

State of Idaho
Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Comprehensive Statewide Needs
Assessment Report

2026



*Idaho Division of
Vocational Rehabilitation*

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
Acknowledgements	4
Executive Summary	5
Key Terms.....	8
Methodology	9
External Data.....	9
Internal Program Data.....	9
Surveys	10
Limitations	11
Idaho at a Glance: Growth and Change	12
Population Trends.....	12
Economic Overview.....	12
Indicators of Change	13
Takeaways	15
Labor Market Conditions	16
Affordability and Economic Stability	16
Regional Variations and Local Labor Markets.....	16
Labor Market Access, Earnings, and Employment Stability	17
Local Industry and Occupational Structure	18
Workforce Preparedness.....	20
Education and Credential Expectations.....	20
Youth and Transition Age Populations.....	22
Access to Services	24
Technology Access and Connectivity	24
Rural Access.....	24
Program Capacity and Service Delivery.....	25
Population Needs and Priority Populations	28
Disability Trends and Service Demand.....	28
Most Significant Disabilities.....	28

Subgroup Differences.....	30
Summary of Findings.....	32
Recommendations	33
Labor Market Conditions.....	33
Workforce Preparedness	35
Access to Services.....	36
Population Needs and Priority Populations.....	37
Appendix	38
External Data.....	38
Surveys	61
Individual Surveys.....	61
Community Partner Surveys	70
Staff Surveys	76
Youth Surveys.....	84
Employer Surveys.....	88
Internal Case Data	92
All Participants	92
Expenditures	94
Other tables.....	96

Acknowledgements

The Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation extends its appreciation to the individuals and partners who contributed to the development of this Comprehensive Statewide Needs Assessment.

Kara Whitehouse, Policy and Planning Analyst, led the development and authorship of this report and conducted the analysis of demographic, economic, and workforce trends.

Andrew Grey, Data Manager, conducted the analysis of internal program data, developed and administered all surveys, and supported interpretation of both quantitative and qualitative findings for this report.

Labor economists with the Idaho Department of Labor provided the labor market and economic data used throughout the analysis.

We also thank survey respondents, including individuals with disabilities, employers, community partners, and IDVR staff, whose input provided valuable insight into service needs, barriers, and system performance. Their feedback was essential in shaping the findings and recommendations in this report.

The Division also acknowledges the State Rehabilitation Council for its collaboration and guidance throughout the CSNA process.

Executive Summary

Key Findings:

- Idaho's population increased 11.8% since the last CSNA review period.
- Demand for VR services exceeds current system capacity.
- Individuals with Most Significant Disabilities now represent nearly half of active participants.
- Rural communities continue to face barriers related to transportation, service availability, and workforce access.
- Labor market participation has improved, but disparities persist across disability, gender, income, and geography.
- Employment quality, retention, and career advancement are emerging priorities.
- Targeted and regionally responsive strategies are needed to reduce disparities and improve outcomes.

The Comprehensive Statewide Needs Assessment (CSNA) is required by federal law and describes the vocational rehabilitation (VR) service needs of individuals with disabilities residing or working in Idaho. Every three years, the designated state unit for the VR program uses the CSNA to identify goals and priorities for program administration aligned with a State Plan that addresses the state's workforce system needs. The 2026 CSNA report provides the requisite assessment of VR service needs along with the needs of program staff and service providers.

This CSNA examines demographic, economic, and workforce trends in Idaho to identify the needs of individuals with disabilities and inform the strategic direction of the Idaho Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (IDVR). The analysis incorporates both external data sources and internal program data to assess changes in population dynamics, labor market conditions, service demand, and system capacity.

Idaho is experiencing sustained population and economic growth. Increases in population, employment, income, and educational attainment reflect positive momentum. However, these improvements are not evenly distributed across regions or populations. Differences in earnings, access to education and training, labor market participation, and disability prevalence highlight variances in how individuals experience economic opportunity. These patterns also contribute to uneven demand for services, which places varying levels of pressure on systems across the state.

Economic growth has occurred alongside rising costs of living, particularly housing. While incomes have increased and poverty levels have declined, these trends do not fully reflect household financial stability. Many individuals, especially individuals with disabilities, low- and moderate-income households, and younger workers, continue to face challenges in maintaining economic security. This suggests that employment alone is not sufficient; greater attention needs to be placed on job quality, wages, and career advancement.

Labor market access has improved statewide, but disparities exist across populations. Individuals with disabilities continue to experience lower labor force participation rates, higher unemployment, and greater variability in employment outcomes. More individuals are entering the workforce; however, many remain in lower wage positions with limited opportunities for advancement. Youth and students with disabilities, particularly those transitioning from school to the workforce, face additional barriers related to work experience and connection to career pathways. Internal program data indicates that IDVR participants are taking longer to obtain employment; however, those who secure employment are generally able to maintain it over time, as reflected in post-exit employment rates. Together these findings highlight the need to prioritize job stability, retention, and career advancement, not just placement.

Regional differences remain a defining feature of Idaho's labor market. Urban areas have experienced higher growth and greater access to employment opportunities, while rural regions continue to see constraints related to transportation, lack of industry diversity, and limited service availability. Local labor market conditions shape employment opportunities and service delivery, therefore flexible, regionally appropriate approaches are needed to meet the needs of individuals throughout the state.

IDVR is operating within a system of constrained capacity. The implementation of Order of Selection (OOS) in 2024 introduced waitlists across all priority categories, with no observed reductions to date, which indicates that demand for services is exceeding system capacity. As a result of the waitlists, some eligible individuals are unable to access services immediately or may delay applying altogether. The proportion of individuals categorized with the Most Significant Disabilities (MSD) has increased substantially and now represents nearly half of active participants. This demonstrates the shift toward higher need, more resource intensive cases as these individuals often require more intensive and long-term supports. Employment outcomes for this group are generally lower, and access to higher-wage opportunities remains limited. Together, these factors have increased service complexity and cost per case, placing additional pressure on IDVR staffing, provider networks, and overall system capacity.

Disparities across gender, income, disability type, and geography further highlight that not all populations are benefiting equally from statewide growth. Addressing these differences will require targeted strategies that align services with participant needs and local labor market conditions. Strengthening coordination across systems, improving connections between services and employment outcomes, and ensuring access across regions will be critical to achieving more consistent outcomes.

Improving employment outcomes for individuals with disabilities will require a greater focus on the quality of jobs obtained, the ability to maintain employment, and long-term economic stability. Strategies to meet this goal will include identifying career pathways that outline a path toward higher wage employment over time. Addressing affordability and economic stability is also critical, as barriers such as housing costs, transportation, and childcare can impact the ability to enter into and maintain employment.

Overall, the findings indicate a need for service delivery approaches that are both responsive and adaptable. Strategies that account for regional differences, varying levels of need, and local economic conditions will be better positioned to improve outcomes across the state. Targeted approaches are needed to reduce disparities across populations, including services that adapt to varying levels of need, reduce barriers to participation, and ensure that individuals across regions and demographic groups can access and benefit from VR services. Intentional and differentiated strategies can help ensure that improvements in system performance lead to more consistent outcomes across all populations.

Key Terms

Disability Priority Categories (D, SD, MSD): Categories used to determine service priority under Order of Selection, based on the significance of an individual's disability and level of support needed for employment.

Disability (D): Individuals with disabilities who require services but do not meet criteria for Significant or Most Significant Disability.

Significant Disability (SD): Individuals with disabilities that seriously limit one or more functional capacities and require multiple vocational rehabilitation services.

Most Significant Disability (MSD): Individuals with disabilities who require intensive, multiple, or long-term supports to achieve and maintain employment.

Order of Selection (OOS): A federally mandated prioritization process used when an agency does not have the funding or staffing resources to serve all eligible individuals, ensuring that clients with the Most Significant Disabilities receive services first.

Individualized Plan for Employment (IPE): A written plan developed between a participant and VR that outlines the employment goal and services needed to achieve that goal.

Pre-Employment Transition Services (Pre-ETS): Services provided to students with disabilities to prepare for employment.

Work-Based Learning Experience (WBLE): Structured work experience that provides individuals with real-world exposure to the workplace.

Community Rehabilitation Provider (CRP): Organizations that contract with VR to provide employment related services.

Measurable Skill Gain (MSG): A performance indicator that measures progress toward a credential or employment through skill development or educational achievement.

Methodology

This Comprehensive Statewide Needs Assessment (CSNA) was developed using a combination of quantitative and qualitative data sources to evaluate the needs of individuals with disabilities and the capacity of the vocational rehabilitation (VR) system in Idaho. The analysis incorporates both external population level data and internal program data to provide a comprehensive view of workforce trends and system performance.

External Data

U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS) data was used to examine population characteristics, disability prevalence, educational attainment, labor force participation, and economic indicators. Both 1-year (2024) and 5-year (2019-2024) ACS estimates were used, depending on data availability and the level of geographic detail required. State and regional labor market information from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) was used to assess industry trends, employment conditions, and occupational demands.

Internal Program Data

Case service data from IDVR's case management system for program years 2021 to 2024 was pulled for the following groupings and used for analysis in this report:

1. All Participants
2. Gender
3. Age
4. Disability Type
5. Supported Employment
6. SSA Beneficiaries
7. American Job Center Referrals
8. Race/Ethnicity

The data analyzed for each group included the following data points:

1. Number of applications
2. Percent of all applications
3. Percent of applications found eligible
4. Percent of applications that had an eligibility determination made within 60 days
5. Number of cases assigned to each Disability Priority category
 - a. Most Significantly Disabled (MSD)
 - b. Significantly Disabled (SD)
 - c. Disabled (D)

6. % of total assigned each Disability Priority
7. Number Added to Waitlist for each Disability Priority
8. Number Removed from Waitlist for each Disability Priority
9. Percent of cases closed prior to Individual Plan for Employment (IPE) development
10. Number of Plans developed
11. Percent of plans developed within 90 days
12. Number of participants in training by type
13. Credential attainment rate
14. Measurable Skill Gains (MSG) Rate
15. Number of cases closed rehabilitated
16. Employment rate at exit
17. Employment rate in 2nd quarter after exit
18. Employment rate in 4th quarter after exit
19. Median wages of all exited participants
20. Total number of cases served
21. Avg. cost of all cases
22. Avg. cost of cases closed as rehabilitated
23. Avg. cost per case closed as unsuccessful
24. Avg. cost per case closed prior to plan

Surveys

The electronic surveys administered to individuals with disabilities, community partners, IDVR staff, businesses, and transition-age youth were developed by the IDVR team and the State Rehabilitation Council (SRC). Individuals invited to participate included those with disabilities who are potential, current, or former participants of IDVR. Community partners consisted of representatives from organizations that provide, coordinate, or advocate for services for individuals with disabilities in Idaho. IDVR staff included employees working within the agency as of February 2026. Business participants were employers who had recently hired a VR participant or received a business service from IDVR.

Survey data was collected using SurveyMonkey, an internet-based survey platform that includes accessibility features such as compatibility with screen readers and keyboard navigation. IDVR staff and community partners received invitations through emailed survey links, while individuals and business participants were contacted using email addresses on file. A follow-up reminder was sent approximately two weeks after the initial invitation to those who had not yet responded. Respondents were provided with contact information for the IDVR Deputy Administrator to request alternative formats or accommodations if needed. Due to an increase in valid email contact information compared to 2023, hard copy surveys were not distributed. To protect confidentiality, respondents were not required to

provide identifying information, and survey results were aggregated prior to analysis to ensure anonymity.

Survey 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 IDVR for themes or concepts that were expressed consistently by respondents. A total of 858 valid surveys were submitted by the different groups, which was 330 less than in 2023. A survey is considered valid if an individual completed the survey, even if they did not answer all questions. It is difficult to determine an exact response rate, as survey invitations were distributed through multiple channels and could be forwarded beyond the initial recipient list. As a result, the total number of individuals who received the survey is unknown, limiting the ability to calculate a precise response rate.

Limitations

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings. External data sources may be subject to reporting error and time lag, which can affect the accuracy of recent trends. Internal program data reflects individuals who have applied for or received services and may not fully capture the needs of individuals with disabilities who do not engage with the VR system.

Changes in policy and system capacity, including the implementation of Order of Selection (OOS), likely influence application patterns and participation levels. In particular, the implementation of OOS in 2024 has significantly affected access to services and the composition of individuals served. As a result, observed trends may reflect both underlying demand and policy-driven constraints on service delivery rather than changes in need alone.

Idaho at a Glance: Growth and Change

Population Trends

Idaho has experienced sustained and rapid population growth, increasing by approximately 12% since the last CSNA review period (Table 1), and is consistently ranking among the fastest growing states in the nation. This growth stems from an influx of new residents and continued natural population growth. Idaho's growth is driven by economic opportunity, quality of life, and relatively lower cost of living compared to neighboring states. While statewide growth signals overall vitality, it is not occurring uniformly across all regions.

Growth has been concentrated in specific regions, including northern Idaho (R1), southwest (R3), and eastern Idaho (R6), which have experienced population increases of approximately 9.7%-13.3%, compared to slower growth in other regions 5.5%-7.4% (Table 1). These differences reflect variation in economic opportunities, infrastructure capacity, and geographic factors, which influence where growth occurs.

Although rural areas experienced a higher percentage increase in population between 2019 and 2024, urban areas accounted for most of the state's total population growth because they began with a substantially larger population base (Table 1).

Distinct differences are evident between urban and rural communities. Urban areas have seen the majority of population increase, with growth occurring through both population density and outward expansion into surrounding communities. Rural areas, by comparison, have generally seen more modest gains, and in some cases, population decline or aging populations, which can create challenges for workforce sustainability and service delivery.

Collectively, these trends point to a pattern of growth that is robust at the statewide level but uneven in its geographic distribution, which leads to important implications for infrastructure, housing, and regional planning.

Economic Overview

Idaho's economy has experienced sustained growth in recent years, reflected in rising incomes and expanded employment. This growth is driven by both population increases and continued labor market demand, resulting in improvements to many traditional economic indicators.

Household income has increased across all regions of the state, exceeding national averages in several areas. Urban regions in particular have experienced strong income growth, with

median household incomes increasing by 44% since the last CSNA review period [Table 2]. Rural areas have also seen income increases, although at a more moderate pace and generally in line with national averages. These patterns indicate that economic growth is occurring statewide, but at different rates depending on regional labor market conditions.

Employment trends further reinforce this growth. Labor force participation has remained stable or increased modestly in many areas, and employment opportunities have expanded alongside population growth. In several regions, increases in employment reflect both job creation and greater workforce participation, including among individuals with disabilities. However, these gains are not uniform across the state; some regions are experiencing stronger growth than others based on industry and local economic conditions.

Growth in Idaho's economy is evident across multiple sectors, including healthcare, education, and professional services, while some traditional industries have remained stable or expanded despite national declines. This diversification reflects a labor market that is evolving alongside demographic change and increasing demand for both service and professional roles.

While these trends indicate strong economic performance at the statewide level, variation across regions and populations remains a defining feature. Differences in growth rates, employment opportunities, and income levels suggest that the benefits of expansion are not evenly distributed. These dynamics highlight the importance of considering both the overall trajectory of the state's economy and the regional conditions that shape outcomes for individuals and communities.

Indicators of Change

Trends across key economic and social measures, including earnings, poverty, education, technology, and disability, provide a consistent picture of change in Idaho's economic and social conditions. When taken together, these measures reflect growth and improvement at the state level while also highlighting variations across regions and populations. These trends are reflected across Tables 4-7.

Earnings have increased across the state, with increases across population groups including individuals with disabilities. In several regions earnings growth for individuals with disabilities has exceeded national trends, which indicates improved labor market engagement. However, in many cases, large percentage increases reflect growth from low starting wages. This trend indicates that while there has been an increase in earnings, wages remain modest. Differences in regional labor market composition such as the

concentration of professional versus service or manual occupations continue to shape wage levels and long-term earning potential.

Poverty rates have declined across Idaho beyond national trends. This reflects overall income growth and increased workforce participation. It should be noted that because poverty measures are based on income rather than expenses, declining poverty rates do not necessarily indicate improved financial stability. Rising housing costs and other living expenses may continue to place financial pressure on households, particularly for individuals with lower wages or limited access to higher wage employment.

Educational attainment has continued to shift toward higher levels, with growth in bachelor's and graduate degrees and a decline in the proportion of individuals with some college but no degree. This trend suggests an increase in credentialed employment, particularly in urban areas. Rural areas have also experienced increases in educational attainment, though at a slower pace, which indicates ongoing differences in access to and completion of postsecondary education.

Access to technology has expanded significantly, with more than 90 percent of Idaho households reporting internet access. Access is consistently high across both urban and rural areas, as well as across regions, with only modest variation between geographies. Improvements have occurred across all regions, particularly in areas that previously experienced low levels of connectivity. As access has become more widespread, the primary challenge has shifted from availability to quality. Rural areas are more likely to rely on lower-quality internet connections, which may impact the consistency of participation in remote work, online job searching, and virtual services. Remote service delivery may still be supported through alternative methods such as phone-based communication and other low-bandwidth approaches, which help maintain access to services in areas where internet reliability is limited.

Disability prevalence has increased in modest amounts, both in Idaho and nationally, with more pronounced increases in urban areas. Regional patterns vary; some regions experience stable or declining rates of disability prevalence, while other regions show increases in specific disability types, particularly cognitive and independent living disabilities. These trends indicate gradual but uneven changes in the population of individuals who may require VR services, which may have implications for both service delivery and system capacity.

Takeaways

Overall, these trends suggest that Idaho is experiencing improvement in measures of economic and social well-being. At the same time, differences in earnings, education, access, and disability prevalence across regions and populations point to an uneven distribution of these improvements. These patterns also contribute to differences in demand for services and place varying levels of pressure on systems and infrastructure across the state. Understanding these dynamics is critical for identifying where additional support and targeted strategies may be needed to ensure access to opportunity for all Idahoans.

Labor Market Conditions

Affordability and Economic Stability

Idaho's economic growth has been accompanied by rising income across all regions; however, increases in housing and living costs have outpaced the income increases. While poverty rates have declined statewide (Table 4), the improvements do not fully reflect household financial conditions, as rising expenses continue to place pressure on many Idahoans. This gap between income growth and cost of living creates ongoing financial instability risks. Instead of indicating improved economic security, declining poverty rates may mask underlying strain, particularly in areas where housing costs have risen most sharply. Income pressures are most notable for individuals with disabilities, low- and moderate-income households, and younger workers entering the labor market, all of whom are more likely to earn lower wages or have limited financial flexibility. Urban populations are also disproportionately impacted by higher housing costs.

