IDVR staff such as Skype, text, etc.
- Staff do not meet clients in the communities where the clients live
- Other (please describe) ____________________

Q26 Accessing services for racial or ethnic minorities

Q27 Are the reasons for finding it difficult to access IDVR services by consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities different from the general population of people with disabilities?
- Yes
- No

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Question 29: Is there anything else we should know about why individuals with disabilities find it difficult to access IDVR services?
Q28 What would you say are the top three reasons that consumers who are racial or ethnic minorities find it difficult to access services (please select a maximum of three reasons)?
- Limited accessibility of IDVR via public transportation
- Other challenges related to the physical location of the office
- Inadequate disability-related accommodations
- Language barriers
- Difficulties completing the application
- Difficulties completing the Individualized Plan for Employment
- Inadequate assessment services
- Slow service delivery
- Difficulties accessing training or education programs
- Lack of options for the use of technology to communicate with IDVR staff such as Skype, text, etc.
- Staff do not meet clients in the communities where the clients live
- Other (please describe) ____________________

Q29 Is there anything else we should know about why individuals with disabilities find it difficult to access IDVR services?

Q30 What is the most important change that IDVR could make to support consumers' efforts to achieve their employment goals?

Q31 What is the most important change that vendors/service providers could make to support consumers' efforts to achieve their employment goals?
Q32 What are the top three changes that would enable you to better assist your IDVR consumers (please select a maximum of three changes)?

[ ] Smaller caseload

[ ] More streamlined processes

[ ] Better data management tools

[ ] Better assessment tools

[ ] Additional training

[ ] More administrative support

[ ] More supervisor support

[ ] Improved business partnerships

[ ] Decreased procurement time

[ ] More effective community-based service providers

[ ] Increased outreach to clients in their communities

[ ] Increased options for technology use to communicate with clients

[ ] Other (please describe) ____________________

Q33 Idaho Department of Labor (DOL) Programs: The next section asks you about the Idaho Department of Labor programs, often referred to as American Job Centers, and how well they serve individuals with disabilities in Idaho.

Q34 How frequently do you work with the American Job Centers through the Idaho Department of Labor in Idaho?

[ ] Very frequently

[ ] Somewhat frequently

[ ] Infrequently

[ ] Not at all

If Not at all Is Selected, Then Skip To Question 37

Your feedback is valuable to us, and we would like to thank you for taking the time to complete the survey! Please select the "NEXT" button below to submit your responses.
Q35 In your opinion, how effectively do the American Job Centers through the Idaho Department of Labor serve individuals with disabilities?
- Very effectively
- Effectively
- Not effectively
- They do not serve individuals with disabilities

Q36 What can the American Job Centers through the Idaho Department of Labor do to improve services to individuals with disabilities (Check all that apply)?
- Improve physical accessibility
- Improve programmatic accessibility
- Train their staff on how to work with individuals with disabilities
- Include individuals with disabilities when purchasing training for their clients
- Partner more effectively with IDVR
- Other (please describe) ____________________

Q37 Your feedback is valuable to us, and we would like to thank you for taking the time to complete the survey! Please select the "NEXT" button below to submit your responses.

**Business Survey 2016-17**

Q1 Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Business Survey The purpose of this survey is to learn more about the needs of businesses and employers with respect to partnering with the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR) and employing and accommodating workers with disabilities. The information that you provide will help to more effectively respond to the needs of businesses and will influence the planning and delivery of vocational services to persons with disabilities. For the purposes of our survey, an individual with a disability is a person who: Has a physical or mental disability that experiences barriers or challenges to employment. This survey will take approximately five minutes to complete. Your responses will be kept confidential and you will not be asked for your name or the name of your organization anywhere in the survey. Please select the
response to each question that best describes your needs at this time. Thank you for your time and input!
Q2 Disability in the Workplace: Does your business need help... (select one response for each question)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding disability-related legislation such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act and/or the Rehabilitation Act?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying job accommodations for workers with disabilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting job applicants who are people with disabilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping workers with disabilities to retain employment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining training on the different types of disabilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining training on disability awareness?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining incentives for employing workers with disabilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining information on On-the-job training programs available for workers with disabilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Obtaining information such as mentoring opportunities or work experiences for students with disabilities

Q3 If you have additional comments or needs regarding disability in the workplace, please describe them in the space below.

Q4 Applicants with disabilities: With respect to applicants with disabilities, does your business need help... (select one response for each question)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting applicants who meet the job qualifications?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting applicants with good work habits?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting applicants with good social/interpersonal skills?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing applicants' skills?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing reasonable job accommodations with applicants?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying reasonable job accommodations for applicants?</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5 If you would like to comment further on any of your answers above, or if you have additional comments or needs regarding applicants with disabilities, please describe them in the space below.
Q6 Employees with disabilities: With respect to employees with disabilities you have now or have had in the past, what are the top three challenges you have experienced with them regarding job retention? (select a maximum of three items)

- Poor attendance
- Difficulty learning job skills
- Slow work speed
- Poor work stamina
- Poor social skills
- Physical health problems
- Mental health concerns
- Communication barriers
- Identifying effective accommodations
- Lack of transportation
- Other (please describe) ____________________

Q7 If you have additional comments or needs regarding employees with disabilities, please describe them in the space below.

Q8 How would you rate your knowledge of IDVR and the services they can provide to businesses?

- Very knowledgeable
- Somewhat knowledgeable
- Little or no knowledge

Q9 Have you utilized any of the services provided to businesses by IDVR?

- Yes
- No
- I don't know

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Question 12: Which of the following best describes your type of business? (select one response).
Q10 Which of the following services did IDVR provide to your business (please select all that apply)?

- Training in understanding disability-related legislation such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act and/or the Rehabilitation Act?
- Assistance identifying job accommodations for workers with disabilities?
- Recruiting job applicants who are people with disabilities?
- Helping workers with disabilities to retain employment?
- Obtaining training on the different types of disabilities?
- Obtaining training on sensitivity to workers with disabilities?
- Obtaining incentives for employing workers with disabilities?
- Obtaining information on training programs available for workers with disabilities?
- Recruiting applicants who meet the job qualifications?
- Recruiting applicants with good work habits?
- Recruiting applicants with good social/interpersonal skills?
- Assessing Applicants' skills?
- Discussing reasonable job accommodations with applicants?
- Identifying reasonable job accommodations for applicants?
- Other (please describe) ____________________

Q11 How satisfied were you with the services you received from IDVR?

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
Q12 Which of the following best describes your type of business? (select one response)
- Service
- Retail
- Manufacturing
- Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing
- Construction
- Government
- Education
- Health care
- Banking/Finance
- Other (please describe) ____________________

Q13 If your business has any needs related to applicants or workers with disabilities that are not currently being met please describe them here:

Q14 How many years has your business been in operation?