These conditions indicate that increases in employment and income have not consistently translated into long-term stability. While wages have risen, they often remain insufficient relative to rising costs, particularly when concentrated in lower-wage occupations. At the same time, individuals with disabilities continue to experience lower labor force participation and higher unemployment, indicating barriers to both entering the labor market and sustaining employment. IDVR survey responses reinforce these patterns, with housing instability, transportation challenges, and concerns about loss of benefits identified as common barriers to employment. The cost of childcare further limits the ability of some individuals to maintain consistent participation in the workforce, particularly among lower-income households.

These patterns show a need to move beyond job placement alone and focus on employment outcomes that support long-term stability. This includes expanding access to higher wage opportunities, strengthening career advancement pathways, and increasing supports such as benefits planning, job retention services, transportation coordination, and childcare.

Regional Variations and Local Labor Markets

Economic growth has occurred across all regions of Idaho, but at uneven rates. Urban areas are experiencing larger percentage gains in income and employment. While every region has seen some level of improvement, there are differences in the pace and composition of growth which have resulted in varied labor market conditions. Regional data shows variations in earnings, employment outcomes, and unemployment trends, which reflect

differences in industries across the state and workforce characteristics. These trends may lead to uneven opportunities for economic advancement across the state.

Statewide averages can obscure the differences; conditions that appear stable at the state level may mask where growth is limited or where economic increases are more modest. Rural regions in particular continue to see limited industry diversity and fewer local employment opportunities (Tables 15-17). These differences are also reflected in variation in employment outcomes, earnings, and service utilization across populations, which further demonstrates that labor market conditions and access to services differ at the local level.

Survey and staff feedback reinforce these patterns. Rural areas are consistently identified as underserved with challenges related to transportation, limited service availability, and difficulty maintaining provider networks. IDVR staff report challenges in effectively serving rural participants due to limited local knowledge, fewer community resources, and the need to cover large geographic areas. Staff perspectives also suggest that workforce stability, including staff and provider turnover, may further affect service continuity and access in rural areas. These factors impact participant access to services and participation in the labor market.

These patterns highlight the need for approaches that are responsive to local conditions rather than relying solely on statewide strategies. Effective responses will require region specific planning, stronger local partnerships, and flexible service delivery models that can adapt to geographical and economic differences. This includes leveraging local employers, coordinating across service systems, and expanding delivery methods that account for distance and resource limitations.

Labor Market Access, Earnings, and Employment Stability

Labor market participation has improved overall, and earnings have increased across population groups, including individuals with disabilities. These trends reflect broader economic gains and engagement in the workforce. However, improvements in access have not consistently led to stable employment outcomes. More individuals are entering the labor market; however, differences across groups exist in wage levels, employment stability, and long-term employment outcomes.

Internal program data shows that employment rates at exit have declined in recent years, while employment rates in the second and fourth quarters after exit have remained relatively stable. This suggests that individuals may take longer to secure employment but are more likely to maintain employment once placed.

Earnings growth is seen across all populations, including individuals with disabilities, though in many cases this growth reflects increases from relatively low starting wages. Higher percentage increases do not necessarily indicate improved financial security. Median wages for participants at exit have increased over time; however, wages remain modest overall and vary by gender, disability type, and region (Tables 10-11). This demonstrates that wage growth does not consistently translate into long-term economic stability. Labor force participation has risen modestly but remains substantially lower for individuals with disabilities compared to individuals without disabilities. Among those who do participate in the labor market, unemployment rates are higher and more variable, which indicates continuing challenges in both obtaining and maintaining employment.

Barriers to stable employment remain consistent and widespread. Survey data from participants, partners, staff, and employers identify common barriers including limited work experience, gaps in job skills, employer perceptions of disability, accommodation challenges, mental health needs, and communication barriers as common obstacles. The consistency of these findings across groups suggests that there are structural issues impacting labor market access and ability to succeed in the workforce, rather than isolated individual challenges.

These patterns disproportionately impact specific populations. Individuals with disabilities, particularly women with disabilities continue to experience lower workforce participation rates and less stable employment outcomes. Entry level workers face similar challenges, as starting wages often do not provide long-term financial sustainability without opportunities for advancement into higher wage roles. Rural populations face greater challenges due to limited job availability and fewer support resources, which can hinder access to employment, long-term retention, and career advancement.

These findings indicate that improving employment outcomes require not only support in accessing employment but also support in employment advancement. Connecting individuals with disabilities to employment is critical; however, long-term success depends on the quality and sustainability of jobs. Success will include development of clear career pathways that outline progression to higher wage employment, and strategies that promote job retention. Addressing individual work readiness as well as broader structural barriers are essential to improving labor market outcomes for individuals with disabilities.

Local Industry and Occupational Structure

Industry and occupational trends in Idaho reflect continued growth in sectors such as healthcare and professional services, and declines in more traditional industries such as

manufacturing. These shifts are not uniform across the state, regional differences in industry composition result in varied local labor markets. Some areas experienced growth in high wage professional occupations, while other areas were more concentrated in service, retail, and manual labor roles.

These trends highlight how local economic conditions shape job opportunities rather than statewide trends. Areas with a broader mix of industries, particularly areas with expanding healthcare and professional sectors, tend to offer more opportunities for higher wage employment and career advancement. In contrast, regions with limited industry diversity may offer fewer pathways beyond entry level or lower wage positions. Fewer opportunities for advancement make it more difficult to achieve long-term economic stability.

Employment outcomes for individuals with disabilities are often concentrated in service, retail, and entry level roles. This reflects the availability of jobs in local labor markets and barriers to accessing high skill occupations. As a result, individuals with disabilities in regions with fewer professional or technical job opportunities may experience compounding challenges, as these professions offer limited opportunities for advancement as well as lower wages.

Internal program data further indicates that employment outcomes for participants are concentrated in transportation, material moving, food service, and maintenance occupations. These roles are typically associated with lower wages and limited opportunities for advancement, which may constrain long-term economic mobility. Individuals with disabilities remain underrepresented in professional and technical occupations, reflecting both local labor market structure and barriers to accessing higher-skill career pathways.

Differences in local industry structure impact service delivery as well. Regions with fewer professional job opportunities experience different challenges than more urban or diversified labor markets. These economic conditions require that service providers navigate both the availability of jobs and the types of employment that are realistically accessible to participants. Workforce strategies need to align with local labor market conditions; training programs must reflect the skills and occupation that are regionally in demand, while job placement strategies should account for realistic employment opportunities and pathways to advancement. Strengthening partnerships with local employers is critical both to improve hiring for individuals with disabilities, and to expand opportunities for advancement.

Workforce Preparedness

Education and Credential Expectations

Educational attainment trends in Idaho and the United States indicate a continued shift toward higher levels of completed education. Between 2021 and 2024, attainment at the bachelor's and graduate levels increased, while the percentage of individuals with "some college but no degree" declined (Table 6). This reflects a shift toward credential completion rather than partial attainment.

Educational attainment also varies across populations and regions. In Idaho, attainment of a bachelor's degree or higher falls below the national average, with larger gaps in rural areas compared to urban areas. At the same time, Idaho has a higher share of individuals with "some college, no degree," which indicates a gap between postsecondary participation and completion. Associate degree attainment is comparable to national levels, suggesting that shorter-term degree pathways continue to play an important role.

These patterns have implications for how individuals access employment opportunities. Bachelor's degrees are more closely associated with higher wage professional occupations, while associate degrees and industry recognized credentials support entry into technical and mid-skill roles. Work-based training and on-the-job training provide alternative pathways that may lead to employment more quickly; however, these pathways may offer more limited long-term wage growth without additional credential attainment. Lower rates of bachelor's attainment, particularly in rural areas, may limit access to higher-wage opportunities, while greater reliance on shorter-term or non-degree pathways may influence long-term earnings potential. Current data do not clearly distinguish between workforce training, industry recognized credentials, and traditional degree pathways, which highlights the need to consider multiple education and training pathways.

In Idaho, the pace of change varies geographically. Urban areas show stronger increases in bachelor's and graduate degree attainment, while rural areas are seeing more gradual increases. The decline in "some college" alongside growth in completed credentials likely reflects multiple factors, including increased access to financial aid through programs such as Idaho Launch (Idaho Workforce Development Council, 2024), labor market demand for credentials, and population changes associated with in-migration.

Labor market conditions continue to favor individuals with completed credentials. Employers are placing greater emphasis on formal education and industry recognized certifications as indicators of workforce readiness. Policy and programmatic changes across Idaho reinforce this pattern. For example, the Idaho Launch program provides funding for

education and training aligned with in-demand careers and supports movement from enrollment to completion. While recent policy changes at the state level have reduced formal degree requirements for some positions, these changes have not altered overall trends. Current data continues to reflect a labor market in which credentials remain an important pathway to economic opportunity.

Rural populations, transition age youth, and individuals with disabilities are particularly affected by increasing expectations around credential attainment. Rural populations often have lower levels of bachelor's degree attainment and limited access to postsecondary institutions and training programs. These constraints are compounded by fewer local employment opportunities which can reduce incentives for continued education.

Transition age youth are making critical decisions about education and workforce entry at a time when economic conditions and local labor markets, particularly for entry level careers, may encourage employment over continued schooling. Early workforce participation can provide short term income but may limit long-term career advancement if credentials are required for advancement opportunities. Career pathways that connect early work experiences to longer-term advancement opportunities can support more informed decision making and improve long-term employment outcomes.

Individuals with disabilities face additional and compounding barriers related to access, accommodation, persistence, and cost, which can make completing credentials even more difficult. Program data indicates that participation in postsecondary training and skill development is increasing, though credential completion rates remain relatively stable. Internal program data shows rising measurable skill gains (MSGs) alongside increasing training participation, but limited change in credential attainment. This suggests that while participants are building skills, the gains do not result in completed credentials, indicating a gap exists between engagement and completion. This reflects challenges such as inconsistent access to accommodations, competing health or personal needs, and concern over financial burdens. As a result, there is a widening gap between educational attainment and labor market requirements for individuals with disabilities. These disparities limit access to higher wage employment opportunities and reinforce longer term disparities in workforce participation and earnings.

These patterns highlight the need to prioritize education completion and credential attainment to align with labor market demands. Post-secondary completion is increasingly important for Idahoans to obtain higher wage and stable employment. Credentials are particularly important in growing sectors such as healthcare, education, trades, and

professional services. Educational pathways that align with the workforce needs are essential for ensuring that education leads to viable employment opportunities.

Program data further illustrates the distinction between credential attainment and workforce readiness. VR services show modest increases in participation in undergraduate and graduate education, along with significant growth in MSGs, as shown in Table 117. However, credentialed attainment rates within VR have remained relatively stable. This suggests that while VR services are improving workforce preparedness and skill development, the impact on credential completion is limited. To lessen the disparities in employment and earnings, workforce systems must address both credential completion and skill development, particularly for populations with increased barriers to employment.

Youth and Transition Age Populations

Youth have different employment patterns than adults, as many are still in school and those who are working are typically in early, entry level jobs. Internal program data indicates that transition-age youth represent a substantial portion of applicants and tend to have lower employment outcomes at exit compared to other groups. At the same time, waitlist additions for this population have increased under OOS, which may limit access to services during critical transition periods. As a result, labor force participation among youth is lower than adults, while unemployment rates are higher and more sensitive to seasonal hiring patterns and changes in employer demand. Youth often experience less stable employment and are more impacted by shifts in the labor market.

Education plays a significant role in shaping outcomes for transition age youth. Those who complete high school are more likely to obtain and maintain employment, while those without a high school diploma are at greater risk of becoming disconnected from both education and the workforce. Recent data shows that youth employment has increased, while at the same time the number of youths who are not enrolled in school has increased, especially in fast growing regions (Table 30). This suggests that more young people may be entering the workforce earlier, which can impact their ability to continue their education and may limit long-term career opportunities.

The transition from school to work remains a key challenge. While more youth are working, the jobs are not always connected to long-term career pathways or continued education. Many young people enter the workforce without direction or access to opportunities that support advancement. When youth enter the workforce without completing high school or continuing their education, they are more likely to work in lower wage employment with limited opportunities for advancement. This is particularly pronounced in areas where local labor market conditions encourage early workforce participation. Structured pathways are

needed to strengthen the connection between education and employment, to enhance career progression and increase future employment opportunities.

Youth ages 16 to 24 are most directly impacted by these transition challenges, as they navigate the connection between education and employment. Within this group, youth with disabilities face additional barriers, including limited access to work experience, fewer available accommodations, and limited exposure to career pathways. These challenges can make it more difficult to gain early employment and build the skills needed for long-term workforce participation.

Rural youth are also disproportionately impacted due to limitations in job availability, training opportunities, and access to postsecondary education. Patterns of school enrollment and labor force participation may appear similar between urban and rural youth; the available opportunities differ. Rural communities tend to have fewer employers, fewer structured work-based learning opportunities, and fewer connections between education and local industry needs. As a result, rural youth may have fewer chances to gain employment, to explore career options, or to continue their education, which can lead to less stable employment and lower long-term earnings.

These patterns highlight the need to strengthen how youth move from school into the workforce. Expanding Pre-ETS can help youth with disabilities build basic workplace skills and better understand career options. Increasing access to work-based learning opportunities can provide practical experience and can help to connect education to real-world work. Stronger employer connections are also important, especially in rural areas, where opportunities may be more limited and less visible. Expanding career exploration efforts can help youth make more informed decisions about education and workforce participation, ensuring that early employment experiences support, rather than replace, long-term educational and career goals. Together, these strategies can reduce disconnection and increase workforce preparedness leading to more stable employment outcomes.

Access to Services

Technology Access and Connectivity

Access to technology and internet connectivity has improved significantly across Idaho. Approximately 90 percent of households now have internet access (Table 5), and regional gaps have narrowed in comparison to the 2023 CSNA data. While access is widespread, differences remain in the quality and reliability of connections, particularly in rural areas where service is less reliable or slower. In most cases, connectivity challenges are not prohibitive, but they can limit efficiency and consistency in participation.

For individuals with disabilities, connectivity limitations can more directly impact access to services, especially when reliable platforms or accessibility supports are required. Disruptions in internet quality may impact participation in remote services, job search activities, and training opportunities. These conditions reinforce the importance of maintaining multiple service delivery options. Hybrid models that combine in person and virtual options allow individuals to engage in ways that reflect their access and needs. Providing alternative communication methods such as phone, text, email, and in person support, further supports participation where internet reliability is limited.

Maintaining in-person service options remains important particularly for individuals who require more direct support. At the same time, expanding digital literacy efforts can help individuals make more effective use of available technology when access is sufficient. Overall, while connectivity challenges persist at some level, they are generally manageable when service delivery models are flexible and responsive to varying levels of access and need.

Rural Access

Rural areas in Idaho continue to experience population growth, though at a slower pace than urban areas. These communities often have fewer service providers and workforce resources, which limits access to employment supports, training opportunities, and other specialized services. The geographic distance between rural communities means that individuals often have to travel further to reach employers and training programs, which adds increased time and cost. Transportation is a key factor that impacts access to employment, services, and training programs. Limited public transportation options and long-distance commutes make attending appointments more challenging. While internet access in rural areas has improved in recent years, gaps remain. This can limit the effective use of virtual tools and online resources. As a result, individuals in rural areas continue to

experience barriers to accessing services and experience lower levels of workforce engagement.

Individuals with disabilities living in geographically isolated areas may experience challenges when services or providers are not available locally. These instances require travel or reliance on limited options. Youth in rural communities may experience reduced access to work-based learning opportunities, internships, and career exploration activities due to a smaller local employer base and fewer structured partnerships between schools and the workforce. This can limit exposure to career pathways and delay entry to employment. Service providers that work with individuals who require more intensive supports must balance travel demands and scheduling constraints, which can impact the frequency and consistency of service delivery.

These patterns highlight the need for flexible and coordinated approaches to service delivery in rural areas. Expanding hybrid and remote service models, along with regional in-person service strategies, can help reduce the impact of distance. In-person service options remain important for individuals who require more direct engagement or who face limitations in online connectivity.

Strengthening local partnerships can improve access by connecting individuals to services and employment opportunities within their communities, particularly in areas with fewer providers. Transportation coordination and support strategies, such as fuel assistance, coordinated scheduling of services, and delivery of services in community-based locations, can help reduce barriers to participation in training and employment. These approaches can limit the need for frequent long-distance travel and improve consistency in service engagement, particularly for more remote areas.

Effective service delivery in rural areas depends on flexibility and coordination. Approaches that account for geographic barriers, while utilizing technology and community resources, can help ensure that individuals remain connected to services and opportunities.

Program Capacity and Service Delivery

IDVR is experiencing capacity constraints that impact the timeliness of services and access for applicants. Following the implementation of Order of Selection (OOS), in 2024, a waitlist for services was introduced. Internal data shows substantial increases in waitlist additions across all disability priority categories in 2024, with no corresponding reductions. This indicates sustained unmet need and confirms that demand for services currently exceeds system capacity. As a result, some individuals may delay applying for services, or disengage

from services altogether, particularly for those in priority categories disabled (D) and significantly disabled (SD).

Initial delays in processing eligibility determinations occurred during early implementation, which stabilized over time. OOS introduced prioritization of individuals with Most Significant Disabilities, which over time has reshaped the composition of individuals served. In 2024, nearly 45% of all IDVR applicants were categorized as MSD, up from 29% in 2023. IDVR has begun to move individuals in MSD Disability Priority status off the waitlist for services, which has further increased this proportion. As of June 2026, IDVR's Case Management System (CMS) shows that 580 of 1213 participants with an IPE (47.8%) were categorized as MSD. As IDVR is required to serve all MSD individuals on the waitlist prior to providing services to additional disability priority categories, it is likely that this proportion will continue to increase.

It is important to note that recent increases in MSD classification may reflect changes in internal review processes and greater consistency in disability priority determination. Enhanced internal controls and centralized review of disability priority assignments have resulted in reclassification of some individuals from SD or D categories into MSD, indicating that earlier data may have underrepresented the number of individuals with Most Significant Disabilities. This suggests that observed increases are due, in part, to improved classification accuracy in addition to changes in demand.

As a result, service delivery is increasingly concentrated among individuals with more complex support needs, leading to higher service complexity and increased cost per case. The system is shifting toward serving fewer individuals with greater needs, while overall demand continues to exceed available capacity.

The capacity constraints impact groups differently. Individuals with Most Significant Disabilities remain prioritized under OOS but may still experience delays due to waitlists. Service delivery for MSD is more dependent on provider availability and system capacity than other groups. Individuals in SD and D categories may delay applying for services or choose not to apply due to expected waitlist times. As a result, some individuals may not seek VR services, which contributes to shifts in application patterns and reduced access to services.

Individuals who are unserved or underserved face increased risk of disengagement. Waitlists and reduced outreach capacity may limit awareness and discourage participation, which makes it more likely that these individuals will remain outside the system.

Potentially eligible students and youth with disabilities may continue to receive Pre-ETS. However, individuals may experience gaps or inability to access services if VR services are needed beyond Pre-ETS.

Provider networks play a critical role in service delivery; however, provider capacity alone does not fully explain current system dynamics. There is a combination of factors that influence service delivery outcomes, including differences in participant needs, local labor market conditions, and the complexity of services required. As a result, system challenges are not only influenced by the number of available providers, but also how services are aligned with participant needs and regional employment opportunities.

Together, these factors highlight the need to strengthen program capacity while also improving alignment between services, providers, and local labor market conditions. Expanding staffing, service infrastructure, and provider networks is critical to address demand and service complexity. At the same time, improving coordination across systems including workforce development partners, education systems, and community providers can help ensure that individuals not currently served due to OOS remain connected to supports. Expanding flexible service delivery approaches, such as hybrid and differentiated models can improve efficiency and better align resources. Differentiated service models aim to address staffing challenges by distributing responsibilities more effectively. Maintaining engagement with individuals who are not currently being served may prevent long-term disengagement and help connect them to alternative supports when available.

Population Needs and Priority Populations

Disability Trends and Service Demand

Disability prevalence has increased in recent years at both the national and state levels, which reflects changing demographic and economic trends. In Idaho, the increases are not uniform across geographies. Urban areas have experienced more consistent growth in disability prevalence, while rural areas show mixed patterns with some regions increasing and others remaining stable or declining (Table 20). Overall changes in disability prevalence are modest, yet the changes indicate a growing population of individuals who may benefit from VR services.

Trends in disability prevalence do not directly translate into proportional increases in participation in VR services. Higher prevalence expands the potential population in need of services; however, actual demand is shaped by multiple factors including awareness of services and labor market conditions. Access to IDVR services is constrained by system capacity related to OOS. This means that while need is increasing, not all individuals that require VR services are able to access services when needed. These dynamics impact how demand appears in the system, particularly across different regions of the state.

The impacts of these trends are most notable among the working age population, which represents the largest share of individuals with disabilities. In urban areas, service delivery systems may experience increased pressure due to population growth and higher numbers of individuals seeking services. In rural areas, the challenge is shaped more by resource limitations, including fewer providers. The patterns show an increasing need as well as uneven access across regions.

These findings highlight the need to plan for continued growth in service demand while accounting for differences in how the demand is expressed. This includes preparing for potential caseload growth and strengthening service capacity. A system that is responsive to increasing need while remaining sympathetic to regional constraints will be better positioned to meet the evolving needs of individuals with disabilities in Idaho.

Most Significant Disabilities

Individuals with the most significant disabilities (MSD) represent a growing share of the population served by IDVR. Internal data shows that the proportion of participants classified as MSD has increased substantially (Table 106) and now represents nearly half of active cases. These individuals experience longer timelines to employment, incur higher service costs, and are less likely to obtain higher-wage employment, which contributes to

overall system complexity. This shift is largely driven by the implementation of Order of Selection (OOS), which prioritizes access to services for individuals with the highest level of need. As a result, the service population is increasingly composed of individuals who require more complex and longer term supports. This presents a dynamic in which individuals may experience greater barriers to obtaining and maintaining employment, which increases reliance on support systems. The increased need for support places additional strain on VR systems and provider networks.

Program data indicates that MSD cases require greater time and cost compared to other populations (Tables 128, 129). These individuals are more likely to require support in obtaining and maintaining employment, ongoing case management, and coordinated services across multiple systems (Table 74). Employment outcomes for those categorized as MSD tend to be lower than for other priority categories. Many individuals in MSD achieve employment outcomes, but timelines are longer and additional supports are often needed to obtain and maintain stable employment outcomes.

The MSD population includes an increasing percentage of certain disability categories, particularly mental health, and cognitive impairments. These disability types are associated with more complex and variable support needs, which require flexible and sustained service approaches (Tables 121, 122). As a result, employment attainment and retention can be more challenging, and access to higher wage opportunities may be limited. Individuals receiving Social Security benefits (Table 124) and those with multiple barriers to employment, including co-occurring disabilities, limited work history, or extended periods of unemployment, are also disproportionately represented within the MSD population. These individuals may face additional challenges navigating both service systems and employment pathways. Service providers and systems supporting individuals with MSD are also impacted, as the increasing complexity of service needs place greater demands on provider capacity.

These trends highlight the need to expand service capacity for individuals with the most significant disabilities. Greater coordination across systems is needed to address complex and overlapping needs. Relevant systems include, but are not limited to VR, mental health, and community-based supports. To meet the increased demand of individuals with complex needs, the system needs more staff, more service providers, and stronger specialized services, particularly those that provide ongoing job support services such as job search assistance and job coaching. Improving outcomes for the MSD population will require a stronger focus on job retention and stability, including ongoing supports, workplace accommodations, and employer engagement.

Subgroup Differences

Data indicates that improvements in employment outcomes, earnings, and access to services are not evenly distributed across populations; variations are seen in gender, disability status, and geographic regions. This suggests that the overall progress does not translate to consistent outcomes for all groups. Many indicators show positive trends at the aggregate level, but they do not fully capture differences in access to employment, training, and support services across populations.

Gender-based differences are seen in wage gaps and variation in employment outcomes, even where participation rates are similar (Table 118). Differences across disability types remain significant, as individuals with more complex disabilities face greater barriers to employment and tend to experience lower overall outcomes. Regional variation further contributes to uneven experiences, as access to services, training options, and employment opportunities differ across urban and rural areas.

These differences most directly impact populations that already face structural barriers within the workforce and service systems. Women with disabilities experience ongoing disparities in wages and may have different patterns of workforce participation, which contributes to unequal economic outcomes despite similar levels of engagement. Individuals in lower income populations are also disproportionately impacted, as they are more likely to face overlapping barriers related to education, access to training, transportation, and service availability.

Regional differences further shape equity outcomes. Individuals that live in areas with fewer employment opportunities or with limited industry diversity may face additional barriers that impact employment outcomes and long-term economic mobility. These differences reflect broader variations in local opportunities rather than individual level characteristics alone. These factors collectively create barriers to employment entry, as well as advancement into higher-wage opportunities.

Some differences also exist between individuals who are served by IDVR in counties classified by the Idaho Department of Labor (IDOL) as Urban versus Rural. In Program Year 2024, 81.6% of applications for VR services came from individuals living in urban counties. Labor market data from IDOL shows that 72.4% of Idaho residents live in urban counties (Idaho Department of Labor, 2025). This shows that individuals in rural counties are underrepresented in the number of individuals applying for VR services in Idaho.

In Program Years 2023 and 2024, individuals in rural counties were also more likely to be classified with a “Disability” priority (D), the lowest level of IDVR’s Disability Priority

structure, and less likely to be determined MSD (Table 130). This difference is likely to further impact the ability of IDVR to serve individuals in rural counties due to priorities of serving MSD individuals.

Addressing these barriers requires targeted strategies that respond to structural differences in access and outcomes. This includes aligning service delivery to better meet the needs of populations facing the greatest barriers and ensuring that services are responsive to variations in geography, income, and level of need. A key component of this approach is identifying and developing career pathways that help guide individuals with disabilities toward higher-wage, long-term employment.

Reducing disparities across disability types will require service approaches tailored to level of need, including expanded access to employment supports for individuals requiring more intensive services. Regional differences highlight the need for localized strategies that align services with local labor markets and available resources. Strengthening partnerships with local employers, particularly in sectors with growth potential, can improve access to employment opportunities and support increased employment outcomes. Expanding access to training aligned with higher-wage occupations, along with increased availability of work-based learning opportunities, will be important for all populations, but especially for students and youth with disabilities as they transition into the workforce. Improving outcomes for lower-income populations will require reducing practical barriers to participation. This includes delivering services in ways that meet individuals where they are, using flexible and accessible approaches to support engagement in services and employment.

Summary of Findings

The data shows that growth and change are occurring across Idaho; however, changes are not uniform. Population growth, labor force participation, educational attainment, and service demand are increasing in separate ways across regions and populations. While these changes are generally positive, they also introduce new challenges related to capacity, access, and disparities in how different populations experience outcomes.

Economic indicators show improvement in areas such as earnings and employment, but these gains are offset by rising housing and living costs. As a result, increased income does not consistently translate into improved economic stability, particularly for individuals with disabilities and lower-income populations who face additional barriers.

Access to the labor market has improved, but outcomes remain uneven. Differences across disability type, gender, income level, and geography continue to impact both entry into employment and long-term outcomes. Individuals with more significant disabilities and those living in rural areas are more likely to encounter barriers to stable, high-wage employment.

Across all findings, local context plays a central role. Regional differences in economic conditions, industry composition, service availability, and infrastructure influence both employment opportunities and access to support. These variations reinforce the importance of aligning services with local labor market conditions and community resources.

Improving employment outcomes will require a stronger focus on job quality, advancement, and long-term stability. This includes identifying career pathways that support progression into higher wage employment. Addressing practical barriers such as housing costs, transportation, and access to services will also be necessary to support consistent participation in the workforce.

Finally, reducing disparities across populations will require targeted and responsive strategies. Tailoring services to meet varying levels of need, improving coordination across systems, and strengthening connections between training and employment opportunities will be key to achieving more consistent outcomes across the state.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are informed by the findings presented throughout this assessment and are intended to address identified barriers, improve service delivery, and strengthen employment outcomes for individuals with disabilities in Idaho.

Labor Market Conditions

To improve service delivery and employment outcomes across Idaho, a combination of strategies is needed to address differences in labor market conditions, access to employment opportunities, and service availability. The following recommendations represent potential approaches to strengthen access, coordination, and alignment between services, participant needs, and local labor market conditions.

- Develop a sustainable model for long-term natural supports in rural communities where vendor availability is absent or limited.
- Increase IDVR employee awareness of the Self-Direct Developmental Disability (DD) Waiver plan through Health and Welfare to support appropriate use and communication of this option for alternative on-site job coaching.
- Support rural employers by developing a training program specific to rural businesses aimed at providing natural supports and accommodation strategies (e.g., checklists, step-by-step instructions) for individuals with disabilities in the workplace.
- Develop a targeted rural outreach strategy to increase visibility of VR services through community-based engagement.
- Strengthen partnerships with the Department of Labor and local organizations to improve coordination and access of workforce services.
- Explore existing virtual career exploration and advancement platforms to reach participants in rural areas.
- Continue coordination of transportation and driving resource referrals through existing partners to address access barriers.
- Increase employer engagement with industries offering multiple job types and advancement pathways, including sectors such as hospitality, resorts, and assisted living.
- Strengthen outreach to resort and tourism-based economies to expand employment opportunities in regionally significant industries.
- Consistent with RSA guidance, support advancement into STEM fields through expanded access to training and employment pathways.
- Leverage existing grant opportunities to support career development and access to high-demand occupations.

- Partner with local education institutions to align training with employer needs and workforce demands.
- Strengthen self-employment services through development of internal processes and training to support consistent service delivery and outcomes.

Workforce Preparedness

Strengthening workforce preparedness for VR consumers will require expanded exposure to career pathways, increased engagement with employers, and improved access to work-based learning experiences (WBLE).

- Increase access to WBLEs for students to support early exposure to workplace environments and skill development.
- Expand WBLEs, including internships, as core components of career development.
- Explore use of paid work experience models through partner agencies, such as Department of Labor, when appropriate and available.
- Develop a career pathway tool to showcase actionable steps, education, or training needed to achieve higher wage employment opportunities.
- Increase the number of students with disabilities into Career and Technical Education (CTE) through Pre-ETS.
- Continued development of transportation solutions to support participation in training and employment, including leveraging existing partnerships and resources to expand access.
- Develop strategies to build trust and improve youth engagement with VR services, particularly for transition age youth.
- Position “Job Ready” as an ongoing process that supports comprehensive workforce preparedness and long-term career development, rather than a point of completion.

Access to Services

Strengthening access to services will require improvements in service delivery models, consistency across staff, and the tools used to support participant progress and outcomes.

- Implement and scale the Differentiated Practice Model to address service capacity and better align Agency resources with participant needs.
- Improve service consistency in the context of minimizing staff turnover through clearer expectations, shared tools, and standardized approaches to service delivery.
- Strengthen onboarding and training to support continuity of services and maintain consistent staff practices.
- Develop and use a standardized case review tool to ensure cases are progressing appropriately and to identify unaddressed barriers.
- Develop or adopt a comprehensive vocational assessment tool to support evaluation of participant needs and more holistic assessments by QRPs.
- Expand partnerships with education, workforce, and community organizations to improve access to services and employment outcomes.

Population Needs and Priority Populations

Addressing differences in access and outcomes will require targeted strategies that respond to the needs of individuals with the most significant disabilities, underserved populations, individuals connected to the broader workforce system, and youth and students with disabilities.

- Expansion of long-term support strategies for areas with limited provider availability to improve outcomes for individuals with the most significant disabilities.
- Increased use of flexible and alternative service models to expand access for individuals with complex needs and those in underserved or rural areas.
- Targeted engagement and outreach strategies to students and youth with disabilities to improve access to VR services.
- Coordinate with workforce system partners to improve access to training, employment opportunities, and support services for individuals served across multiple systems.
- Development of career pathways that connect individuals to higher-wage employment opportunities, particularly for populations with limited access to advancement.
- Expanded access to the variety of WBLEs and early career exploration opportunities to support workforce entry for youth and students with disabilities.
- Strengthen integration of students with disabilities into CTE and other workforce-aligned training programs.
- Continued development of transportation and access solutions to support participation in services and employment, particularly for individuals in rural areas or with limited resources.
- Expansion of self-employment as an alternative pathway to employment, particularly for individuals with the most significant disabilities and those in rural or underserved areas.

Appendix

External Data

Table 1

Idaho Population Growth by Region, 2019–2024

Geographic Area	2019 Population	2024 Population	5-Year Change
United States	328,329,953	340,003,797	3.6%
Idaho	1,789,060	2,000,872	11.8%
Idaho -- Urban	1,159,114	1,272,973	9.8%
Idaho -- Rural	558,636	661,289	18.4%
R1	248,053	280,921	13.3%
R2	109,754	115,818	5.5%
R3	828,560	932,582	12.6%
R4	204,276	219,485	7.4%
R5	173,603	184,912	6.5%
R6	244,132	267,901	9.7%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, County Population Totals: 2015-2019, 2020–2025 (Population Estimates Program, Counties Total)

Table 2

Median Age/Median Working Age (16-64)

Geographic Area	Median Age	Median Working Age
U.S.	38.9	39.6
U.S. -- Urban	37.9	39.0
U.S. -- Rural	43.3	42.3
ID	37.3	38.6
ID -- Urban	35.4	37.2
ID -- Rural	42.2	42.1
R1	44.6	42.1
R2	44.5	40.1
R3	42.8	40.6
R4	37.0	39.0
R5	36.8	39.4
R6	39.2	39.2

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS), 5-Year Estimates (2020–2024)

Table 3*Median Household Income and Median Home Value*

Geographic Area	Median Household Income	Household Income Ranges	Median Home Value 2024	Home Value Ranges
Idaho	\$77,800	\$51,615 - \$99,805	\$418,600	\$212,900 - \$735,300
ID -- Urban	\$77,919	-----	\$421,400	-----
ID -- Rural	\$77,534	-----	\$410,400	-----
R1	\$66,280	\$55,527 - \$81,861	\$395,600	\$267,400 - \$518,700
R2	\$63,193	\$51,615 - \$72,599	\$301,400	\$225,300- \$368,600
R3	\$70,069	\$54,000 - \$91,502	\$413,680	\$278,100 - \$657,000
R4	\$70,734	\$57,955 - \$92,566	\$337,838	\$250,900 - \$735,300
R5	\$70,924	\$61,146 - \$77,878	\$281,143	\$212,900 - \$372,600
R6	\$69,710	\$53,015 - \$99,805	\$371,000	\$216,900 - \$690,500

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS), 1-Year Estimates (2024)**Table 4***Poverty Rates: Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population Ages 18 to 64 Years*

Geographic Area	Average Poverty Rate	Lowest Level	Highest Level
U.S.	11.60%		
Idaho	10.30%		
R1	11.90%	Kootenai 8.9%	Benewah 14.9%
R2	14.48%	Idaho 11.9%	Latah 21.8%
R3	10.81%	Boise 6.5%	Adams 17.4%
R4	9.56%	Camas 3.6%	Minidoka 12.6%
R5	9.70%	Franklin 6.5%	Bannock 12.2%
R6	13.46%	Jefferson 7.9%	Madison 29.2%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS), 5-Year Estimates (2020–2024)

Table 5*Computers and Internet Access: U.S. and ID, including Urban and Rural Areas*

Geographic Area	Total households	Has one or more types of computing device	Has an internet subscription	Broadband of any type	Cellular data plan
United States	132,737,146	95.0%	91.1%	93.2%	88.7%
Idaho	751,181	96.5%	92.1%	92.8%	88.1%
ID -- Urban	517,435	97.0%	92.7%	93.0%	88.7%
ID -- Rural	233,746	95.2%	90.5%	92.4%	86.6%
R1	21,267	94.2%	89.6%	89.2%	78.6%
R2	9,105	93.0%	86.7%	86.5%	77.7%
R3	33,524	94.8%	90.1%	89.2%	81.0%
R4	9,746	94.3%	89.9%	89.8%	83.3%
R5	9,163	96.1%	90.6%	90.5%	84.6%
R6	9,310	96.0%	90.3%	90.2%	84.6%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS), 5-year estimates (2020-2024)