Q15 How many people are employed at your business? (select one response)
- 1 - 15
- 16 - 50
- 51 - 250
- 251 - 999
- 1,000 or more

Q16 Your feedback is valuable to us, and we would like to thank you for taking the time to complete the survey! Please select the "NEXT" button below to submit your responses.

**Individual Survey 2016-17**

Q1 Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Individual Survey The Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR) is working collaboratively with the State Rehabilitation Council and staff at the Interwork Institute at San Diego State University in order to conduct an assessment of the needs of individuals with disabilities who live in
Idaho. The results of this needs assessment will help improve programs and services for persons with disabilities in Idaho. The following survey includes questions that ask you about the unmet, employment-related needs of persons with disabilities. We anticipate that it will take about 20 minutes of your time to complete the survey. If you prefer, you may ask a family member, a personal attendant, or a caregiver to complete the survey for you. If you are a family member, personal attendant or caregiver for a person with a disability and are responding on behalf of an individual with a disability, please answer the survey questions based upon your knowledge of the needs of the person with the disability. Your participation in this needs assessment is voluntary. If you decide to participate, your responses will be anonymous, that is, recorded without any identifying information that is linked to you. You will not be asked for your name anywhere in this survey. If you have any questions regarding this survey or if you would prefer to complete this survey in an alternate format, please contact Mark Tucker at San Diego State University at the following e-mail address or phone number: mtucker@mail.sdsu.edu (619) 594-3498 Thank you very much for your time and input!

Q2 Which statement best describes your association with the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR)? (select one response)
☑ I have never used the services of IDVR
☑ I am a current client of IDVR
☑ I am a previous client of IDVR, my case has been closed
☑ I am not familiar with IDVR
☑ Other (please describe) ____________________

Q3 Please indicate whether you receive the following Social Security disability benefits (please check all that apply).
☑ I receive SSI (Supplemental Security Income).
☑ I receive SSDI (Social Security Disability Insurance. SSDI is provided to individuals that have worked in the past and is based
on the amount of money the individual paid into the system through payroll deductions)

- I do not receive Social Security disability benefits
- I receive a check from the Social Security Administration every month, but I do not know which benefit I get
- I don't know if I receive Social Security disability benefits
Q4 Employment-Related Needs The next several questions ask you about employment-related needs that you may have.

Q5 Do you have the education or training to achieve your employment goals?
  ☑ Yes
  ☑ No

Q6 Do you have the job skills to achieve your employment goals?
  ☑ Yes
  ☑ No

Q7 Do you have the job search skills to achieve your employment goals?
  ☑ Yes
  ☑ No

Q8 Have you been prevented from achieving your employment goals because of prior convictions for criminal offenses?
  ☑ Yes
  ☑ No

Q9 Have you been prevented from achieving your employment goals because of limited English language skills?
  ☑ Yes
  ☑ No

Q10 Have you been prevented from achieving your employment goals because there were not enough jobs available?
  ☑ Yes
  ☑ No

Q11 Have employers' perceptions of people with disabilities prevented you from achieving your employment goals (some of these employer perceptions might be that people with disabilities can't
work, insurance costs will be too high, accommodations will be too costly, etc.)?
- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Q12 Has a lack of assistive technology (such as adaptive computers, screen readers, etc.) prevented you from achieving your employment goals?
- Yes
- No

Q13 Has a lack of attendant care prevented you from achieving your employment goals?
- Yes
- No

Q14 Has a lack of disability-related transportation (such as accessible buses) prevented you from achieving your employment goals?
- Yes
- No

Q15 Have other transportation issues, such as not having a reliable means to go to and from work, prevented you from achieving your employment goals?
- Yes
- No

Q16 Have mental health issues prevented you from achieving your employment goals?
- Yes
- No

Q17 Have substance abuse issues prevented you from achieving your employment goals?
- Yes
- No
Q18 Besides mental health and substance abuse issues, have any other health issues prevented you from achieving your employment goals?
☐ Yes (please describe) ____________________
☐ No

Q19 Have issues with childcare prevented you from achieving your employment goals?
☐ Yes
☐ No

Q20 Have issues with housing prevented you from achieving your employment goals?
☐ Yes
☐ No

Q21 Have concerns regarding how earning money will affect your Social Security benefits prevented you from achieving your employment goals?
☐ Yes
☐ No

Q22 Is there anything else that has prevented you from achieving your employment goals?
☐ Yes (please describe) ____________________
☐ No

Q23 What is the most significant barrier to achieving your employment goals?

Q24 Barriers to Accessing Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR) Services The next several questions ask you about barriers to accessing IDVR services.
Q25 Has limited accessibility to IDVR via public transportation made it difficult for you to access IDVR services?
○ Yes
○ No

Q26 Have other challenges related to the physical location of the IDVR office made it difficult for you to access services?
○ Yes
○ No

Q27 Have IDVR’s hours of operation made it difficult for you to access services?
○ Yes
○ No

Q28 Has a lack of information about the services available from IDVR made it difficult for you to access services?
○ Yes
○ No

Q29 Has a lack of disability-related accommodations (such as sign language interpreters, reader services or assistive technology) made it difficult for you to access IDVR services?
○ Yes
○ No

Q30 Have language barriers made it difficult for you to access IDVR services?
○ Yes (Please describe) ____________________
○ No

Q31 Have difficulties scheduling meetings with your counselor made it difficult for you to access IDVR services?
○ Yes
○ No
Q32 Have other difficulties working with staff made it difficult for you to access IDVR services?
○ Yes (please describe) ____________________
○ No

Q33 Have difficulties completing the application made it difficult for you to access IDVR services?
○ Yes (please describe) ____________________
○ No

Q34 Have difficulties completing the Individualized Plan for Employment made it difficult for you to access IDVR services?
○ Yes (please describe) ____________________
○ No

Q35 Have you had any other challenges or barriers not already mentioned that have made it difficult for you to access IDVR services?
○ Yes (please describe) ____________________
○ No

Q36 Where do you usually meet with your counselor?
○ I usually meet with my counselor in my community/school
○ I go to an IDVR office to meet with my counselor
○ I don't have an IDVR counselor

Q37 What changes to IDVR services might improve your experience with IDVR and help you to achieve your employment goals?