Table 6*Educational Attainment: Population 25 Years and Over*

Geographic Area	High school graduate (includes equivalency)	Some college, no degree	Associate degree	Bachelor's degree	Graduate or professional degree	High school graduate or higher	Bachelor's degree or higher
U.S.	26.0%	19.1%	8.8%	21.6%	14.1%	89.6%	35.7%
U.S. - Urban	24.1%	18.7%	8.5%	23.0%	15.3%	89.5%	38.3%
U.S. - Rural	33.6%	20.4%	10.1%	16.4%	9.5%	89.9%	25.9%
Idaho	26.1%	24.2%	9.7%	21.3%	10.5%	91.9%	31.8%
ID - Urban	24.5%	23.9%	9.6%	23.0%	11.5%	92.5%	34.5%
ID - Rural	29.4%	24.9%	10.0%	17.7%	8.5%	90.5%	26.2%
R1	31.8%	26.0%	9.3%	15.2%	7.8%	90.1%	23.0%
R2	30.8%	25.8%	10.3%	17.4%	8.9%	93.1%	26.3%
R3	30.7%	24.5%	8.9%	17.4%	8.0%	89.4%	25.4%
R4	27.8%	23.8%	9.7%	15.9%	7.2%	84.3%	23.0%
R5	33.7%	27.4%	8.6%	15.3%	7.1%	92.2%	22.4%
R6	26.2%	23.2%	11.5%	20.8%	8.8%	90.4%	29.6%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS), 5-Year Estimates (2020–2024)

Table 7 (C16)*Educational Attainment for Individuals with Disabilities: U.S. and Idaho*

Educational Attainment for Individuals with Disabilities:	United States		Idaho	
	With a Disability	No Disability	With a Disability	No Disability
TCNP Age 25 and Over	231,700,222		1,311,959	
Population Age 25 and Over	39,241,164	192,459,058	1,311,959	1,069,936
Less than high school graduate	16.1	8.6	11.4	6.5
High school graduate (includes equivalency)	32.6	24.1	32.2	24.6
Some college or associate degree	29	27	35.2	32.8
Bachelor's degree or higher	22.2	40.3	21.1	36.1

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS), 1-Year Estimates (2024)

Table 8*Race/Ethnicity and Educational Attainment: United States and Idaho*

Race/Ethnicity	United States		Idaho	
	High school graduate or higher	Bachelor's degree or higher	High school graduate or higher	Bachelor's degree or higher
White alone	94.00%	41.00%	95.40%	34.60%
Black alone	89.00%	26.90%	87.60%	38.10%
American Indian or Alaska Native alone	78.50%	17.20%	81.10%	15.70%
Asian alone	89.00%	59.10%	90.10%	55.40%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	87.30%	19.40%	95.6	23.5
Two or more races	81.80%	29.20%	80.20%	22.90%
Hispanic or Latino Origin	74.80%	20.70%	71.50%	16.40%

	United States -- Urban		Idaho -- Urban	
Race/Ethnicity	High school graduate or higher	Bachelor's degree or higher	High school graduate or higher	Bachelor's degree or higher
White alone	94.70%	44.50%	95.80%	37.00%
Black alone	89.50%	27.90%	91.30%	44.80%
American Indian or Alaska Native alone	76.60%	18.40%	81.30%	20.90%
Asian alone	88.90%	59.30%	90.30%	58.30%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	87.30%	19.80%	94.2	17.2
Two or more races	81.70%	30.10%	80.80%	23.40%
Hispanic or Latino Origin	74.20%	21.90%	73.30%	18.60%
	United States -- Rural		Idaho -- Rural	
Race/Ethnicity	High school graduate or higher	Bachelor's degree or higher	High school graduate or higher	Bachelor's degree or higher
White alone	92.30%	28.30%	94.50%	30.20%
Black alone	85.00%	19.00%	N	N
American Indian or Alaska Native alone	82.80%	14.60%	80.90%	10.80%
Asian alone	90.60%	54.70%	88.70%	36.10%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	87.50%	15.80%	N	N
Two or more races	82.70%	23.30%	78.50%	21.90%
Hispanic or Latino Origin	73.20%	17.70%	66.90%	10.70%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS), 1-Year Estimates (2024)

Table 9

Race/Ethnicity and Educational Attainment: VR Service Regions

Race/Ethnicity	Degree level and higher	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6
White	HS graduate+	91.5%	93.3%	92.3%	90.8%	94.1%	92.0%
	Bachelor's degree+	38.5%	41.2%	39.8%	40.9%	38.7%	42.5%
Black	HS graduate+	89.5%	91.0%	82.0%	88.7%	90.1%	85.5%
	Bachelor's degree+	21.5%	26.8%	22.4%	24.1%	23.3%	20.5%

American Indian/Alaska Native	HS graduate+	82.5%	84.1%	79.8%	76.2%	83.7%	80.4%
	Bachelor's degree+	15.8%	14.2%	16.0%	13.5%	14.8%	17.2%
Asian	HS graduate+	91.0%	92.5%	90.2%	88.5%	91.8%	92.1%
	Bachelor's degree+	58.5%	55.2%	52.8%	56.1%	57.3%	54.9%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	HS graduate+	87.5%	88.9%	85.2%	84.1%	88.0%	86.7%
	Bachelor's degree+	20.1%	22.8%	19.7%	18.5%	21.9%	19.3%
Two or more races	HS graduate+	83.8%	84.5%	82.1%	81.4%	84.9%	83.2%
	Bachelor's degree+	27.5%	29.1%	26.8%	27.2%	28.3%	29.5%
Hispanic/Latino	HS graduate+	75.9%	74.3%	70.2%	71.6	73.8%	72.4%
	Bachelor's degree+	20.5%	19.2%	18.7%	17.9%	18.5%	19.8%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS), 5-Year Estimates (2020–2024)

Table 10

Median Earnings for Individuals with Disabilities 16 Years and Older: U.S. and Idaho

	U.S.	U.S. -- Urban	U.S. -- Rural	Idaho	ID -- Urban	ID -- Rural
Total:	\$46,997	\$47,258	\$45,990	\$41,627	\$41,541	\$41,834
With a disability:	\$34,114	\$34,128	\$34,059	\$32,491	\$32,864	\$31,335
Male	\$40,099	\$39,560	\$41,081	\$40,506	\$41,590	\$36,661
Female	\$30,244	\$30,578	\$27,546	\$26,648	\$28,097	\$23,083
No disability:	\$48,514	\$49,015	\$46,973	\$42,363	\$42,345	\$42,404
Male	\$55,073	\$55,050	\$55,157	\$51,951	\$51,217	\$55,628
Female	\$41,366	\$41,831	\$38,789	\$34,367	\$35,655	\$31,740

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS), 1-Year Estimates (2024)

Table 11*Median Earnings for Individuals with Disabilities 16 Years and Older by Region*

Individual Earnings	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6
With a disability:	\$27,451	\$28,216	\$28,964	\$29,676	\$24,727	\$30,100
Male	\$30,696	\$31,231	\$37,784	\$33,525	\$42,010	\$33,466
Female	\$21,145	\$25,018	\$24,187	\$26,858	\$17,671	\$23,204
Without a disability:	\$39,764	\$40,746	\$39,738	\$38,773	\$36,762	\$33,306
Male	\$50,817	\$50,893	\$49,191	\$47,117	\$50,212	\$40,522
Female	\$29,160	\$29,740	\$31,368	\$27,348	\$24,853	\$24,813

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS), 1-Year Estimates (2024)**Table 12***Labor Force Participation - Total Civilian Non-institutionalized Population (TCNP) Age 16 and Over: U.S. and State*

	United States			Idaho		
	TCNP	With a Disability	No Disability	TCNP	With a Disability	No Disability
Population Age 16 and Over	271,371,099	42,689,659	228,681,440	1,567,116	271,562	1,295,554
Employed	61.60%	29.30%	67.70%	61.60%	34.90%	67.20%
Not in Labor Force	35.40%	67.70%	29.30%	36.00%	62.50%	30.50%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS), 1-Year Estimates (2024)

Table 13 (C26)*Employment-to-Population Ratio for Individuals with Disabilities Ages 18-64 Years*

State/ Urban – Rural/ County		
Geographic Area		Percent
United States	Total	46.6%
	Urban	47.8%
	Rural	42.0%
Idaho	Total	53.1%
	Urban	53.2%
	Rural	53.0%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS), 1-Year Estimates (2024)

Table 14*Labor Force Participation and Unemployment Rates*

Date	Labor Force Participation Rate With Disability	Labor Force Participation Rate Without Disability	Unemployment Rate With Disability	Unemployment Rate Without Disability
Jan 2024	24.5%	67.6%	6.6%	3.9%
Feb 2024	24.4%	68.0%	7.7%	4.0%
Mar 2024	24.5%	68.2%	8.6%	3.7%
Apr 2024	24.5%	68.0%	6.3%	3.4%
May 2024	25.0%	67.9%	7.5%	3.5%
Jun 2024	24.5%	68.5%	8.0%	4.1%
Jul 2024	24.2%	68.7%	8.2%	4.3%
Aug 2024	23.9%	68.3%	8.3%	4.2%
Sep 2024	24.5%	68.1%	7.2%	3.7%
Oct 2024	24.5%	68.1%	7.6%	3.7%
Nov 2024	25.1%	67.9%	7.1%	3.8%
Dec 2024	24.7%	67.8%	7.3%	3.7%
Jan 2025	24.8%	67.7%	8.5%	4.2%
Feb 2025	24.3%	67.8%	8.5%	4.2%
Mar 2025	23.9%	68.1%	7.8%	4.1%
Apr 2025	24.2%	68.0%	8.2%	3.6%
May 2025	24.5%	67.9%	7.6%	3.8%
Jun 2025	24.8%	68.3%	8.6%	4.1%
Jul 2025	24.7%	68.4%	10.0%	4.3%
Aug 2025	25.1%	67.9%	8.6%	4.3%
Sep 2025	25.0%	67.9%	8.7%	4.0%
Nov 2025	26.2%	68.0%	7.0%	4.2%
Dec 2025	25.3%	67.7%	7.7%	3.9%
Jan 2026	24.6%	67.5%	8.1%	4.5%

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), Current Population Survey (CPS), 2024–2026

Table 15*Local Area Top Industries by Employment: U.S. and ID, Including Urban and Rural Averages*

Geographic Area	Industries	Percent
U.S.	1- Educational services; Healthcare & social assistance	23.8%
	2- Professional; Scientific; Administrative services	12.9%
	3- Retail trade	10.6%
	4- Manufacturing	9.6%
	5- Arts; Entertainment; Hospitality; Food services	8.9%
	6- Construction	6.9%
U.S. Urban	1- Educational services; Healthcare & social assistance	24.0%
	2- Professional; Scientific; Administrative services	13.7%
	3- Retail trade	10.7%
	4- Arts; Entertainment; Hospitality; Food services	9.4%
	5- Manufacturing	9.0%
	6- Finance; Real estate; Rental & leasing	6.9%
U.S. Rural	1- Educational services; Healthcare & social assistance	22.9%
	2- Manufacturing	12.3%
	3- Retail trade	10.5%
	4- Professional; Scientific; Administrative services	9.4%
	5- Construction	9.3%
	6- Arts; Entertainment; Hospitality; Food services	7.0%
Idaho	1- Educational services; Healthcare & social assistance	23.0%
	2- Retail trade	11.8%
	3- Professional; Scientific; Administrative services	11.6%
	4- Manufacturing	9.2%
	5- Construction	8.8%
	6- Arts; Entertainment; Hospitality; Food services	8.5%
Idaho Urban	1- Educational services; Healthcare & social assistance	23.7%
	2- Retail trade	12.5%
	3- Professional; Scientific; Administrative services	11.7%
	4- Manufacturing	9.5%
	5- Arts; Entertainment; Hospitality; Food services	9.2%
	6- Construction	8.4%
Idaho Rural	1- Educational services; Healthcare & social assistance	21.5%
	2- Professional; Scientific; Administrative services	11.3%
	3- Retail trade	10.1%
	4- Construction	9.8%
	5- Manufacturing	8.5%
	6- Agriculture; Forestry; Fishing; Mining	8.0%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS), 1-Year Estimates (2024)

Table 16*Distribution of Employed Individuals by Occupation and Disability Status (U.S. and Idaho)*

	United States			Idaho		
	Noninstitutional Population (TCNP)	With a Disability	No Disability	TCNP	With a Disability	No Disability
Management, business, science, and arts occupations	43.50%	35.50%	44.10%	39.80%	31.20%	40.70%
Service occupations	16.50%	20.30%	16.20%	17.10%	20.70%	16.80%
Sales and office occupations	19.10%	21.20%	18.90%	19.80%	22.40%	19.60%
Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations	8.30%	8.00%	8.30%	10.90%	10.60%	10.90%
Production, transportation, and material moving occupations	12.60%	15.00%	12.40%	12.30%	15.20%	12.00%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS), 1-Year Estimates (2024)

Table 17

Local Area Top Industries by Employment: Individuals with and without Disabilities Ages 16 and Over: State and Regions

	Industry	Employees with Disabilities	Employees without Disabilities
Idaho	1- Educational services; Healthcare & social assistance	20.3%	23.3%
	2- Retail trade	14.1%	11.6%
	3- Arts; Entertainment; Hospitality & food services	9.3%	8.4%
	4- Manufacturing	9.0%	9.2%
	5- Construction	9.0%	8.8%
	6- Professional; Scientific; Administrative services	8.8%	11.9%
R1	1- Educational services; Healthcare & social assistance	19.1%	79.7%
	2- Retail trade	13.9%	12.1%
	3- Professional; Scientific; Administrative services	12.5%	11.3%
	4- Agriculture; Forestry; Fishing; Mining	9.8%	2.9%
	5- Arts; Entertainment; Hospitality & food services	13.0%	9.0%
	6- Construction	9.2%	11.4%
R2	1- Educational services; Healthcare & social assistance	19.4%	23.1%
	2- Manufacturing	12.9%	17.7%
	3- Construction	11.3%	7.4%
	4- Other services	10.4%	6.0%
	5- Arts; Entertainment; Hospitality & food services	9.8%	7.3%
	6- Professional; Scientific; Administrative services	8.6%	4.7%
R3	1- Educational services; Healthcare & social assistance	20.8%	21.6%
	2- Retail trade	13.2%	11.3%
	3- Professional; Scientific; Administrative services	10.6%	12.0%
	4- Arts; Entertainment; Hospitality & food services	9.1%	7.7%
	5- Construction	9.4%	10.1%
	6- Manufacturing	8.9%	9.4%
R4	1- Educational services; Healthcare & social assistance	23.6%	21.1%
	2- Manufacturing	13.8%	13.0%
	3- Wholesale trade	10.9%	1.9%
	4- Arts; Entertainment; Hospitality & food services	10.2%	9.5%
	5- Transportation & utilities	8.1%	5.6%
	6- Public administration	6.8%	3.6%
R5	1- Arts; Entertainment; Hospitality & food services	20.4%	9.4%
	2- Educational services; Healthcare & social assistance	20.2%	29.0%
	3- Retail trade	11.7%	11.3%

	4- Professional; Scientific; Administrative services	9.2%	7.6%
	5- Transportation & utilities	7.4%	5.6%
	6- Finance; Real estate; Rental & leasing	5.8%	8.1%
R6	1- Educational services; Healthcare & social assistance	19.6%	23.6%
	2- Retail trade	12.8%	12.4%
	3- Professional; Scientific; Administrative services	12.7%	13.9%
	4- Construction	11.9%	9.1%
	5- Arts; Entertainment; Hospitality & food services	10.6%	10.0%
	6- Manufacturing	8.0%	8.0%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS), 5-Year Estimates (2020–2024)

Table 18

Largest Occupations in the United States, May 2022- May 2024

Occupation	2022	2024	% Change
Home Health and Personal Care Aides	3,504,230	3,988,140	+13.8%
Retail Salespersons	3,640,040	3,800,250	+4.4%
Fast Food and Counter Workers	3,325,050	3,780,930	+13.7%
General and Operations Managers	3,376,680	3,584,420	+6.2%
Registered Nurses	3,072,700	3,282,010	+6.8%
Cashiers	3,296,040	3,148,030	–4.5%
Laborers and Freight, Stock, and Material Movers, Hand	2,934,050	2,982,530	+1.7%
Customer Service Representatives	2,879,840	2,725,930	–5.3%
Stockers and Order Fillers	2,842,060	2,779,530	–2.2%
Office Clerks, General	2,517,350	2,510,550	–0.3%

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics (OEWS), May 2022, and May 2024

Table 19*Largest Occupations in Idaho, May 2022 – May 2024*

Occupation	2022	2024	% Change
General and Operations Managers	24,790	30,600	+23.4%
Fast Food and Counter Workers	22,350	24,440	+9.4%
Retail Salespersons	19,220	20,670	+7.5%
Customer Service Representatives	19,020	23,520	+23.7%
Home Health and Personal Care Aides	18,320	16,960	-7.4%
Office Clerks, General	16,940	22,460	+32.6%
Cashiers	15,900	16,660	+4.8%
Heavy and Tractor-Trailer Truck Drivers	14,030	14,860	+5.9%
Registered Nurses	13,680	14,540	+6.3%
Laborers and Freight, Stock, and Material Movers, Hand	13,410	18,580	+38.6%

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), Occupational Employment and Wage Statistics (OEWS), May 2022, and May 2024

Table 20*Disability Status: Total Civilian Noninstitutionalized Population*

Geographic Area		With a disability	Under 18 years with a disability	18 to 64 years with a disability
U.S.	Total	13.30%	4.90%	10.90%
	Urban	12.80%	4.80%	10.40%
	Rural	15.40%	5.10%	12.80%
Idaho	Total	14.10%	4.90%	12.20%
	Urban	13.70%	5.30%	12.20%
	Rural	14.90%	3.90%	12.30%
R1		18.26%	4.00%	15.18%
R2		19.38%	4.54%	15.90%
R3		15.86%	4.40%	13.10%
R4		15.04%	4.06%	13.66%
R5		14.14%	4.00%	12.46%
R6		15.57%	3.79%	12.32%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS), 5-Year Estimates (2020–2024)

Table 21*Disability Types: U.S. and Idaho*

Disability Status	Percent with a disability					
	U.S.	U.S. Urban	U.S. Rural	Idaho	ID Urban	ID Rural
With a hearing difficulty	3.6%	3.3%	5.0%	4.6%	4.1%	5.7%
Population under 18 years	0.5%	0.5%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
Population 18 to 64 years	2.0%	1.8%	2.9%	2.7%	2.4%	3.3%
With a vision difficulty	2.5%	2.4%	2.8%	2.5%	2.4%	2.6%
Population under 18 years	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
Population 18 to 64 years	2.1%	2.0%	2.4%	2.3%	2.3%	2.3%
With a cognitive difficulty	5.6%	5.5%	5.9%	6.1%	6.4%	5.4%
Population under 18 years	4.9%	4.9%	5.0%	5.0%	5.7%	3.6%
Population 18 to 64 years	5.1%	5.0%	5.5%	6.0%	6.3%	5.3%
With an ambulatory difficulty	6.7%	6.4%	7.8%	6.2%	5.8%	7.2%
Population under 18 years	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.4%
Population 18 to 64 years	4.4%	4.1%	5.6%	4.3%	4.1%	4.9%
With a self-care difficulty	2.6%	2.5%	2.8%	2.4%	2.4%	2.5%
Population under 18 years	1.2%	1.2%	1.1%	1.1%	1.2%	0.9%
Population 18 to 64 years	1.7%	1.6%	2.0%	1.6%	1.6%	1.8%
With an independent living difficulty	5.9%	5.8%	6.4%	5.7%	5.7%	5.7%
Population 18 to 64 years	3.9%	3.7%	4.5%	4.2%	4.2%	4.2%

Source: American Community Survey (ACS), 1-Year Estimates (2024)

Table 22*Disability Types: Regions*

Disability Status	Percent with a disability					
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6
With a hearing difficulty	6.4%	7.5%	5.8%	5.5%	4.8%	5.0%
Population under 18 years	0.3%	0.5%	0.5%	0.9%	0.3%	0.7%
Population 18 to 64 years	3.1%	4.2%	2.9%	3.1%	3.4%	2.9%
With a vision difficulty	3.5%	4.1%	3.0%	3.0%	2.4%	2.9%
Population under 18 years	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%	0.9%	0.8%	0.4%
Population 18 to 64 years	2.9%	3.9%	2.6%	2.6%	1.8%	2.3%
With a cognitive difficulty	6.4%	7.5%	5.8%	5.0%	5.8%	7.4%

Population under 18 years	3.5%	5.1%	4.5%	3.6%	3.6%	3.8%
Population 18 to 64 years	6.6%	7.5%	5.5%	4.7%	6.2%	6.6%
With an ambulatory difficulty	9.5%	10.2%	7.4%	7.6%	6.4%	7.5%
Population under 18 years	1.0%	0.8%	0.6%	0.5%	0.6%	0.4%
Population 18 to 64 years	7.1%	6.5%	5.5%	6.7%	4.3%	4.3%
With a self-care difficulty	3.2%	3.4%	2.8%	2.2%	2.4%	3.0%
Population under 18 years	1.5%	1.2%	1.3%	0.9%	0.5%	0.7%
Population 18 to 64 years	2.2%	2.3%	2.2%	1.4%	1.6%	2.0%
With an independent living difficulty	6.7%	6.9%	6.4%	5.4%	5.7%	6.9%
Population 18 to 64 years	5.5%	5.0%	4.8%	3.4%	4.1%	4.6%

Source: American Community Survey (ACS), 5-Year Estimates (2020–2024)

Table 23

Disability Type by Race/Ethnicity (US & Idaho)

Race or Ethnicity	United States	Idaho
White	14.70%	15.30%
Black or African American	15.30%	15.00%
American Indian and Alaska Native	16.10%	20.20%
Asian	8.60%	9.80%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	13.40%	N
Two or more races	11.70%	12.50%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	10.80%	10.90%

Source: American Community Survey (ACS), 1-Year Estimates (2024)

Table 24

Disability Type by Race/Ethnicity (Regions)

Race/Ethnicity and Disability	Percent with a disability					
	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6
White	18.4%	19.2%	16.4%	16.9%	14.2%	15.7%
Black or African American	12.6%	14.2%	18.4%	17.4%	33.2%	24.4%
American Indian and Alaska Native	25.5%	26.1%	34.2%	25.4%	33.4%	17.6%
Asian	5.8%	24.0%	18.8%	20.1%	8.9%	8.4%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	17.7%	30.0%	5.6%	6.8%	30.6%	39.1%
Two or more races	21.2%	19.4%	13.2%	8.3%	18.7%	13.6%
Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	13.6%	16.3%	10.0%	8.5%	8.2%	10.3%

Source: American Community Survey (ACS), 5-Year Estimates (2020–2024)

Table 25*Race and Ethnicity in Idaho*

Area	Total population	Hispanic or Latino (of any race)	White	Black or African American	American Indian and Alaska Native	Asian	Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	Two or more races
U.S.	334,922,499	19.34%	60.95%	12.22%	0.92%	5.95%	0.19%	12.63%
U.S. -- Urban	267,307,278	22.04%	55.93%	13.81%	0.78%	7.18%	0.21%	13.88%
U.S. -- Rural	67,615,221	8.64%	80.82%	5.94%	1.51%	1.11%	0.10%	7.70%
Idaho	1,934,262	13.65%	81.68%	0.77%	1.15%	1.37%	0.17%	9.73%
ID Urban	1,329,100	14.32%	80.99%	0.97%	0.82%	1.73%	0.21%	10.04%
ID Rural	605,162	12.17%	83.20%	0.33%	1.89%	0.57%	0.08%	9.04%
R1	54,029	5.19%	87.47%	0.39%	1.08%	0.69%	0.06%	8.55%
R2	22,774	4.62%	87.82%	0.50%	2.32%	1.28%	0.21%	6.60%
R3	89,548	15.02%	79.89%	1.11%	0.84%	1.99%	0.21%	10.63%
R4	26,745	25.72%	73.41%	0.53%	1.18%	0.69%	0.14%	13.34%
R5	25,841	12.43%	82.26%	0.58%	2.84%	0.87%	0.15%	7.67%
R6	28,879	12.54%	85.56%	0.47%	0.60%	0.85%	0.14%	7.69%

Source: American Community Survey (ACS), 5-Year Estimates (2020–2024)

Table 26*Race/Ethnicity and Poverty: United States and Idaho*

Race/Ethnicity	United States	U.S. Urban	U.S. Rural	Idaho	Idaho Urban	Idaho Rural
White	9.50%	9.50%	9.60%	9.50%	10.10%	8.50%
Black or African American	20.30%	20.30%	20.70%	19.10 %	17.20%	N
American Indian and Alaska Native	19.60%	17.70%	23.60%	16.00 %	14.40%	17.50%
Asian	9.70%	9.80%	7.50%	14.80 %	16.20%	N
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	15.70%	15.40%	17.60%	N	N	N
Two or more races	14.00%	14.10%	13.40%	13.60 %	14.70%	10.60%
Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race)	16.20%	16.20%	15.60%	14.60 %	13.20%	18.20%

Source: American Community Survey (ACS), 1-Year Estimates (2024)

Table 27*Race/Ethnicity and Poverty: Regions*

	R1	R2	R3	R4	R5	R6
White	9.50%	13.32%	8.45%	9.93%	10.69%	12.02%
Black or African American	9.70%	34.47%	19.66%	17.23%	23.83%	15.44%
American Indian and Alaska Native	24.91%	20.74%	16.84%	8.10%	28.78%	39.96%
Asian	12.01%	14.90%	8.91%	4.18%	8.14%	13.98%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	44.16%	22.13%	17.05%	0.72%	3.77%	39.44%
Two or more races	12.97%	19.85%	12.59%	16.09%	8.85%	14.56%
Hispanic or Latino origin (of any race)	12.08%	12.96%	13.93%	16.07%	13.08%	16.58%

Source: American Community Survey (ACS), 5-Year Estimates (2020–2024)

Table 28*Poverty by Disability Type: Ages 18 and Over United States and Idaho*

	2021 United States	2024 United States	Changes in U.S. 2021 - 2024	2021 Idaho	2024 Idaho	Changes in Idaho 2021 - 2024
Total Population	323,173,982	331,172,247	7,998,265	1,864,114	1,948,200	84,086
18 years and over:	250,876,885	259,372,389	8,495,504	1,402,466	1,485,507	83,041
Percent of population 18 and over	77.60%	78.32%	0.72%	75.20%	76.25%	1.05%
Number of 18 years and over population classified in under .50 to .99 poverty ratio	29,118,807	14,615,499	14,503,308	144,770	84,301	-60,469
Percent of 18 years and over population classified in under .50 to .99 poverty ratio	11.60%	5.63%	-5.97%	10.30%	5.67%	-4.63%
With a disability:	3.00%	1.75%	-1.25%	2.60%	1.70%	-0.90%
With a hearing difficulty	0.60%	0.38%	-0.22%	0.60%	0.33%	-0.27%
With a vision difficulty	0.60%	0.38%	-0.22%	0.50%	0.30%	-0.20%
With a cognitive difficulty	1.40%	0.77%	-0.63%	1.20%	0.89%	-0.31%

With an ambulatory difficulty	1.70%	1.00%	-0.70%	1.30%	0.78%	-0.52%
With a self-care difficulty	0.70%	0.42%	-0.28%	0.60%	0.30%	-0.30%
With an independent living difficulty	1.40%	0.82%	-0.58%	1.20%	0.74%	-0.46%
No disability	8.60%	3.88%	-4.72%	7.70%	3.97%	-3.73%
	2021 U.S. Urban	2024 U.S. Urban		2021 Idaho - Urban	2024 Idaho - Urban	
Total Population	258,603,034	263,025,576	4,422,542	1,276,435	1,310,351	33,916
18 years and over:	200,688,958	206,084,194	5,395,236	962,660	1,000,956	38,296
Percent of population 18 and over	77.60%	78.35%	0	75.40%	76.39%	0.99%
Number of 18 years and over population classified in under .50 to .99 poverty ratio	24,069,314	11,701,987	- 12,367,327	109,347	57,934	-51,413
Percent of 18 years and over population classified in under .50 to .99 poverty ratio	12.00%	5.68%	-6.32%	11.40%	5.79%	-5.61%
With a disability:	3.00%	1.72%	-1.28%	2.90%	1.79%	-1.11%
With a hearing difficulty	0.60%	0.35%	-0.25%	0.60%	0.34%	-0.26%
With a vision difficulty	0.60%	0.37%	-0.23%	0.60%	0.29%	-0.31%
With a cognitive difficulty	1.40%	0.77%	-0.63%	1.50%	1.00%	-0.50%
With an ambulatory difficulty	1.70%	0.98%	-0.72%	1.40%	0.80%	-0.60%
With a self-care difficulty	0.70%	0.42%	-0.28%	0.80%	0.32%	-0.48%
With an independent living difficulty	1.40%	0.82%	-0.58%	1.50%	0.79%	-0.71%
No disability	8.90%	3.96%	-4.94%	8.40%	4.00%	-4.40%

	2021 U.S. Rural	2024 U.S. Rural		2021 Idaho - Rural	2024 Idaho - Rural	
Total Population	64,570,948	68,146,671	3,575,723	587,679	637,849	50,170
18 years and over:	50,187,927	53,288,195	3,100,268	439,806	484,551	44,745
Percent of population 18 and over	77.70%	78.20%	0.50%	73.60%	75.97%	2.37%
Number of 18 years and over population classified in under .50 to .99 poverty ratio	5,049,493	2,913,512	-2,135,981	35,423	26,367	-9,056
Percent of 18 years and over population classified in under .50 to .99 poverty ratio	10.10%	5.47%	-4.63%	8.10%	5.44%	-2.66%
With a disability:	3.10%	1.87%	-1.23%	1.90%	1.53%	-0.37%
With a hearing difficulty	0.80%	0.48%	-0.32%	0.60%	0.31%	-0.29%
With a vision difficulty	0.60%	0.40%	-0.20%	0.40%	0.31%	-0.09%
With a cognitive difficulty	1.30%	0.77%	-0.53%	0.70%	0.64%	-0.06%
With an ambulatory difficulty	1.70%	1.08%	-0.62%	0.90%	0.73%	-0.17%
With a self-care difficulty	0.60%	0.39%	-0.21%	0.40%	0.28%	-0.12%
With an independent living difficulty	1.30%	0.81%	-0.49%	0.60%	0.63%	0.03%
No disability	7.00%	3.59%	-3.41%	6.10%	3.91%	-2.19%

Source: American Community Survey (ACS), 1-Year Estimates (2024)

Table 29*Race and Ethnicity Service Rate Comparison of Idaho with IDVR Customers*

Race/Ethnicity	Number Served	Percent of all served by IDVR 2024	Percent in Idaho ACS 1-Year 2024	Difference (negative notes underserved)
White	9079	93.30%	80.90%	12.40%
Black or African American	307	3.20%	0.80%	2.40%
American Indian and Alaska Native	406	4.20%	1.10%	3.10%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	77	0.80%	0.20%	0.60%
Asian	184	1.90%	1.50%	0.40%
Ethnicity				
Hispanic/Latino	1297	13.30%	14.30%	-1.00%

Source: American Community Survey (ACS), 1-Year Estimates (2024)

Table 30*Education and Employment for Ages 16 to 19 Years: Regions*

	R1		R2	
	Total Population	% Enrolled/ Not Enrolled	Total Population	% Enrolled/ Not Enrolled
Total:	11,556	-----	7,719	-----
Enrolled in school:	8,910	77.10%	6,650	86.15%
Employed	3,495	30.24%	2,534	32.83%
Unemployed	352	3.05%	502	6.50%
Not in labor force	5,063	43.81%	3,614	46.82%
Not enrolled in school:	2,646	22.90%	1,069	13.85%
High school graduate (includes equivalency):	1,743	15.08%	801	10.38%
Employed	1,328	11.49%	654	8.47%
Unemployed	165	1.43%	6	0.08%
Not in labor force	250	2.16%	141	1.83%
Not high school graduate:	903	7.81%	268	3.47%
Employed	399	3.45%	106	1.37%
Unemployed	116	1.00%	22	0.29%
Not in labor force	388	3.36%	140	1.81%
Total Labor Force Participation	5,855	50.67%	3,824	49.54%
Total Not in labor force	5,701	49.33%	3,895	50.46%

	R3		R4	
	Total Population	% Enrolled/ Not Enrolled	Total Population	% Enrolled/ Not Enrolled
Total:	48,486	-----	12,934	-----
Enrolled in school:	38,716	79.85%	9,753	75.41%
Employed	14,491	29.89%	3,954	30.57%
Unemployed	1621	3.34%	588	4.55%
Not in labor force	22,604	46.62%	5,211	40.29%
Not enrolled in school:	9,770	20.15%	3,181	24.59%
High school graduate (includes equivalency):	7,101	14.65%	1,786	13.81%
Employed	4,571	9.43%	1,397	10.80%
Unemployed	615	1.27%	167	1.29%
Not in labor force	1915	3.95%	222	1.72%
Not high school graduate:	2669	5.50%	1395	10.79%
Employed	1137	2.35%	615	4.75%
Unemployed	298	0.61%	232	1.79%
Not in labor force	1234	2.55%	548	4.24%
Total Labor Force Participation	22,733	46.89%	6,953	53.76%
Total Not in labor force	25,753	53.11%	5,981	46.24%
	R5		R6	
	Total Population	% Enrolled/ Not Enrolled	Total Population	% Enrolled/ Not Enrolled
Total:	11,441	-----	25,521	-----
Enrolled in school:	8,981	78.50%	19,641	76.96%
Employed	3,624	31.68%	8,865	34.74%
Unemployed	575	5.03%	1607	6.30%
Not in labor force	4,782	41.80%	9,169	35.93%
Not enrolled in school:	2,460	21.50%	5,880	23.04%
High school graduate (includes equivalency):	1,766	15.44%	4,806	18.83%
Employed	1,216	10.63%	4,139	16.22%
Unemployed	152	1.33%	223	0.87%
Not in labor force	398	3.48%	444	1.74%
Not high school graduate:	694	6.07%	1074	4.21%
Employed	230	2.01%	675	2.64%
Unemployed	267	2.33%	197	0.77%
Not in labor force	197	1.72%	202	0.79%

Total Labor Force Participation	6,064	53.00%	15,706	61.54%
Total Not in labor force	5,377	47.00%	9,815	38.46%

Source: American Community Survey (ACS), 5-Year Estimates (2020–2024)

Source: Idaho Department of Labor. (2025). *Rural profile, Part I: Economic and labor force conditions* [Webinar presentation]. <https://lmi.idaho.gov/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/Rural-Profile-Pt-I-Webinar-Presentation.pdf>

Source: Idaho Workforce Development Council. (2024). *Idaho LAUNCH grant program*. State of Idaho.