Q38 American Job Centers through the Idaho Department of Labor
The next several questions ask you about experiences you may have had with American Job Centers (formerly referred to as One-Stops through the Idaho Department of Labor)
Q39 Have you ever tried to use the services of American Job Centers (formerly referred to as the One-Stop through the Idaho Department of Labor)?
- Yes
- No

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Question 49: Demographic Information

Q40 Did you experience any difficulties with the physical accessibility of the building?
- Yes (If yes, please describe the difficulties you experienced)
  ______________________
- No

Q41 Did you have any difficulty accessing the programs at the Center (i.e. no available assistive technology, no interpreters, etc.)?
- Yes
- No

Q42 Did you go to the Center to get training?
- Yes
- No

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Question 45: Did you go to the Center to find a job?

Q43 Did you get the training that you were seeking?
- Yes
- No

Q44 Did the training result in employment?
- Yes
- No
Q45 Did you go to the Center to find a job?
☑ Yes
☑ No

If No Is Selected, Then Skip To Question 47: Please describe your opinion of the helpfulness of the staff at the Center.

Q46 Did they help you find employment?
☑ Yes
☑ No

Q47 Please describe your opinion of the helpfulness of the staff at the Center.
☑ Very helpful
☑ Somewhat helpful
☑ Not helpful

Q48 Please describe your opinion of the value of the services at the Center.
☑ Very valuable
☑ Somewhat valuable
☑ Not valuable

Q49 Demographic Information

Q50 Are you male or female?
☑ Male
☑ Female

Q51 In what year were you born

Q52 What is your ethnicity?
☑ Hispanic/Latino
☑ Not Hispanic/Latino
Q53 What is your primary race (check all that apply)?
- African American/Black
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Caucasian/White
- Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Other (please describe) ____________________
- I don't know

Q54 What is your language of preference for communication?
- English
- Spanish
- Hawaiian
- Chinese
- Japanese
- American Sign Language
- Other (Please identify) ____________________

Q55 What part of Idaho do you live in?
- Eastern Idaho
- Southwestern Idaho
- Southern Idaho
- Northern Idaho
Q56 Which of the following would you use to describe your primary disability? (select one)

- Blindness or visually impaired
- Deaf or Hard of Hearing
- Deaf-Blind
- Intellectual Disability (ID)/developmental disability (DD) or cognitive
- Communication
- Mental Health
- Physical/Mobility
- Other (please describe) ____________________
- Unsure

Q57 If you have a secondary disability, which of the following would you use to describe it? (select one) If you do not have a secondary disability, please select "No impairment" below.

- Blindness or visually impaired
- Deaf or Hard of Hearing
- Deaf-Blind
- Intellectual disability (ID)/developmental disability (DD) or cognitive
- Communication
- Mental Health
- Physical/mobility
- Other (please describe) ____________________
- No impairment
- Unsure

Q58 Is there anything else you would like to add about IDVR or its services?

Q59 This is the end of the survey! Your information and feedback is valuable to IDVR, thank you for completing the survey. Please select the "NEXT" button below to submit your responses.
Appendix B: IDVR Informant Interview Summary

Barriers to Employment
- Transportation—across the board, lack of a viable transportation system, even in Boise, is a significant barrier to employment and access to service
- Para-transit unreliable
- Large Rural State
- Most of employment earnings would be spent on travel
- EES has waiting list for Long Term Supports
- Huge work disincentives associated with Medicaid
- Access to job training is an issue for many consumers
- Lack of information on employment rights for PWDs
- Hard to get OJT/Work adjustment training for adults
- Lack of information and feedback to and from employers
- Employers lack ability to provide accommodations
- Low expectation of individuals with disabilities, families and service
- Low wage jobs in Idaho—bottom quartile of lowest states in the country for average pay
- Strong corporate support of diversity, HP—recommend VR help with diversity
- Lack of apprenticeship opportunities
- Need more WE and OJT for adults
- Employers in small towns know the youth, which could be both good and bad
- Lack of appropriate services and supports for DD/MH
- Local transportation boards—who is at the table who can effect change
- Bus routes are limited. Chances of a person working near a bus line are slim
- Uber and Lyft accessibility is an issue
• Getting people to medical services is an issue because of lack of transportation
• Lack of access to Internet in rural areas will limit self-employment options
• Anyone with a glitch in availability due to child care are told to come back when they are available
• Lack of variety of employment and job opportunities
• Limited training opportunities—low paying jobs—lack of access to STEM jobs
• Ability of PWDs to access online applications

**Unserved/Underserved**
• High percentage of individuals with mental health issues on caseloads
• Refugee population underserved - more Syrians than in NYC
• VR has good contact with refugee agencies
• Refugee population lack of understanding of the employment culture in the US
• Difficulty getting translators for non-English speaking individuals
• Questionable outreach to Hispanics, Native Americans (especially those not on Reservation; Migrant workers
• Ex-offenders
  o Felons
  o High rate of MH issues with offenders as well as substance abuse
• Underserved- People leaving the juvenile justice system
• Recommendations—VR imbedded in community coalitions
• Refugees from war torn countries have high incidences of PTSD
• Need to educate the legislature on the value of VR and document what has been done
• People with mental health issues need certified peer support specialists
• Native Americans
• Very rural
• Lack of education
Not a lot of jobs on reservation
Tribe employs 200 people
Lack of trust may be due to lack of contact
Families do not know about VR
Does not do much Supported Employment
CAP does not get many calls from refugee community but not sure how services

Barriers to Accessing Services
- Employers reluctance to hire PWDs
- Cost of prescription meds and lack of availability of generic meds for people with MH issues
- Idaho does not have expanded Medicaid—many falling through the cracks
- People with MH issues do not know about VR
- Lack of insurance coverage for MH—crisis
  - Lack of medication
  - Counseling
  - Treatment
- Limited resources in rural areas
- Limited Supported Employment or self-employment options
- People in rural areas need incredibly strong support systems
- VR caseloads 50-75% MSD
- VR needs visibility in the communities
- Lack of translation services—language barriers
- Rural poverty- access to any services
- SD and MSD people who do not have access to long-term supports through waivers go unserved
- Twin Falls-epicenter of refugees, especially Syrian
- Consumers n=2 told of cuts in funding
- Growth of MH cases does not keep up with available resources
- Access to affordable health care is a barrier to some that do not qualify for Medicaid ACA
- What often gets interpreted as laziness or lack of responsiveness could be avoidance brought on by anxiety
• Perception of caregivers that work is inconvenient
• Families and individuals not understanding how and why to contact VR
• Individuals have been told that VR cannot do anything until long-term supports are in place
• Individuals are put on EES waiting list, then case closed
• Physical barriers to access services in buildings
• People with a learning disability or drug abuse history may not identify
• Regional transportation boards’ budget is cut. Funding not keeping up with the needs
• People with MH issues cannot get immediate help unless they go to the ER
• Challenge in finding integrated community settings
• Training sites too far away, limited resources in rural areas [recommend state wide resource mapping]
• Travel to isolated communities is difficult in winter conditions
• Certain segments of the population place a stigma on accessing social services

**Transition/Education Partners**
• Pre-ETS—summer work experience is successful
• Parents are concerned that children will lose benefits
• Increasing numbers of transition aged individuals needing Supported Employment
• Pre-ETS changes everything, especially the relationship with teachers
• Strong connection between parental involvement and success
• Unserved –out of school youth –
• Low funding per student
• Need more cross training between VR and educators
• Struggle serving kids youth out of the school system. They do not walk through the door. They must be engaged
  o Corrections and Education work well together
• Parents don’t believe kids can work
• Need for benefits counseling for youth and adults
• Spike in referrals because of Summer Work Experiences
• HS students cannot access training programs because they do not score well on entry tests. Address the issue of competency of youth coming out of HS
• Youth who are not eligible for long-term supports may not be served by VR
• Need more emphasis on career pathways—need to start someplace
  o What is VR and WF role in identifying and creating pathways
• Youth leaving HS are not well prepared for postsecondary options
• Youth leave HS—wonder around for few years—live in parent’s basement until there is motivation to seek employment
• Academics will trump availability of youth to access mentoring opportunities
• Need work experience opportunities in all High Schools
• Smaller school districts ‘do things their own way’
• There are schools who don’t want anyone from VR in the school
• Relationship is great with schools when there is a dedicated VR counselor [same theme as one-stop]
• Consumers not knowing how to prepare for jobs—hygiene
  o Lack of computer skills
  o Lack of GED or HS Diploma
  o Criminal backgrounds—fewer employers willing to hire
  o Lack of motivated parents
  o Fearful of loss of benefits
• CRPs and educators like the direction Pre-ETS is taking
• Parents who do not sign plans
• Transition youth need to see pathways
  o Work experience
  o Internships
• More training in practical life skills like cooking, budgeting
• Transition—whole new world after WIOA
  o More summer work experiences
Parents need more information and options and need it sooner
  • Distance between schools especially in rural areas makes it difficult for transition counselors to provide timely services
  • Increase of students on IPEs because of WIOA
  • School teachers have pressure on academics leaving little time for other activities related to Pre-ETS
  • Schools are getting better at understanding what VR is because of Pre-ETS
  • Seeing results in schools where there are embedded VR staff

**Community Rehabilitation Programs**
  • There is an adequate number of CRPs but many of them have questionable quality of services
  • Low level of professionalism at CRPs e.g. dress
  • CRPs have strong political connections and can dictate how things are done.
  • High turnover—low pay with CRPs
    o Instability affects the clients
    o How to evaluate CRPs
    o Counselor hands are tied and forced to refer to CRPs that are not effective
    o If VR could team up with DOL may be less of a need for CRPs
  • Questionable capacity of CRPs to serve people with language barriers
  • Lack of trained skilled and professional job coaches. Some are right out of HS and this is their first job
  • Need better monitoring and evaluation of CRPs
    o Facility based CRPs do not do as well in the community
  • No formal or consistent training of CRP staff
  • No incentive for CRPs to work quickly to serve consumers
  • Helps to have regular meetings with CRPs
  • VR contracts with specific CRPs limits options for counselors and consumers
• Need transparency of who is getting services from CRPs and who is not
• CRP lack of accountability/monitoring. Accreditation does not address these
• Need to move to Milestone payment system for CRPs
• CRPs need to expand work readiness programs beyond thrift stores
• Good relationships with schools and WF when there is co-location or bedding
• Getting timely and completed referrals from VR is an issue
• Local CRP director active on Transportation board and has been influential in getting bus routes re-figured
• From CRP perspective, there is a wide range in skill and passion of VR counselors which determines the quality of services
• Reliance of job coaches who are not well trained especially on AT

**Agency Partners**

• Productive relationship with DD agency, MH and DOC
• Partnerships and coordination are improving—finding new ways to innovate
• Joint agency regional efforts are fragmented and isolated. Need a funded position to facilitate these forums
• Not much CRP support in rural areas opportunity to look at what constitutes a CRP]
• CRP reports some disconnect in VR and clients expecting what they get from CRPs
• CRPs need solutions to the current ESS system
• Job developers go to the same employers
• VR needs to be creative and understand that working with MSD requires time and creativity
• In it for the long haul but may not be prepared for that
• From CRP - focus on numbers puts pressure on VRCs

**Workforce Development**

• Workforce—mutual desire to work together
• VR counselors give clients Workforce resource options
• ID VR staff active at the SWIB and were instrumental in putting together the Combined Plan
• Workforce agencies can do internships
• DOL focused on out-of-school youth—hard to locate or dislocated youth
• People in rural areas need access to Workforce training centers
• Barriers to access WF centers is inaccessible forms – frustration—avoidance often
• Increase the presence of VRCs in Workforce centers
• Frontline staff at One stops cannot work with PWDs
• Turnover is high at One stops
• Staff should be required to get AT training
  o VR should refer to DOL for higher functioning clients—to CRP for lower functioning client
• Lack of computers and lack of access to the ones that exist
• WF does not provide one on one career counseling

Agency Partners
• Joint cases with other agencies to ensure that basic needs are met (housing/medications)
• Smaller more rural regions rely on partner agencies
• VR works well with MH Court and MH Team
• Pushback from some agencies on Employment First that employment is the first option for people with the most significant disabilities

Agency Performance
• From managers—VR process is too cumbersome
• State agencies tend to be in reactionary mode—putting out fires and not addressing long standing issues
• Counselors crushed under paperwork
• Bureaucratic Creep—harder for VRCs to provide services
• Need streamlined processes
• Data requirement is huge
• Soft caps for counselors in terms of hours of services they can authorize
• Excessive travel time issues for counselors in accessing rural locations
• VR counselors do not mingle in the community and business
• Acknowledgement of the training it takes to make a complex system work for VR and CRPs
• There are more data requirements
• More players than ever before
• Less time for counselors to do Guidance and Counseling for VRC
• Field days and community contacts go away because of pressure to supply data
• Look at taking duties from counselors to let them do quality work
• 90 days not enough time to develop a quality plan in rural areas+ mandated signature requirement
• Need more community outreach—advertising
• VRCs should have a better understanding of job accommodations and customization—how an individual can benefit the employer

**Expectations of this report**
• Widely disseminated
• VR make a conscientious effort to implement recommendations
• Some of the issues are long standing issues. Agencies tend to be in reactionary mode and long-term issues get put on the back burner
Appendix C: Idaho Regional Demographics

Idaho CSNA 2016
Narrative

The data in this report is a compilation of statistics relevant to demographics in the State of Idaho based on information for the years 2014 and 2015. The research items highlighted in this Narrative are points of interest related to the Comprehensive State-Wide Needs Assessment in an effort to better understand trends in the State’s population. These include the following items, designated by region: Population, Primary Demographic, Secondary Demographic, Disabilities prevalence below Age 65, Youth below Age 18, Transition-Aged Youth, Youth in Special Education, High School Graduate rates, Education Level at or above Bachelor’s Degree, Unemployment Rates, and Labor Force Participation. For the purposes of this Narrative, the term Transition-Aged Youth encompasses youth in grades 9-12 of high school, up to the age of 21 years. The term Youth in Special Education includes high school students with Individualized Education Plans (IEP) to support their educational and transitional needs. Educational data spanned the 2014-2015 Academic Year and located through the Idaho State Department of Education (SDE).