Surveys

Individual Surveys

Table 31

Individual Survey: Age of Respondents

Age Range of Respondents	Number	Percent
25-64	184	92.5%
65 and over	14	7.0%
Under 25	1	0.5%
Total	199	100%

Table 32

Individual Survey: Region of Residence

Region of Residence	Number	Percent
Treasure Valley East: Counties include Valley, Boise, Ada, and Elmore	79	23.8%
Treasure Valley West: Counties include Adams, Washington, Payette, Gem, Canyon, and Owyhee	44	13.3%
Region 4: Counties include Camas, Blaine, Gooding, Lincoln, Jerome, Minidoka, Twin Falls, and Cassia	34	10.2%
Region 6: Counties include Lemhi, Custer, Butte, Clark, Jefferson, Fremont, Madison, Teton, and Bonneville	33	9.9%
Region 2: Counties include Latah, Clearwater, Nez Perce, Lewis, and Idaho	32	9.6%
Region 5: Counties include Bingham, Caribou, Power, Bannock, Oneida, Franklin, and Bear Lake	28	8.4%
Region 1: Counties include Boundary, Bonner, Kootenai, Benewah, and Shoshone	25	7.5%
Other	57	17.17
Total	332	100%

Table 33

Individual Survey: Primary Disability of Respondents – 2023 and 2026 CSNA Survey

2023 CSNA			2026 CSNA		
Disability	Number	Percent	Primary Disability	Number	Percent
Mental Health (such as depression, anxiety, bipolar)	154	28.4%	Mental Health (such as depression, anxiety, bipolar)	109	43.6%
Physical	85	15.7%	Deaf or Hard of Hearing	58	23.2%
Other (please describe)	62	11.4%	Physical	46	18.4%
Hard of Hearing	49	9.0%	Learning Disability	44	17.6%
Autism Spectrum Disorder	44	8.1%	Developmental Disability (DD)	38	15.2%

Learning disability	32	5.9%	Other (please specify)	27	10.8%
Mobility	26	4.8%	Intellectual Disability (ID)	22	8.8%
Developmental Disability (DD)	22	4.1%	Communication	18	7.2%
Intellectual Disability (ID)	17	3.1%	Traumatic Brain Injury	14	5.6%
Traumatic Brain Injury	16	3.0%	Blindness or visually impaired	5	2.0%
Deaf	11	2.0%			
Visual impairment	9	1.7%			
None	8	1.5%			
Blind	3	0.6%			
Communication	3	0.6%			
Deaf-Blind	1	0.2%			
Total	542	100%	Total	250	100%

Table 34

Individual Survey: Secondary Disability of Respondents – 2023 and 2026 CSNA Survey

2023 CSNA			2026 CSNA		
Disability	Number	Percent	Secondary Disability	Number	Percent
None	107	22.2%	Mental Health (such as depression, anxiety, bipolar)	67	36.8%
Mental Health (such as depression, anxiety, bipolar)	105	21.7%	Other (please describe)	34	18.7%
Physical	65	13.5%	Learning Disability	30	16.5%
Other (please describe)	43	8.9%	Physical	23	12.6%
Learning disability	36	7.5%	Deaf or Hard of Hearing	18	9.9%
Mobility	23	4.8%	Mobility	16	8.8%
Intellectual disability (ID)	19	3.9%	Communication	14	7.7%
Developmental Disability (DD)	19	3.9%	Intellectual Disability (ID)	9	5.0%
Hard of hearing	17	3.5%	Traumatic Brain Injury	9	5.0%
Traumatic Brain Injury	15	3.1%	Developmental Disability (DD)	8	4.4%
Autism Spectrum Disorder	13	2.7%	Blindness or Visually Impaired	7	3.9%
Visual impairment	11	2.3%			
Communication	7	1.5%			
Deaf	2	0.4%			
Blind	1	0.2%			

Deaf-Blind	0	0.0%			
Total	483	100%	Total	182	100%

Table 35

Individual Survey: Customer Status 2026

Relationship with IDVR	Number	Percent
I am a previous participant of VR - my case had been closed	188	58.4%
I am a current participant of VR	131	40.7%
I have never used VR services	3	0.9%
I am not familiar with VR	0	0%
Total	322	100%

Table 36

Individual Survey: Length of Association with IDVR

Length of Association with IDVR	Number	Percent
2- 5 years	116	46.6%
1 year	55	22.1%
Less than 1 year	42	16.9%
6 – 9 years	22	8.8%
10 years or more	14	5.6%
Total	249	100%

Table 37

Individual Survey: Meeting Location

Meeting Location	Number	Percent
At the VR office	196	74.5%
I don't have a VR counselor	24	9.1%
We meet by phone	20	7.6%
We meet remotely by video conference	15	5.7%
In my community/school	8	3.0%
Total	263	100%

Table 38

Individual Survey: Number of IDVR Counselors

Number of IDVR Counselors	Number	Percent
1	167	62.3%
2	41	15.3%
3	31	11.6%
4	14	5.2%
More than 4	10	3.7%
I have never had a VR counselor	5	1.9%
Total	268	100%

Table 39*Individual Survey: Ability to Reach Counselor*

Are you able to reach your counselor when you need to?	Number	Percent
Usually	208	80.3%
Sometimes	32	12.4%
Rarely	19	7.3%
Total	259	100%

Table 40*Individual Survey: Getting Along with Counselor*

How do you get along with your VR counselor?	Number	Percent
Great	189	71.9%
Fine	58	22.1%
Bad	16	6.1%
Total	263	100%

Table 41*Individual Survey: Effectiveness of Remote Services*

If you have worked with your counselors by phone or video conference, how well does it work for you?	Number	Percent
Effective	149	56.4%
Less Effective	26	9.9%
Not effective at all	11	4.2%
I have not worked with my counselor by phone, email, or video conference	78	29.6
Total	264	100%

Table 42*Individual Survey: Social Security Benefit Status*

Social Security Benefits Status	Number of times chosen	Percent of number of respondents
I do not receive Social Security disability benefits	137	53.3%
I receive an SSI and/or SSDI check every month	97	37.7%
I have applied for Social Security Benefits, but I was denied benefits.	20	7.8%
I have received benefits in the past, but no longer receive them	11	4.3%
I don't know if I receive Social Security disability benefits	0	0%
Total	257	

Table 43*Individual Survey: Primary Mode of Transportation*

How do you usually get around?	Number	Percent
I drive	210	71.2%
I get rides from family or friends	44	14.9%
I use the bus or another form of public transportation	11	3.7%
I get rides from staff	9	3.1%
I ride my bike and/or walk	8	2.7%
I use ride-sharing services (i.e., Uber or Lyft or Taxi)	6	2.0%
Other (please specify)	7	2.4%
Total	295	100%

Table 44*Individual Survey: Identifying Barriers to Getting a Job*

Please identify which of the following have been barriers to you getting a job. (Select all that apply)	Number	Percent
Employer concerns about my ability to do the job due to my disability	77	35.8%
Lack of training	68	31.6%
Lack of job skills	62	28.8%
Lack of education	60	27.9%
Lack of available jobs	59	27.4%
Lack of social skills	57	26.5%
Lack of job search or interview skills	53	24.7%
Age	41	19.1%
Lack of reliable transportation	40	18.6%
Legal history	32	14.9%
Concern over loss of Social Security benefits due to working	30	14.0%
Lack of stable housing	25	11.6%
Lack of Support (paid or unpaid) from family or staff	23	10.7%
Lack of assistive technology	19	8.8%
Lack of access to mental health services	19	8.8%
Substance abuse	18	8.4%
Lack of reliable internet access	12	5.6%
Lack of access to needed medication	11	5.1%
Lack of child and/or family member care	10	4.7%
Lack of access to medical services	6	2.8%
Limited English skills	1	0.5%
Total	215	100%

Table 45*Individual Survey: Barriers to Accessing IDVR Services*

Please indicate which of the following have been a barrier to you accessing VR services. (Select all that apply)	Number	Percent
Lack of information about available services	38	32.8%
I don't have transportation to the VR office	23	19.8%
VR not returning my messages	23	19.8%
Lack of disability-related accommodations	22	19.0%
Difficulty attending scheduled appointments with VR	22	19.0%
Unreliable internet access	15	12.9%
VR's hours of operation	13	11.2%
I can't attend virtual appointments	3	2.6%
Difficulties completed VR intake form	2	1.7%
Language barriers	1	0.9%
Total	116	100%

Table 46*Individual Survey: IDVR Helped Progress to Employment Goal*

Has VR helped you to make progress towards your employment goal?	Number	Percent
Yes	197	74.9%
No	60	22.8%
I have not worked with VR	6	2.3%
Total	263	100%

Table 47*Individual Survey: Race or Ethnic Group*

Primary Race	Number	Percent
Caucasian/White	252	84.6%
African American/Black	12	4.0%
American Indian or Alaska Native	8	2.7%
Asian	7	2.4%
I don't know	6	2.0%
Other (please specify)	6	2.0%
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1	0.3%
Ethnicity		
Hispanic/Latino	18	6.0%
Total	298	

Table 48*Individual Survey: Preferred Language for Communication*

Language Preference	Number	Percent
English	291	97.7%
American Sign Language	4	1.3%
French	1	0.3%
Japanese	1	0.3%
Spanish	1	0.3%
Total	298	100%

Table 49*Individual Survey: VR Honors and Respects Cultural Identity*

Do you feel that IDVR honors and respects your cultural identity?	Number	Percent
Yes	251	84.5%
No	4	1.4%
I don't know	42	14.1%
Total	297	100%

Table 50*Individual Survey: American Job Center's (AJCs)– Use and Accessibility*

Accessibility Questions	Yes	Percent of Total	No	Percent of Total	Total Number of Responses
Have you ever tried to use the services of the Idaho Department of Labor offices beyond creating an online account? (this may include testing, preparing for or finding employment, job coaching, training assistive technology, or other services)	107	42.3%	146	57.7%	253
Did you experience any difficulties with the physical accessibility of the American Job Centers/Idaho Department of Labor offices building?	4	5.1%	74	94.9%	78
Did you have any difficulty accessing the programs at the American Job Centers/Idaho Department of Labor offices (i.e., no available assistive technology, no interpreters, etc.)?	9	10.6%	76	89.4%	85

Table 51*Individual Survey: AJCs of Idaho - Training and Employment*

Training and Employment Questions	Yes	Percent of Total	No	Percent of Total	Total Number of Responses
Did you go to the American Job Centers/Idaho Department of Labor offices to get training?	24	21.6%	87	78.4%	111
Did you get the training that you were seeking from the American Job Centers/Idaho Department of Labor offices?	12	57.1%	9	42.9%	21
Did the training purchased or provided by the American Job Centers/Idaho Department of Labor offices result in employment?	6	22.2%	21	77.8%	27
Did you go to the American Job Centers/Idaho Department of Labor offices to find a job?	41	48.8%	43	51.2%	84
Did the American Job Centers/Idaho Department of Labor offices staff help you find employment?	21	21.0%	75	75.0%	100

Table 52*Individual Survey: Helpfulness of AJCs' Staff*

Was the Idaho Department of Labor offices staff helpful?	Number	Percent
Very helpful	27	45.8%
Somewhat helpful	25	42.4%
Not helpful	7	11.9%
Total	59	100%

Table 53*Individual Survey: Effectiveness of AJCs Services*

Were the services at the Idaho Department of Labor offices effective?	Number	Percent
Very Effective	19	30.2%
Somewhat Effective	29	46.0%
Not effective	15	23.8%
Total	63	100%

Table 54*Individual Survey: Effectiveness of AJC Services to Individuals with Disabilities*

Overall, how would you rate the effectiveness of the Idaho Department of Labor offices in serving individuals with disabilities?	Number	Percent
Very effective	21	32.3%
Somewhat effective	30	46.2%
Not effective	14	21.5%
Total	143	100%

Table 55*Individual Survey: Quality of Service - Service Provider*

How would you rate the quality of the services paid for by VR and delivered by your service provider?	Number	Percent
Great	112	67.9%
Fine	47	28.5%
Bad	6	3.6%
Total	96	100%

Table 56*Individual Survey: Responsiveness of Service - Service Provider*

Responsiveness of Service Provider	Number	Percent
Great	129	70.9
Fine	44	24.2
Bad	9	4.9
Total	182	100%

Community Partner Surveys

Table 57

Organization Type of Partner Survey Respondents

Organization Type	Number	Percent
Secondary School (K - 12)	26	35.6%
One Stop Partner	21	28.8%
Community Rehabilitation Program	11	15.1%
Other federal, state, or local government entity	8	11.0%
Developmental disability organization	2	2.7%
Other (please describe)	2	2.7%
Client advocacy organization	1	1.4%
Other public or private organization	1	1.4%
Individual service provider (non-CRP)	1	1.4%
Postsecondary institution	0	0.0%
Mental health provider	0	0.0%
Medical provider	0	0.0%
Veteran's agency	0	0.0%
Total	51	100%

Table 58

Partner Survey: Part of Idaho Served by Community Partner Organizations

Part of State Served	Number of times chosen	Percent of number of respondents
Eastern Idaho (Idaho Falls, Pocatello, Blackfoot)	47	55.3%
Southwestern Idaho (Treasure Valley, Boise metro, McCall, Cascade)	29	34.1%
Northern Idaho (Coeur d'Alene, Lewiston)	17	20.0%
South Central Idaho (Twin Falls, Hailey, Burley)	15	17.7%
Total	93	100%

Table 59

Partner Survey: Customer Populations Served Regularly

Customer Populations	Number of times chosen	Percent of number of respondents
Transition-aged youth (14 - 24)	51	59.3%
Individuals with the most significant disabilities	39	45.4%
Individuals from unserved or underserved populations	36	41.9%
Individuals who are racial or ethnic minorities	35	40.7%
Individuals who use supported employment	32	37.2%

Individuals served by the American Job Centers through the Idaho Department of Labor/Equus	27	31.4%
Individuals who are deaf	24	27.9%
Individuals who are blind or visually impaired	23	26.7%
Veterans	15	17.4%
Other (please describe)	8	9.3%
Total	256	

Table 60

Partner Survey: Most Common Barriers to Achieving Employment Goals

Most Common Barriers to Employment Goals	Number	Percent
Lack of reliable transportation	31	79.5%
Perceptions regarding the impact of income on Social Security benefits (fear of losing benefits)	27	69.2%
Poor social skills	26	66.7%
Little or no work experience	25	64.1%
Not having job skills	22	56.4%
Not having education or training	21	53.8%
Not having job search skills	21	53.8%
Limited work experience	46	76.7%
Social/interpersonal skills challenges	44	73.3%
Lack of reliable transportation	41	68.3%
Lack of job skills	40	66.7%
Employer perceptions about disability	40	66.7%
Limited job availability	34	56.7%
Lack of job search skills	33	55.0%
Lack of education or training	32	53.3%
Disability-related transportation issues	29	48.3%
Mental health issues	28	46.7%
Fear of losing benefits (e.g., Social Security)	24	40.0%
Criminal history	18	30.0%
Lack of accommodations or assistive technology	17	28.3%
Need for disability-related personal care	17	28.3%
Childcare needs	12	20.0%
Housing issues	12	20.0%
Other health issues	11	18.3%
Substance use issues	10	16.7%
Language barriers	9	15.0%
Other (please describe)	3	5.0%
Total	60	100%

Table 61*Partner Survey: Top Three Reasons Difficult Access IDVR Services*

Top Three Reasons Difficult to Access IDVR Services	Number	Percent
Participant-related barriers (e.g., transportation, follow-through, health issues)	45	64.3%
Not enough service providers available in area	33	47.1%
Low staffing levels	23	32.9%
Low reimbursement rates	21	30.0%
Staff turnover	18	25.7%
Other (please describe)	15	21.4%
Total	93	

Table 62*Partner Survey: Barriers to Achieving Employment Goals – Youth with Disabilities*

Barriers to Employment Goals - Students	Number	Percent
Lack of job skills	44	75.9%
Limited work experience	43	74.1%
Social/interpersonal skills challenges	39	67.2%
Lack of job search skills	37	63.8%
Lack of reliable transportation	33	56.9%
Employer perceptions about disability	32	55.2%
Lack of education or training	31	53.5%
Disability-related transportation issues	25	43.1%
Limited job availability	24	41.4%
Mental health issues	19	32.8%
Lack of accommodations or assistive technology	17	29.3%
Fear of losing benefits (e.g., Social Security)	14	24.1%
Need for disability-related personal care	12	20.7%
Criminal history	10	17.2%
Housing issues	9	15.5%
Substance use issues	8	13.8%
Other (please describe)	8	13.8%
Language barriers	6	10.3%
Other health issues	6	10.3%
Childcare needs	5	8.6%
Total	58	

Table 63*Partner Survey: Frequency of Interaction with AJCs*

Frequency of Interaction with AJCs	Number	Percent
Often	25	36.8%
Never	20	29.4%
Rarely	13	19.1%
Sometimes	10	14.7%
Total	68	100%

Table 64*Partner Survey: Physical Accessibility of the AJCs*

Physical Accessibility of the AJCs	Number	Percent
Fully accessible	17	50.0%
Somewhat accessible	11	32.4%
Not Accessible	1	2.9%
I do not know	5	14.7%
Total	34	100%

Table 65*Partner Survey: Programmatic Accessibility of the AJCs*

Programmatic Accessibility of the AJCs	Number	Percent
Fully accessible	25	56.8%
Somewhat accessible	12	27.3%
Not accessible	1	2.3%
I do not know	6	13.6%
Total	44	100%

Table 66*Partner Survey: Effectiveness of the AJCs*

Effectiveness of AJCs	Number	Percent
Very effectively	8	18.6%
Effectively	24	55.8%
Not Effectively	11	25.6%
Total	29	100%

Table 67*Partner Survey: Improving Service of the AJs to Effectively Serve PWD*

Improving Service of the ACJs to Effectively Serve PWD	Number	Percent
Partner more effectively with VR	25	59.5%
Train their staff on how to work with individuals with disabilities	23	54.8%
Improve physical accessibility	11	26.2%
Include individuals with disabilities when purchasing training for their customers	11	26.2%
Improve programmatic accessibility (such as computers, written materials, and interpreters)	9	21.4%
Other (please describe)	8	19.1%
Total	42	

Table 68*Partner Survey: Services Readily Available*

Please select all services that are readily available in your region.	Number	Percent
Job training services (job coaching, on-the-job training)	53	77.9%
Job development services	48	70.6%
Postsecondary education	48	70.6%
Medical treatment	33	48.5%
Assistive technology	31	45.6%
Health insurance	29	42.7%
Mental health treatment	28	41.2%
Transportation assistance	27	39.7%
Housing assistance	27	39.7%
Substance use treatment	22	32.4%
Personal care attendants	22	32.4%
Benefits planning	21	30.9%
Vehicle modification	8	11.8%
Other (please describe)	6	8.8%
Total	68	

Table 69*Partner Survey: Services Not Readily Available*

Please select all services that are NOT readily available or do not exist in your region.	Number	Percent
Vehicle modification	30	62.5%
Transportation assistance	22	45.8%
Mental health treatment	17	35.4%
Personal care attendants	17	35.4%
Benefits planning	17	35.4%

Assistive technology	16	33.3%
Substance use treatment	16	33.3%
Housing assistance	15	31.3%
Health insurance	12	25.0%
Job development services	11	22.9%
Medical treatment	11	22.9%
Other (please describe)	11	22.9%
Job training services (job coaching, on-the-job training)	10	20.8%
Postsecondary education	6	12.5%
Total	147	