The State was divided into 4 regions that were identified by the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation: Northern, Southwestern, Southern, and Eastern. These regions are comprised of counties that are considered to represent those regions. Both the Northern and Southwestern regions have 10 counties each, while the Southern region has 11, and the Eastern region has 13 counties. Each region contains at least one (1) highly populated county with populations between 80,000-100,000 people (6 counties total). The majority of Idaho State’s 44 counties are sparsely populated with 17 counties having populations below 10,000 people and 14 counties with populations between 10,001-25,000 people. The remaining 7 counties have populations between 25,000-50,000 people.
The 2015 Census data shows that the predominant racial demographic in Idaho is White at 82.5% of the population. Hispanic or Latino race was identified as the second predominant demographic at 12.2% of the State population. The Census data disclosed that, “Hispanics may be of any race, so also are included in applicable race categories” (http://www.census.gov/quickfacts) therefore racial data for White was isolated down to “White alone, not Hispanic or Latino”. There were two (2) counties in the North that identified Native Indian Alaskan American as a predominant secondary demographic. Lewis County showed an equal demographic percentage of Hispanic and Native Indian Alaskan Native (6.5%) while Nez Perce County showed prevalence of Native Indian Alaskan Native only (5.9%).
The 2015 Census data showed that each region had unique variations in comparison to the State’s overall statistics regarding population Under the Age of 18 years old and people with Disabilities Under the Age of 65 years old. There were also several categories where the regions had similarities: High School graduate (87.3%), Education Level at or above Bachelor’s Degree (20.4%), and Unemployment Rate (5%). Unemployment Rates located through www.bls.gov.

The following descriptions provide general information about the regions, any significant findings, and employment data as it relates to labor market outlook. Significant findings are described as percentage variances at least +/- 5% or more of State Average. In the case of Education Level at or above a Bachelor’s Degree, a majority of the counties were at least -5% below State Average (27/44 counties), while six (6) counties well surpassed the State Average by +10-20%. In the case of Unemployment Rates, significant findings are described as variations +/- 1% of State Average. A vast majority of the counties were below or within the 1% variance, although there were seventeen (17)
counties that had Unemployment Rates exceeding +1%. In general, the entire State has a good variety of Educational Institutions and Training Facilities, and labor markets represent an assortment of sectors.

Information in this section was also compiled from Data USA https://datausa.io/ a multi-agency project out of the MIT Media Lab.

**Northern Region**

The region considered as Northern begins at Idaho County and continues through Boundary County, which shares an international border with Canada. There is only one (1) highly populated county in this region (Kootenai) while the remaining nine (9) counties are evenly split amongst the more common populations below 50,000 people. Counties included in this data set: Boundary, Bonner, Kootenai, Benewah, Latah, Nez Perce, Lewis, Shoshone, Clearwater, and Idaho. The North region makes up 20% of the State’s population as a whole and is commonly known as the Idaho Panhandle, bordering Washington to the West and Montana to the East. The average Poverty Rate for the North is 16.6% (+1.5%), which slightly exceeds the State Average, although Latah (+4.5%) and Shoshone (+6%) had significantly higher rates of Poverty. The Median Household income in the North is estimated at $41,012.00, which is below (-$6,849) the State median.

The predominant Industry in the Northern market is Healthcare and Social Assistance, which employs an estimated 14.6% of the labor force with a particularly high employment rate (22.4%) in Clearwater County. Two (2) other industries showed some prevalence spread amongst the counties: Retail Trade (13.8%) and Manufacturing (13.1%). Latah County had a high percentage in Educational Services with 28% of the market located in this sector. Educational Institutions in this region are more academically focused with several options available: University of Idaho, North Idaho College, and Lewis and Clark State College.
Highest single-sector industries share in the Northern region: Educational Services at 28% in Latah County.

Findings

Disabilities Under the Age of 65
The North has a higher rate (+4%) of people who are Under the Age of 65 and have a disability when compared against the State Average. There were three (3) counties identified as having significant findings in this category: Shoshone (+5.3%), Clearwater (+10.2%), and Idaho (+5.6%).

Youth Under the Age of 18
The North has a lower rate (-5.5%) of Youth Under the Age of 18 when compared against the State Average. There were four (4) counties identified as having significant findings in this category: Bonner and Idaho (-6.1%), Latah (-7.7%), and Clearwater (-10.2%).

High School Graduate Rates
The majority of North had average numbers for High School Graduates with the exception of Latah (+6.7%), which presented higher graduation rates in comparison to the rest of the State.

**Education Level at or above Bachelor’s Degree**
In general, the North has a lower rate (-5.3%) of Education Level at or above a Bachelor’s Degree when compared against the State Average. Six out of ten (6/10) of the Northern region’s counties were below a 5% margin, while one (1) county, again Latah, showed outstanding rates of Education Levels in comparison to the State as a whole (+18.6%).

**Unemployment Rates**
The North is characterized by High Unemployment Rates. Seven out of ten (7/10) counties were at least 1% higher than the average State Unemployment Rate, with Shoshone (+3.9%) and Clearwater (+3.6%) having the most significant difference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>North</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disabilities &lt;65</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth &lt;18</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>-5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level BA/BA+</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>-5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Transition-Aged Youth in Special Education*
Based on the Idaho State Department of Education’s Indicator 13 Secondary Transition data, the Northern region has a total of 26 schools that fall under this requirement, which mandates students with IEP’s to receive transition services. Thirteen (13) schools were documented as having Met those requirements providing transition services to 100% of their student population, while the remaining thirteen (13) were listed as requirement Not Met, ranging from 0%-50% of students served.