Table 70

Partner Survey: Services that Service Providers Are Most Effective in Providing

Services that Service Providers are Most Effective in Providing to IDVR Customers	Number	Percent
Job development services	52	76.5%
Job training services (job coaching, on-the-job training)	50	73.5%
Postsecondary education	21	30.9%
Assistive technology	16	23.5%
Transportation assistance	12	17.7%
Mental health treatment	11	16.2%
Other (please describe)	11	16.2%
Medical treatment	8	11.8%
Personal care attendants	6	8.8%
Benefits planning	6	8.8%
Health insurance	5	7.4%
Substance use treatment	4	5.9%
Housing assistance	3	4.4%
Vehicle modification	1	1.5%
Total	68	

Staff Surveys

Table 71

Staff Survey: Staff Job Classification

What is your job function?	Number	Percent
Field Service Team (Pre-ETS, General, Business Services)	23	63.9%
Leadership (Supervisors and Managers)	6	16.7%
Central Office Non – Leadership (including training, fiscal team members)	7	19.4%
Total	36	100%

Table 72

Years in Current Position: Staff Respondents

How long have you worked for IDVR?	Number	Percent
1- 5 years	18	40.9%
6 - 10 years	9	20.5%
11 - 20 years	9	20.5%
21 + years	6	13.6%
Less than one year	2	4.6%
Total	70	100%

Table 73

Staff Survey: Top Three Changes To Better Serve IDVR Customers

Top Three Changes to Better Serve IDVR Customers	Number of times chosen	Percent of number of respondents
More effective community-based service providers	13	59.1%
More resources to assess appropriate vocational goals	11	50.0%
Accountability for poor performance by service providers	11	50.0%
Improved business partnerships	9	40.9%
More community-based service providers for specific services	8	36.4%
Increased engagement with participants	7	31.8%
Increased collaboration with other workforce partners including American Job Centers	6	27.3%
Other (please describe)	4	18.2%
More leadership support	3	13.6%
Total	22	

Table 74*Staff Survey: Most Common Barriers to Employment Goals*

What are the most common barriers for participants to achieve a successful employment outcome? (Select all that apply)	Number	Percent
Lack of reliable transportation	44	84.6%
Not having job skills	39	75.0%
Little or no work experience	38	73.1%
Poor social skills	37	71.2%
Not having education or training	35	67.3%
Not having job search skills	35	67.3%
Convictions for criminal offenses	30	57.7%
Mental health issues	29	55.8%
Disability-related transportation issues	24	46.2%
Little or no work experience	20	90.9%
Poor social skills	20	86.4%
Not having job skills	19	81.8%
Lack of reliable transportation	18	77.3%
Not having job search skills	17	72.7%
Mental health issues	16	63.6%
Not having education or training	14	54.6%
Employers' perceptions about employing persons with disabilities	12	54.6%
Legal history	12	50.0%
Not enough jobs available in the local labor market	11	50.0%
Disability-related transportation issues	11	45.5%
Substance abuse issues	10	40.9%
Other health issues	9	36.4%
Housing issues	8	36.4%
Not having disability-related accommodations	8	27.3%
Perceptions regarding the impact of income on Social Security benefits (fear of losing benefits)	6	22.7%
Childcare issues	5	18.2%
Language barriers	4	9.1%
Lack of help with disability-related personal care	2	9.1%
Other (please describe)	2	4.6%
Total	22	

Table 75*Staff Survey: Barriers to Achieving Employment Goals – Most Significant Disabilities*

Because we are currently in order of selection (OOS), the needs of participants with Most Significant Disabilities (MSD) are a priority at this time. What are the most common barriers for participants with MSD to achieve a successful employment outcome?	Number	Percent

Little or no work experience	19	86.4%
Poor social skills	17	77.3%
Not having job skills	16	72.7%
Lack of reliable transportation	16	72.7%
Not having job search skills	14	63.6%
Not having education or training	11	50.0%
Employers' perceptions about employing persons with disabilities	11	50.0%
Disability-related transportation issues	11	50.0%
Mental health issues	11	50.0%
Perceptions regarding the impact of income on Social Security benefits (fear of losing benefits)	8	36.4%
Not having disability-related accommodations	7	31.8%
Not enough jobs available in the local labor market	6	27.3%
Substance abuse issues	5	22.7%
Other health issues	5	22.7%
Lack of help with disability-related personal care	4	18.2%
Legal history	3	13.6%
Language barriers	3	13.6%
Housing issues	2	9.1%
Other (please describe)	2	9.1%
Childcare issues	1	4.6%
Total	22	

Table 76
Staff Survey: Reasons Difficult Access IDVR

Top Three Reasons Difficult to Access IDVR Services	Number	Percent
Limited accessibility of VR via public transportation	11	61.1%
Lack of Private Transportation	11	61.1%
Other challenges related to the physical location of the VR office	1	5.6%
Inadequate disability-related accommodations	2	11.1%
Language barriers	2	11.1%
Difficulties completing the application	3	16.7%
Difficulties completing the Individualized Plan for Employment (IPE)	3	16.7%
Lack of providers providing assessment services	7	38.9%
Slow vendor service delivery	7	38.9%
Difficulties accessing training or education programs	5	27.8%
VR staff are not located in the communities where the participants	3	16.7%
Total	18	

Table 77*Staff Survey: Remote IDVR Services Received*

Do you engage with participants remotely?	Number	Percent
Yes	29	67.4%
No	14	32.6%
Total	43	100%

Table 78*Staff Survey: Effectiveness of Remote Services*

Effectiveness of Remote Services	Number	Percent
Effective	9	30.0%
Somewhat effective	17	56.7%
Not effective at all	4	13.3%
Total	30	100%

Table 79*Staff Survey: Barriers to Achieving Employment Goals – Youth in Transition*

Barriers to Employment Goals - Youth in Transition	Number of times chosen	Percent of number of respondents
Little or no work experience	18	90.0%
Not having job search skills	16	80.0%
Poor social skills	16	80.0%
Not having job skills	14	70.0%
Lack of reliable transportation	11	55.0%
Not having education or training	10	50.0%
Employers' perceptions about employing persons with disabilities	7	35.0%
Disability-related transportation issues	6	30.0%
Not having disability-related accommodations	5	25.0%
Not enough jobs available in the local labor market	4	20.0%
Mental health issues	4	20.0%
Other health issues	2	10.0%
Housing issues	2	10.0%
Other (please describe)	2	10.0%
Lack of help with disability-related personal care	1	5.0%
Substance abuse issues	1	5.0%
Childcare issues	1	5.0%
Legal history	0	0.0%
Language barriers	0	0.0%
Perceptions regarding the impact of income on Social Security benefits (fear of losing benefits)	0	0.0%
Total	20	

Table 80*Staff Survey: Frequency of Interaction with American Job Centers (AJCs)*

How often do you work with American Job Center partners?	Number	Percent
Often	6	26.1%
Sometimes	9	39.1%
Rarely	3	13.0%
Never	5	21.7%
Total	23	100%

Table 81*Staff Survey: Frequency of referral to AJCs*

How often do you refer participants to American Job Centers?	Number	Percent
Often	6	33.3%
Sometimes	10	55.6%
Rarely	2	11.1%
Never	0	0.0%
Total	18	100%

Table 82*Staff Survey: Physical Accessibility of the AJCs*

How physically accessible are the American Job Centers for individuals with disabilities?	Number	Percent
Fully accessible	9	50.0%
Somewhat accessible	6	33.3%
Not accessible	0	0.0%
I do not know	3	16.7%
Total	18	100%

Table 83*Staff Survey: Programmatic Accessibility of the AJCs*

How accessible are the tools and supports at American Job Centers (such as computers, written materials, and interpreters)?	Number	Percent
Fully accessible	6	33.3%
Somewhat accessible	8	44.4%
Not accessible	0	0.0%
I do not know	4	22.2%
Total	18	100%

Table 84*Staff Survey: Effectiveness of the AJCs*

Effectiveness of AJCs	Number	Percent
Very effective	1	6.3%
Effective	10	62.5%
Not effective	5	31.3%
Total	16	100%

Table 85*Staff Survey: Improving Service of the American Job Centers to Effectively Serve PWD*

Improving Service of the ACJs to Effectively Serve PWD	Number	Percent
Train their staff on how to work with individuals with disabilities	11	78.6%
Include individuals with disabilities when providing funding for training for their clients	3	21.4%
Improve physical accessibility	2	14.3%
Improve programmatic accessibility (such as computers, written materials, and interpreters)	1	7.1%
Other (please describe)	0	0.0%
Total	14	

Table 86*Staff Survey: Services Readily Available to IDVR Customers*

Services Readily Available	Number	Percent
Job development services	20	87.0%
Job training services (Job Coaching, OJT, etc.)	20	87.0%
Postsecondary education	19	82.6%
Benefit planning assistance	19	82.6%
Assistive technology	18	78.3%
Medical treatment	16	69.6%
Mental health treatment	15	65.2%
Vehicle modification assistance	11	47.8%
Other education services	10	43.5%
Substance abuse treatment	10	43.5%
Transportation assistance	8	34.8%
Health insurance	8	34.8%
Income assistance (TANF/TAFI)	7	30.4%
Personal care attendants	7	30.4%
Other (please describe)	2	8.7%
Total	23	

Table 87*Staff Survey: Services Not Readily Available*

Services Not Readily Available	Number	Percent
Personal care attendants	39.1%	9
Transportation assistance	34.8%	8
Vehicle modification assistance	34.8%	8
Health insurance	34.8%	8
Income assistance (TANF/TAFI)	30.4%	7
Substance abuse treatment	26.1%	6
Mental health treatment	21.7%	5
Other (please describe)	21.7%	5
Other education services	8.7%	2
Medical treatment	8.7%	2
Job training services (Job Coaching, OJT, etc.)	4.4%	1
Assistive technology	4.4%	1
Benefit planning assistance	4.4%	1
Job development services	0.0%	0
Postsecondary education	0.0%	0
Total	103	

Table 88*Staff Survey: Frequency of Service Providers Meeting Needs*

Frequency of Service Providers Meeting Needs	Number	Percent
Often	11	44.0%
Sometimes	14	56.0%
Rarely	0	0.0%
Total	25	100%

Table 89*Staff Survey: Service Needs that Rehab Providers are Unable to Meet*

Unmet Service Needs	Number	Percent
Transportation assistance	10	50.0%
Personal care attendants	7	35.0%
Vehicle modification assistance	5	25.0%
Other (please describe)	5	25.0%
Job development services	4	20.0%
Income assistance (TANF/TAFI)	4	20.0%
Job training services (Job Coaching, OJT, etc.)	3	15.0%
Other education services	3	15.0%
Assistive technology	3	15.0%
Mental health treatment	3	15.0%
Health insurance	3	15.0%
Medical treatment	2	10.0%
Substance abuse treatment	2	10.0%

Benefit planning assistance	2	10.0%
Postsecondary education	1	5.0%
Total	20	

Table 90

Staff Survey: Primary Reasons Providers are Unable to Meet Customer Needs

Primary Reasons Service Providers are Unable to Meet Customer Needs	Number	Percent
Low wages paid by service providers to their employees	11	47.8%
Not enough service providers in the area	10	43.5%
Participant-related barriers affect provider success	10	43.5%
Low service quality	9	39.1%
Lack of accountability for poor performance	9	39.1%
Other (please describe)	5	21.7%
Low reimbursement rates paid by VR to service providers	4	17.4%
Total	147	

Youth Surveys

Table 91

Youth Survey: Respondent Classification

Who is taking this survey?	Number	Percent
I am answering for a student or youth (age 14-24)	238	72.6%
I am a student or youth (age 14-24)	90	27.4%
Total	328	100%

Table 92

Youth Survey: Age of Represented Youth

Age of Youth Representing in Survey	Number	Percent
14-21	157	93.5%
22-24	10	6.0%
25 years or older	3	0.9%
Total	168	100%

Table 93

Youth Survey: Region of Residence

Part of State Reside In	Number	Percent
Southwestern Idaho (Treasure Valley, McCall, Cascade, or nearby)	106	36.4%
Eastern Idaho (Idaho Falls, Pocatello, Blackfoot, Salmon, or nearby)	82	28.2%
Northern Idaho (Coeur d'Alene, Lewiston, Moscow, Sandpoint, or nearby)	78	26.8%
South Central Idaho (Twin Falls, Hailey, Burley, or nearby)	25	8.6%
Total	291	100%

Table 94

Youth Survey: Primary Disability

What is your main disability?	Number	Percent
Learning disability	73	24.8%
Developmental disability	67	22.7%
Intellectual disability	51	17.3%
Other (please describe)	46	15.6%
Deaf or hard of hearing	15	5.1%
Mental health disability	12	4.1%
I am not sure	12	4.1%
Physical/mobility disability	11	3.7%
Blind or visually impaired	4	1.4%
Communication disability	3	1.0%
Alcohol or drug disability	1	0.3%
Total	295	100%

Table 95*Youth Survey: Association with IDVR*

How much do you know about VR?	Number	Percent
I worked with VR in the past	95	43.0%
I am working with VR now	79	35.8%
I have never heard of VR	47	21.3%
Total	221	100%

Table 96*Youth Survey: Pre-Employment Transition Services*

Have you received help from VR?	Number	Percent
Yes	132	44.8%
No	89	30.2%
I am not sure	74	25.1%
Total	295	100%

Table 97*Youth Survey: Received Job Exploration Counseling*

Did you get help learning about different jobs you might like?	Number	Percent
Yes	111	60.7%
No	72	39.3%
Total	183	100%

Table 98*Youth Survey: Quality of Job Exploration Counseling Services*

How good was the help you got learning about jobs?	2023 Number	2023 Percent
Great	42	41.2%
Fine	56	54.9%
Bad	4	3.9%
Total	102	100%

Table 99*Youth Survey: Participate in Work-Based Learning Experiences*

Work-Based Learning	Number	Percent
Yes	109	62.3%
No	66	37.7%
Total	175	100%

Table 100*Youth Survey: Quality of Work-Based Learning Experiences*

Quality of Work-Based Learning Experiences	2023 Number	2023 Percent
Great	49	50.0%
Fine	45	45.9%
Bad	4	4.1%
Total	187	100%

Table 101*Youth Survey: Received Postsecondary Education Counseling*

Postsecondary Ed Counseling	Number	Percent
Yes	71	44.1%
No	90	55.9%
Total	161	100%

Table 102*Youth Survey: Quality of Postsecondary Education Counseling*

How good was the help you got about school or job training after high school?	2023 Number	2023 Percent
Great	34	46.0%
Fine	32	43.2%
Bad	8	10.8%
Total	112	100%

Table 103*Youth Survey: Received Social Skills or Independent Living Training*

Did you get help learning job and life skills? For example: resumes, interviews, talking to a boss, talking about money, or how to get work	Number	Percent
Yes	81	48.8%
No	85	51.2%
Total	166	100%

Table 104*Youth Survey: Quality of Social Skills or Independent Living Training*

Quality of Social Skills or Independent Living Training	2023 Number	2023 Percent
Great	33	46.5%
Fine	36	50.7%
Bad	2	2.8%
Total	68	100%

Table 105*Youth Survey: Received Self Advocacy Instruction*

Self-Advocacy Instruction	Number	Percent
Yes	80	54.4%
No	67	45.6%
Total	147	100%

Table 106*Youth Survey: Quality of Self-Advocacy Instruction*

How good was the help you got learning to speak up for yourself?	Number	Percent
Great	30	37.0%
Fine	50	61.7%
Bad	1	1.2%
Total	93	100%

Table 107*Youth Survey: Services Needed from IDVR*

What help do you still need to get and keep a job (check all that apply)	Number of times chosen	Percent of number of respondents
Help finding a job	145	67.1%
Job training	142	65.7%
Help at work (like a job coach)	99	45.8%
Help writing a resume or applying for jobs	98	45.4%
Rides or transportation	92	42.6%
College	57	26.4%
Special tools or technology	34	15.7%
Mental health help	28	13.0%
Safe and affordable housing	26	12.0%
Other (please describe)	22	10.2%
Alcohol or drug help	3	1.4%
Childcare	0	0.0%
Total Respondents	216	

Employer Surveys

Table 108

Disability in the Workplace: Employer Needs

Disability in the Workplace: Please select all services that would benefit your business.	Number	Percent
Understanding services available from State workforce programs	26	59.1%
Applying for incentives or tax credits for hiring individuals with disabilities	18	40.9%
Identifying the appropriate reasonable accommodations for applicants	18	40.9%
Training regarding different types of disabilities	17	38.6%
Learning about training programs that can upskill employees or jobseekers	17	38.6%
Recruiting qualified applicants	15	34.1%
Supporting your employees with disabilities to maintain their employment	15	34.1%
Understanding disability-related laws such as the Americans with Disabilities Act	14	31.8%
Identifying reasonable accommodations or engaging in the interactive process	14	31.8%
Training on disability etiquette	14	31.8%
Assessing applicant skills	12	27.3%

Table 109

Recruitment: Applicants with Disabilities: Does Your Business Need Help with...