*See Disability and Secondary Transition addendum

**Southwestern Region**
The region considered as Southwestern begins with Adams and Valley counties and extends directly south through Owyhee County, which borders both Oregon and Nevada. The Southwest also includes the State Capital located in Boise City, under the county seat of Ada County, which has the highest population in the State at 434,211 people. There are two (2) highly populated counties in this region, Ada and Canyon. The remaining eight (8) counties have at or below 25,000 people in population. Counties included in this data set: Adams, Valley, Washington, Payette, Gem, Canyon, Ada, Owyhee, Elmore, and Boise. The Southwest makes up 45% of the State’s population as a whole, and half the counties border Oregon. The average Poverty Rate for the Southwest is 15.2%, which is on par with the State Average, although Owyhee had the highest Poverty Rate for the region (+4.8%) and was also identified as having the 2nd highest rate of Substance Abuse in the State. The Median Household income in the North is estimated at $42,920, which is below (-$4,941) the State median although Ada County had the highest regional median income at $57,716, possibly due to population and presence of local State government.

The predominant Industry in the Southwestern market is Retail Trade, ranging from 9%-14.8% across eight (8) counties. Several other industries took prominence including Healthcare and Social Assistance (14%), Manufacturing (13%), and Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting which had a high level of representation in Owyhee County (28%). Some counties were identified as having industries that were more isolated to those areas such Accommodation and Food Service (Valley County) and Public Administration (Elmore and Boise). Through satellite campuses, the Southwest has a wide variety of traditional Educational Institutions including Lewis and Clark State College, Idaho State, Boise State, University of Idaho, Treasure Valley Community College, and the well-known Brigham Young University. In addition to a variety of other academic and vocationally based options such as College of Western Idaho, Northwest Nazarene University, Milan Institute-Nampa, and Academy di Firenze.
Highest population in the State, including Native and Foreign born citizens: Ada County with 434,211 people.

Findings

Disabilities Under the Age of 65
All of the counties in the Southwest were within an insignificant range of difference in comparison to the State Average, although two (2) counties, Adams and Washington, presented statistics that very close to exceeding the minimum 5% difference.

Youth Under the Age of 18
The majority of counties in the Southwest had comparable rates to the State Average for Youth Under the Age of 18. There were, however, three (3) counties that presented significant findings in this category: Adams (-8.9%), Valley (-8.1%), and Boise (-8.5%). On average, this region is -2.9% below the State statistics.

High School Graduate Rates
The majority of the Southwest had average numbers for High School Graduates with the exception of Owyhee (-14.8%), which had a significantly lower graduation rate.
Education Level at or above Bachelor’s Degree
In general, the Southwest has a low rate (-4.8%) of Education Level at or above Bachelor’s Degree when compared against the State Average. Six out of ten (6/10) of the Southwestern region’s counties were below a 5% margin, while two (2) counties were well above the State Averages: Valley (+8.6%) and Ada (+11%).

Unemployment Rates
On average, the Southwest was has a slightly higher (+1.2%) Unemployment Rates when compared against the State. Five out of ten (5/10) counties were at least 1% higher than the average State Unemployment Rate, with Adams (+3.5%) having the most significant difference. Conversely, Ada County had the lowest Unemployment Rate in the region (-0.5%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disabilities &lt;65</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth &lt;18</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level BA/BA+</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Transition-Aged Youth in Special Education
Based on the Idaho State Department of Education’s Indicator 13 Secondary Transition data, the Southwestern region has a total of 23 schools that fall under this requirement, which mandates students with IEP’s to receive transition services. Thirteen (13) schools were documented as having Met those requirements providing transition services to 100% of their student population, while ten (10) were listed as requirement Not Met, ranging from 0%-71.43% of students served.

*See Disability and Secondary Transition addendum

South Region
The region considered as Southern begins at Lemhi County and extends directly south through to Cassia and Twin Falls County, the only highly populated county in this region with 82,375 people. The
majority of this region is sparsely populated with ten of the eleven (10/11) counties with populations under 25,000 people. Counties included in this data set: Lemhi, Custer, Butte, Blaine, Camas, Gooding, Lincoln, Minidoka, Jerome, Twin Falls, and Cassia. The South makes up 13% of the State’s population as a whole, and borders three different States with Montana to the North and both Nevada and Utah to the South. The Average Poverty Rate for the South is 14.5%, which is lower than the State Average (-0.6%) although two counties had extraordinarily high Rates: Gooding (28.1%) and Jerome (23.5%). Conversely, Blaine County presented both the lowest Poverty Rate (8.9%) and the highest Median Household Income ($62,489) in the entire State. The Median Household Income in the South is $42,916, which is lower than the State Median (-$4,945).

The predominant Industry in the South is Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, and Hunting making up 16% of the market across nine of the eleven (9/11) counties with the highest market share in Gooding County (28.1%). Several other industries took prominence including Manufacturing (13.3%) and Retail Trade (12.8%) across a more limited six (6) counties. Some counties were identified as having industries that were more isolated to those areas such as Education Services (Butte County) and Accommodation/Food Service and Construction (Blaine). The South has a wide variety of vocationally based training options: Academy di Firenze, Cosmetology School of Arts and Science, Austin Kade Academy, and Eastern Idaho Technical College. There are also several academically focused institutions including
Lewis and Clark State College and College of Southern Idaho.

**Median Household Income in Blaine County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yearly Income</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Idaho</th>
<th>Blaine County</th>
<th>Hailey, ID Micro Area</th>
<th>Elmore, Jerome, Blaine, Minidoka, Gooding, Lincoln &amp; Camas Counties Puma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0-15k</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15k-20k</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20k-25k</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25k-30k</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30k-35k</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35k-40k</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40k-45k</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45k-50k</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50k-55k</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$55k-60k</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dataset: ACS 5-year Estimate
Source: Census Bureau

*Highest Median Household Income in Idaho State: Blaine County at $62,489.*

**Findings**

**Disabilities Under the Age of 65**
The South has a slightly higher rate (+1.3%) of people who are under the Age of 65 and have a disability. There were three (3) counties identified as having significant findings in this category: Butte (+6.4%) and Camas (+6.9%) exceeded State Average while Blaine county had the lowest rate in this region (-4.9%).

**Youth Under the Age of 18**
On average, the Southern region presented insignificant findings (-0.3%) when compared against State statistics. However, four (4) counties had unique variations with regard to rate of Youth Under the Age of 18. Both Lemhi (-8.1%), Custer (-8.9%) scored below average, while Jerome (+5%) and Cassia (+6.2%) had uncommonly high rates of Youth.
High School Graduate Rates
In general, the South has lower rates (-6.4%) of High School Graduation when compared against the State. Six of the eleven (6/11) counties showed significant findings that presented deficient numbers of graduation rates. Camas, Gooding, Lincoln, Minidoka, and Cassia were deficient by a minimum of -5.4% upwards of -13.2% while Jerome county has the lowest Rate of Graduation in the entire State (-18.5%).

Education Level at or above Bachelor’s Degree
On average, the Southern region has low rates (-6.4%) of High School Graduation when compared against the State. Seven (7) of the counties showed significantly low numbers of Education Rates when compared against the State Average. Butte, Gooding, Lincoln, Jerome, Minidoka, Cassia, and Twin Falls presented -8.5% upwards of -14.1%. Conversely, Blaine County has the highest Rate of Education in the entire State (+19.4%).

Unemployment Rates
In general, the South has low Unemployment Rates and is on par with the State Average (+0.1%) although two (2) counties showed significant findings: Lemhi (+2.9%) and Custer (+2.5%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disabilities &lt;65</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth &lt;18</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>-6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level BA/BA+</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Transition-Aged Youth in Special Education
Based on the Idaho State Department of Education’s Indicator 13 Secondary Transition data, the Southern region has a total of 20 schools that fall under this requirement, which mandates students with IEP’s to receive transition services. Eleven (11) schools were documented as having Met those requirements providing transition
services to 100% of their student population, while nine (9) were listed as requirement Not Met, ranging from 0%-50% of students served.

*See Disability and Secondary Transition addendum

**East Region**

The region considered as Eastern begins at Clark and Fremont Counties and extends directly south through to Oneida, Franklin and Bear Lake County, which all border Utah. There are two (2) highly populated counties in this region: Bonneville (110,089 people) and Bannock (83,744 people). Six (6) counties have populations under 10,000 and the remaining five (5) have populations between 10,001-50,000 people. Counties included in this data set: Clark, Fremont, Jefferson, Madison, Teton, Bonneville, Bingham, Power, Bannock, Caribou, Oneida, Franklin, and Bear Lake. The East makes up 22% of the State’s population as a whole, and borders three different States with Montana to the North, Utah to the South, and Wyoming to the East. The Average Poverty Rate for the East is 14.5%, which is slightly lower than the State Average (-0.6%) although two counties had extraordinarily high Rates: Bannock (22.3%) and Madison (28.1%), which coincidentally, also had the lowest Unemployment Rate in the entire State (2.7%). The Median Household Income in the South is $45,434, which is only slightly lower than the State Median ($2,427).

The most prevalent Industry in the South is Retail Trade making up 12% of the market across nine of the thirteen (9/13) counties. Several other industries took prominence due to extraordinarily high market shares in isolated counties. For example, Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing, and Hunting makes up 17.1% of the market across seven (7) counties due to Clark County’s (45.2%) high rate of industry in this sector. In addition, Healthcare and Social Assistance made up 13.4% of the market across seven (7) counties while Manufacturing presented a 16.3% market share across a more limited five (5) counties. Some counties were identified as having industries that were more isolated such as Accommodation/Food Service and Construction in Teton, Caribou, and Bear Lake as well as Education Service in Bannock and Madison, with a large share at 24.5%. The East also has a good spread of academic institutions, such as Lewis and Clark State College, Brigham Young University-Idaho, and Idaho State as well as
vocationally based options like Eastern Idaho Technical College and College of Massage Therapy.

**Wage Distribution in Madison County**
The closest comparable wage Gini for Madison County, ID is from Bingham (Outside Fort Hall AirB, Madison, Jet

**Data USA:**

*Despite lowest Unemployment Rate (2.7%), low Wages are likely cause of Madison County’s high Poverty Rate (28.1%).*

**Findings**

**Disabilities Under the Age of 65**
The South presented comparable rates of people with Disabilities under the age of 65 with regard to State statistics, with the exception of Clark County (+5.6%).

**Youth Under the Age of 18**
On average, the East is statistically within range when compared against the State Average (+1.3%) although several counties were outside the +/-5% significance: Clark (-11.9%) and Fremont (-10%) had low numbers of Youth, while Jefferson (+8.2%), Bingham (+5.2%), and Franklin (+7.3%) showed significantly higher rates in comparison to the State Average.

**High School Graduate Rates**
The majority of counties in this region showed statistically average rates of High School Graduation when compared against the State although two (2) counties presented high and low variances: Clark County (-11.1%) and Madison County (+6%).

**Education Level at or above Bachelor’s Degree**
The Eastern region presented low rates (-4%) of Education Levels at or above a Bachelor’s Degree when compared against the State Average. Seven of the eleven (7/11) counties showed significantly low numbers of Education Rates when compared against the State Average. Clark, Fremont, Bingham, Caribou, Bear Lake, Franklin, and Oneida presented low numbers of -5.7% upwards of -12.7%. Conversely, both Teton (+12.8%) and Madison (+9%) showed significantly high Rates.

**Unemployment Rates**
The East is characterized by low Unemployment Rates with the majority of its counties falling within the significant variance range including the two (2) lowest Rates in the State: Franklin (-1.0%) and Madison (-1.4%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disabilities &lt;65</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth &lt;18</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level BA/BA+</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Transition-Aged Youth in Special Education*
Based on the Idaho State Department of Education’s Indicator 13 Secondary Transition data, the Eastern region has a total of 25 schools that fall under this requirement, which mandates students with IEP’s to receive transition services. Eleven (11) schools were documented as having Met those requirements providing transition services to 100% of their student population, while fourteen (14) were listed as requirement Not Met, ranging from 0%-83.33% of students served. *See Disability and Secondary Transition addendum*
Disability and Secondary Transition
The Idaho State Department of Education (SDE) publishes information on their annual Report Card that is more focused on demographics and achievement, and did not post the data needed to identify Enrollment numbers for Transition-Aged Youth, nor the amount of IEP’s that are being administered in their public schools. Therefore, a more generalized assessment is provided here.

Disability Prevalence
The Idaho SDE publishes a detailed Child Count including Age and Disability type for the entire State. Based on the 2014-2015 Academic Year, Table 1 shows mount of students with Disabilities per Age 14-20.

Table 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech/Language</td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Disturbance</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Impairment</td>
<td>1,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Learning Disability</td>
<td>2,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf-Blind</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traumatic Brain Injury</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Disabilities</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondary Transition
In regard to Secondary Transition, the SDE website provided information for Student Engagement/Career & Technical Readiness services being administered throughout their public school system.
This included several transition-focused programs developed out of local State legislation as well as National requirements. As a foundation, the SDE refers to Indicator 13 - Secondary Transition, and cites 20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) as authority for mandating services:

“Indicator 13 is a compliance indicator that measures the percent of youth with IEPs aged 16 and above with an IEP that includes appropriate measurable postsecondary goals that are annually updated and based upon an age appropriate transition assessment, transition services, including courses of study, that will reasonably enable the student to meet those postsecondary goals, and annual IEP goals related to the student’s transition services needs. There also must be evidence that the student was invited to the IEP Team meeting where transition services are to be discussed and evidence that, if appropriate, a representative of any participating agency was invited to the IEP Team meeting with the prior consent of the parent or student who has reached an age of majority”.

As supplemental legislation in 2016, the Idaho State Senate passed Bill 1290 indicating that:

“Each public school in Idaho who serves students in grades 8-12 shall establish a college and career advising program for their students. These programs can include advising personnel, near peer/college mentors, student ambassadors, and virtual coaching, among other activities.”

To meet compliance standards, public schools have access to the following programs to fulfill Secondary Transition services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21st Century Community Learning Centers</td>
<td>Developed under No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Title IV, Part B Academic enrichment, Recreation, Prevention, Youth Development Includes some College and Career Readiness Grant funded, Non-School Hours, Application-Based services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Opportunities</td>
<td>Under Idaho State Senate Bill 1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requires schools serving Grades 8-12 establish College/Career Advising programs More academically focused: Dual Credits, Early Graduation, Placement Exams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gear Up</td>
<td>Early intervention/preparation for college, meet basic standard for graduation Grant Funded – Low Income, including Students with Disabilities Program activities: Counseling, Financial Aid, Career Planning, College Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Advising</td>
<td>College and Career Readiness / Social and Emotional Wellbeing College and Career Advising Guidance, Scholarship Awareness Training, Social Emotional Tools/Guides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Idaho Transportation

Idaho is not alone in its struggle to maintain transportation infrastructure. Each of its peer states are trying to cope with deteriorating infrastructure, decreased revenue from dedicated fund sources, and inconsistent commitments from federal sources. As noted, there are many ways that states can fund transportation infrastructure. One thing that stands out is that when compared to its peer states, Idaho uses by far the fewest number of options, in effect limiting the vision and opportunities that surround transportation funding. Many of Idaho’s peer states have implemented innovative funding solutions. Others are investigating ideas. It is clear from this analysis that there are many ways to approach this pressing public problem. It seems, legislatively, that Idaho has boxed itself in with respect to its ability to be innovative and non-conventional when it comes to the universe of policy alternatives that exist. As evidenced in a recent article in the New York Times, states are recognizing the federal government’s limitations on funding transportation infrastructure, and thus are looking inward for policy solutions. In fact, there are public transportation bills worth over $200 billion dollars on the November 2016 ballot. Utah, Colorado, and Arizona are listed as states leading the way.\footnote{54}

Finally, one of the main challenges for Idaho, aside from the actual financial shortfall dilemma, is helping the citizenry recognize transportation infrastructure funding is a major problem. Recent surveys statewide and in the Treasure Valley have identified jobs, the economy and education as the main issues facing Idaho. Those surveys also noted those issues as the top priorities that the Idaho
legislature should address. Transportation barely registered on either of these scales. However, jobs, economy, and education are inexorably linked to transportation and the infrastructure needed to support them. As Idaho 2020 considers the alternatives listed in this report, we recommend that at least part of the effort be devoted to informing the public on the state of Idaho’s transportation system, and how transportation and jobs work together to make Idaho’s economy strong.

Many organizations in Idaho are working hard to preserve Idaho’s transportation system. From Metropolitan Planning Organizations to local leaders to the ITD, each group has a commitment to excellence. By engaging the citizenry and key transportation stakeholders regarding this issue and offering policy alternatives adopted by peer states, Idaho can move toward instituting new and innovative dedicated funding
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Regional Service Needs and Gaps</th>
<th>Short Falls and Challenges</th>
<th>Project Proposals and Progress</th>
<th>Improvement and Strategy Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relating to Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lack of crisis services with health care status and 24 hour availability</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Lack of general and intensive outpatient providers in rural areas</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Lack of capacity for local ERs to identify/manage/address/acute crisis needs</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Lack of SUD prevention, early intervention services and residential options</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Lack of case management services</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Better crisis response plan</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>High demand on crisis center and</strong></td>
<td><strong>Continue to survey steak-holds to prioritize needs</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Research results submitted to legislature</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>All Substance Abuse Providers need to be certified to treat dual diagnosis</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Adults: Community Recovery Centers to assist those in recovery</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Improve communication</strong></td>
<td><strong>CDA selected as site of crisis center 23 hour voluntary holds</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Collect data from primary and secondary consumers on perception of their needs for services</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Latah County NAMI assisting with WSU data collections for Region 2</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sources for transportation infrastructure that is vital to Idaho’s future economic competitiveness and vitality. It is our hope that this report will provide decision makers with alternatives that may not yet have been considered or realized, and help frame the debate as Idaho lawmakers tackle this important public policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>additional centers are needed</th>
<th>about hospital actions that limit bed availability and result in diversion to other hospitals out of region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Increased need for diversion</td>
<td>• Engage the new BHC Director in community planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Explore options for sub-acute detoxification services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Searching for funding that incorporates individuals with dual diagnosis legislature need to pass/approve Medicaid Expansion/Restructuring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Youth: Data/outcomes from Shelter Care, Prevention data/outcomes from schools,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Excerpts from Regional Health Board State Behavioral Assessment and Plan

Regional Behavioral Health Board

Gaps and Needs Analysis

2015

Please provide a brief description for each of the columns listed. Include additional information as needed.

Identified Barriers

Each year the Regional BHBs submit a report to the BHPC detailing their successes, as well as the needs and gaps within their regions. Upon reviewing the reports, the BHPC recognized many statewide trends regarding barriers to both accessing services and maintaining recovery.

Barriers to Accessing Services

• Lack of consistent, reliable Telehealth services.
• Lack of providers (psychiatrists, as well as other behavioral health providers), especially in rural areas.
• Lack of access to services for non-criminal justice, at-risk youth and adults
• Lack of collaboration among providers about mental health and physical health needs (often due to system limitations, not the choice of the professional).
• Lack of access to insurance coverage for the "gap" population.

Barriers to Maintaining Recovery

• Lack of housing, including traditional housing (especially for women and families) and models with more supervision for high risk patients with complex
medical and co-occurring conditions transitioning out of hospital settings.

- Lack of consistent, reliable **transportation**.
- Lack of **supported employment** for those with the most serious mental health challenges.
- **Stigma** often limits access to opportunities that are currently available.
- Lack of **family engagement** for youth during treatment (due to a variety of issues including not being able to take off time from work, lack of transportation for parents, lack of understanding about the treatment process, etc.).

See full report at:  
http://healthandwelfare.idaho.gov/Portals/0/Medical/Mental%20Health/FY1617CombinedBlockGrantPlanUpdate.pdf