What challenges have you experienced in recruiting and retaining permanent employees?	Number	Percent
No known challenges recruiting or retaining employees	16	33.3%
Lack of qualified applicants for open positions	16	33.3%
Other (please describe)	4	8.3%
Transportation challenges	3	6.3%
Poor attendance	2	4.2%
Slow work pace	2	4.2%
Mental health concerns	2	4.2%
Low work stamina	1	2.1%
Physical health problems	1	2.1%
Difficulty identifying effective accommodations	1	2.1%
Difficulty learning job skills	0	0.0%
Social/interpersonal difficulties	0	0.0%
Language barriers	0	0.0%

Table 110*Knowledge of IDVR Services to Businesses*

Knowledge of IDVR Services to Businesses	Number	Percent
Knowledgeable	11	23.4%
Somewhat knowledgeable	26	55.3%
No knowledge	10	21.3%
Total	47	100%

Table 111*Employer Usage of IDVR Services*

Employer Usage of IDVR Services	Number	Percent
Yes	14	29.2%
No	24	50.0%
Unsure	10	20.8%
Total	48	100%

Table 112*Identify IDVR Services Used by Employers*

Identify IDVR Services Used by Employers	Number	Percent
Recruiting job applicants with disabilities?	7	50.0%
Helping employees with disabilities to maintain their employment?	6	42.9%
Recruiting qualified applicants?	4	28.6%
Recruiting applicants with good work habits?	3	21.4%
Assistance identifying job accommodations for employees with disabilities?	3	21.4%
Help recruiting qualified applicants	2	14.3%
Support for employees with disabilities to maintain employment	2	14.3%
Discussing reasonable accommodations during the application process	1	7.1%
Assistance identifying reasonable accommodations for employees	1	7.1%
Assessing applicants' transferable skills	1	7.1%
Identifying appropriate and reasonable accommodation for applicants	0	0.0%
Other (please describe)	0	0.0%
Training on disability-related legislation such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act and the Rehabilitation Act	7	50.0%
Training on disability language and etiquette	6	42.9%
Information about training programs for employee upskilling	4	28.6%

Training about different disabilities and employment	3	21.4%
Assistance applying for incentives or tax credits	3	21.4%
Total	14	

Table 113

Satisfaction Rating

How satisfied were you with the services you received?	Number	Percent
Satisfied	13	92.9%
Dissatisfied	1	7.1%
Total	14	100%

Table 114

Use VR Again or Recommend to Others

How likely are you to use VR services again or recommend VR to other businesses?	Number	Percent
Likely	13	100%
Unlikely	0	0.0%
Total	13	100%

Table 115

Type of Business

Business Type	Number	Percent
Other (please describe)	13	25.5%
Service	9	17.7%
Manufacturing	6	11.8%
Education	6	11.8%
Retail	5	9.8%
Government	4	7.8%
Construction	3	5.9%
Banking/Finance	3	5.9%
Agriculture/Forestry/Fishing	1	2.0%
Health care	1	2.0%
Total	51	100%

Table 116*Number of Employees*

Number of Employees	Number	Percent
1 - 15	22	46.8%
16 - 50	8	17.0%
51 - 250	9	19.2%
251 - 500	3	6.4%
501 - 999	0	0.0%
1,000 or more	5	10.6%
Total	38	100%

Internal Case Data

All Participants

Table 117

Item	ALL CONSUMERS			
	2021	2022	2023	2024
Applications	2464	3093	4263	3004
Percent of all applications	100%	100%	100%	100%
Percent of apps found eligible	93.51%	94.15%	95.59%	94.61%
Percent of apps that had a determination made within 60 days	96.96%	97.25%	97.10%	89.02%
Significance of Disability				
Disabled	924	1110	1471	637
% of total	40.51%	39.66%	36.52%	21.28%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	595
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0
Significant	725	907	1403	1037
% of total	31.78%	32.40%	34.83%	34.64%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	1005
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0
Most Significant	632	782	1154	1320
% of total	27.71%	27.94%	28.65%	44.09%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	1289
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0
Percent closed prior to IPE development	29.90%	29.76%	29.57%	0.73%
Plans developed	1615	1852	2697	639
Percent of plans developed within 90 days	96.10%	97.03%	95.59%	98.44%
Number of consumers in training by type				
Vocational	643	660	803	715
Undergraduate	514	504	588	610
Graduate	35	46	51	53
Credential attainment rate	56.87%	61.05%	60.04%	56.20%
MSG Rate	58.58%	57.10%	57.87%	69.27%
Number of cases closed rehabilitated	773	690	682	751
Employment rate at exit	41.23%	40.37%	37.72%	34.42%
Employment rate in 2nd quarter after exit	63.16%	65.27%	65.19%	61.71%
Employment rate in 4th quarter after exit	57.25%	62.89%	61.52%	61.00%
Median wages of all exited participants	\$4,456	\$4,945	\$5,360	\$5,808
Total number of cases served	6340	6572	8093	7794

Avg. cost of all cases	\$964.48	\$824.47	\$792.66	\$995.46
Avg. cost of cases closed rehabilitated	\$4,249.85	\$4,121.54	\$5,092.21	\$5,761.46
Avg. cost per case closed unsuccessful	\$1,321.60	\$1,211.72	\$1,078.35	\$1,768.45
Avg. cost per case closed prior to plan	\$98.26	\$113.23	\$110.53	\$74.23

Expenditures

Table 118

Expenditure by Service Category

Service Category	Amount spent per year			
	2021	2022	2023	2024
97 - Job Exploration Counseling	\$25,298	\$51,659	\$66,865	\$50,072
103 - Work Based Learning Experience	\$129,183	\$110,035	\$128,904	\$133,532
109 - Counseling on Enrollment Opportunities	\$11,489	\$25,660	\$31,785	\$47,004
115 - Workplace Readiness Training	\$223,565	\$133,942	\$129,898	\$179,344
121 - Instruction in Self Advocacy	\$19,018	\$47,718	\$54,717	\$39,602
129 - Graduate College or University	\$192,784	\$231,088	\$340,049	\$263,727
136 - Four-Year College or University Training	\$819,723	\$845,138	\$1,232,035	\$1,081,422
143 - Junior or Community College Training	\$151,779	\$144,903	\$239,136	\$124,625
150 - Occupational or Vocational Training	\$702,948	\$643,974	\$874,737	\$933,994
157 - On The Job Training	\$48,098	\$27,721	\$25,500	\$35,709
164 - Registered Apprenticeship Training	\$10,700	\$2,922	\$17,150	\$30,169
170 - Basic Academic Remedial or Literacy Training	\$430	\$2,935	\$5,355	\$7,260
177 - Job Readiness Training	\$18,089	\$10,240	\$4,668	\$1,780
184 - Disability Related Skills Training	\$8,245	\$27,630		(\$200)
191 - Miscellaneous Training	\$75,703	\$86,301	\$123,013	\$133,767
205 - Customized Training			\$28,813	
212 - Assessment	\$502,008	\$607,517	\$625,305	\$293,815
219 - Diagnosis and Treatment of Impairments	\$42,728	\$101,384	\$78,203	\$57,358
233 - Job Search Assistance	\$343,467	\$374,448	\$457,515	\$562,320
247 - Short Term Job Supports	\$244,569	\$200,962	\$168,251	\$163,309
254 - Supported Employment Services	\$765,425	\$783,651	\$818,412	\$838,103
268 - Benefits Counseling	\$198,182	\$318,547	\$306,593	\$136,940
287 - Transportation	\$94,130	\$127,495	\$362,889	\$162,387
294 - Maintenance	\$46,294	\$76,677	\$134,766	\$61,368
301 - Rehabilitation Technology	\$590,803	\$558,013	\$1,077,656	\$1,077,794
308 - Personal Assistance Services			\$800	
315 - Technical Assistance Services related to Self-Employment		\$2,302	\$4,950	
329 - Interpreter Services	\$16,552	\$114,264	\$38,612	\$41,868
336 - Other Services	\$196,084	\$258,939	\$377,690	\$201,555
402 - Work Based Learning Experience	\$4,330	\$14,035	\$16,908	\$2,293
Total	\$5,481,625	\$5,930,098	\$7,771,173	\$6,660,917

Table 119*Employment Outcomes by SOC Code for PY2024*

Employment Outcome Description	Percentage of Total
Transportation and Material Moving	22.37%
Food Preparation and Serving Related	9.05%
Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance	7.19%
Production	6.52%
Office and Administrative Support	6.39%
Sales and Related	5.06%
Educational Instruction and Library	4.93%
Healthcare Support	4.79%
Management	4.53%
Construction and Extraction	4.13%
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	3.99%
Community and Social Service	3.86%
Personal Care and Service	3.86%
Installation, Maintenance, and Repair	3.60%
Business and Financial Operations	2.53%
Protective Service	1.73%
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, and Media	1.60%
Farming, Fishing, and Forestry	1.07%
Architecture and Engineering	0.80%
Computer and Mathematical	0.80%
Life, Physical, and Social Science	0.80%
Legal	0.40%

Other tables

Table 120

Internal Case Data by Gender

	GENDER							
	Male				Female			
	2021	2022	2023	2024	2021	2022	2023	2024
Applications	1426	1833	2415	1710	1024	1218	1772	1203
Percent of all applications	58%	59%	57%	57%	42%	39%	42%	40%
Percent of apps found eligible	93%	93%	95%	94%	95%	96%	97%	96%
Percent of apps with eligibility determination made within 60 days	97%	97%	97%	89%	97%	98%	98%	89%
Significance of Disability:								
Disabled	543	663	856	386	372	432	588	240
% of total	42%	41%	38%	23%	38%	38%	35%	20%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	360	0	0	0	223
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Significant	376	491	762	561	343	399	611	444
% of total	29%	30%	34%	33%	35%	35%	36%	36%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	540	0	0	0	433
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most Significant	370	469	650	734	258	301	481	540
% of total	29%	29%	29%	44%	27%	27%	29%	44%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	720	0	0	0	523
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent closed prior to IPE development	28%	30%	32%	1%	32%	30%	27%	1%
Plans developed	897	1073	1486	354	709	753	1154	276
Percent of plans developed within 90 days	97%	96%	95%	98%	95%	98%	96%	99%
Number of consumers in training by type								
Vocational	342	354	407	366	299	305	393	339
Undergraduate	260	235	272	291	250	265	302	301
Graduate	16	19	16	17	19	27	35	34
Credential attainment rate	57%	62%	61%	57%	56%	59%	58%	56%

MSG Rate	60%	59%	58%	71%	58%	55%	58%	67%
Number of cases closed rehabilitated	478	391	405	449	291	294	273	298
Employment rate at exit	43%	41%	40%	37%	39%	40%	35%	32%
Employment rate in 2nd quarter after exit	65%	64%	63%	61%	60%	66%	68%	63%
Employment rate in 4th quarter after exit	60%	63%	60%	60%	54%	63%	64%	63%
Median wages of all exited participants	\$4,833	\$5,481	\$6,189	\$6,405	\$3,928	\$4,406	\$4,595	\$5,423
Total number of cases served	3602	3763	4597	4362	2690	2738	3372	3258
Avg. cost of all cases	\$970	\$814	\$761	\$981	\$964	\$848	\$850	\$1,056
Avg. cost of cases closed rehabilitated	\$4,089	\$4,043	\$4,792	\$5,647	\$4,536	\$4,223	\$5,485	\$5,982
Avg. cost per case closed unsuccessful	\$1,252	\$1,198	\$963	\$1,607	\$1,424	\$1,246	\$1,267	\$2,024
Avg. cost per case closed prior to plan	\$102	\$120	\$114	\$93	\$96	\$105	\$108	\$47

Table 121

Internal Case Data by Age

	AGE							
	14-24				25-64			
	2021	2022	2023	2024	2021	2022	2023	2024
Applications	749	961	1207	895	1647	2044	2916	2027
Percent of all applications	30%	31%	28%	30%	67%	66%	68%	68%
Percent of apps found eligible	94%	95%	96%	95%	93%	93%	95%	94%
Percent of apps with eligibility determination made within 60 days	97%	97%	97%	89%	97%	97%	98%	89%
Significance of Disability:								
Disabled	240	263	318	118	647	799	1078	470
% of total	34%	30%	27%	14%	42%	44%	39%	23%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	110	0	0	0	446
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Significant	191	278	368	218	521	607	1006	798
% of total	27%	31%	32%	25%	34%	33%	37%	39%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	212	0	0	0	773

Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most Significant	268	349	481	529	358	418	659	763
% of total	38%	39%	41%	61%	24%	23%	24%	38%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	513	0	0	0	748
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent closed prior to IPE development	24%	22%	27%	0%	33%	34%	31%	1%
Plans developed	535	657	841	181	1035	1128	1772	433
Percent of plans developed within 90 days	95%	97%	94%	98%	97%	97%	96%	99%
Number of consumers in training by type								
Vocational	166	182	208	198	469	470	582	506
Undergraduate	314	302	352	368	200	202	235	241
Graduate	10	17	14	13	24	28	37	40
Credential attainment rate	55%	59%	56%	52%	62%	66%	65%	61%
MSG Rate	61%	59%	63%	73%	57%	55%	52%	66%
Number of cases closed rehabilitated	234	192	170	202	493	468	468	496
Employment rate at exit	35%	34%	28%	30%	44%	43%	42%	35%
Employment rate in 2nd quarter after exit	64%	66%	65%	61%	63%	65%	66%	63%
Employment rate in 4th quarter after exit	61%	65%	63%	63%	56%	62%	61%	60%
Median wages of all exited participants	\$3,963	\$4,300	\$4,597	\$4,422	\$5,001	\$5,926	\$6,316	\$7,200
Total number of cases served	2343	2366	2753	2637	3846	4055	5121	4959
Avg. cost of all cases	\$1,220	\$975	\$940	\$1,252	\$811	\$751	\$714	\$849
Avg. cost of cases closed rehabilitated	749	961	1207	895	1647	2044	2916	2027
Avg. cost per case closed unsuccessful	30%	31%	28%	30%	67%	66%	68%	68%
Avg. cost per case closed prior to plan	94%	95%	96%	95%	93%	93%	95%	94%

Table 122*Internal Case Data for Visual and Physical Impairment*

	Visual Impairments				Physical Impairments			
	2021	2022	2023	2024	2021	2022	2023	2024
Applications	10	16	19	10	411	543	705	526
Percent of all applications	0.4%	0.5%	0.5%	0.3%	16.7%	17.6%	16.5%	17.5%
Percent of apps found eligible	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	98.3%
Percent of apps that had a determination made within 60 days	90.0%	100%	100%	80.0%	97.6%	98.3%	98.9%	89.4%
Significance of Disability								
Disabled	4	4	5	2	131	165	214	93
% of total	40.0%	26.7%	27.8%	20.0%	32.2%	31.7%	31.0%	17.7%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	89
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Significant	3	5	7	4	183	240	293	174
% of total	30.0%	33.3%	38.9%	40.0%	45.0%	46.2%	42.4%	33.0%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	170
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most Significant	3	6	6	4	93	115	184	260
% of total	30.0%	40.0%	33.3%	40.0%	22.9%	22.1%	26.6%	49.3%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	255
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent closed prior to IPE development	40.0%	20.0%	50.0%	0.0%	33.2%	35.0%	32.4%	0.6%

Plans developed	7	14	9	1	286	297	445	114
Percent of plans developed within 90 days	100%	92.9%	100%	100%	97.6%	96.0%	94.4%	99.1%
Number of consumers in training by type								
Vocational	1	0	2	3	160	156	179	148
Undergraduate	3	4	5	4	133	134	145	160
Graduate	0	0	0	0	14	16	14	16
Credential attainment rate	0.0%	50.0%	Null	100%	55.3%	56.8%	57.5%	60.9%
MSG Rate	100%	80.0%	85.7%	66.7%	65.1%	58.8%	59.6%	70.9%
Number of cases closed rehabilitated	3	0	3	5	109	85	72	86
Employment rate at exit	42.9%	0.0%	42.9%	62.5%	34.4%	28.5%	24.7%	23.2%
Employment rate in 2nd quarter after exit	75.0%	50.0%	25.0%	42.9%	59.9%	60.9%	55.5%	48.2%
Employment rate in 4th quarter after exit	63.6%	42.9%	100%	28.6%	50.2%	58.5%	55.6%	49.6%
Median wages of all exited participants	\$4,929	\$2,562	\$910	\$5,674	\$4,042	\$6,070	\$5,695	\$4,671
Total number of cases served	28	30	41	36	1104	1169	1387	1358
Avg. cost of all cases	\$736	\$301	\$537	\$1,042	\$1,013	\$800	\$807	\$1,087
Avg. cost of cases closed rehabilitated	\$1,647	\$0	\$3,793	\$6,334	\$5,931	\$5,546	\$7,894	\$7,960
Avg. cost per case closed unsuccessful	\$1,564	\$1,263	\$550	\$1,171	\$1,285	\$1,161	\$1,124	\$2,355
Avg. cost per case closed prior to plan	Null	\$0.00	\$580	Null	\$77	\$121	\$113	\$56

Table 123*Internal Case Data for Communicative and ID/DD or other Cognitive Impairment*

	Communicative Impairments				ID/DD or other Cognitive			
	2021	2022	2023	2024	2021	2022	2023	2024
Applications	248	295	485	235	355	403	528	373
Percent of all applications	10%	10%	11%	8%	14%	13%	12%	12%
Percent of apps found eligible	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%
Percent of apps that had a determination made within 60 days	94%	96%	93%	85%	97%	97%	97%	88%
Significance of Disability								
Disabled	191	204	336	173	64	74	96	33
% of total	78%	73%	73%	62%	18%	19%	18%	9%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	149	0	0	0	32
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Significant	42	56	78	70	79	107	178	81
% of total	17%	20%	17%	25%	23%	28%	34%	22%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	67	0	0	0	76
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most Significant	13	20	45	35	206	206	250	250
% of total	5%	7%	10%	13%	59%	53%	48%	69%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	31	0	0	0	248
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent closed prior to IPE development	15%	11%	7%	1%	22%	23%	26%	1%
Plans developed	220	242	412	80	276	291	362	94
Percent of plans developed within 90 days	99%	98%	99%	98%	95%	97%	96%	98%
Number of consumers in training by type								
Vocational	19	21	24	22	83	74	76	82
Undergraduate	46	46	56	56	76	64	74	83
Graduate	4	10	12	11	4	2	2	1
Credential attainment rate	64%	65%	57%	53%	55%	59%	56%	51%
MSG Rate	66%	66%	71%	77%	53%	57%	55%	69%
Number of cases closed rehabilitated	170	168	194	273	170	128	114	100

Employment rate at exit	74%	75%	76%	80%	42%	43%	36%	30%
Employment rate in 2nd quarter after exit	74%	76%	76%	71%	66%	68%	69%	60%
Employment rate in 4th quarter after exit	69%	73%	77%	72%	57%	65%	65%	62%
Median wages of all exited participants	\$7,772	\$9,563	\$9,655	\$10,357	\$3,387	\$3,209	\$2,739	\$3,356
Total number of cases served	581	591	812	757	1175	1068	1198	1090
Avg. cost of all cases	\$1,173	\$1,204	\$1,172	\$2,369	\$1,321	\$1,208	\$1,177	\$1,209
Avg. cost of cases closed rehabilitated	\$2,689	\$2,757	\$3,518	\$5,198	\$5,088	\$5,621	\$6,768	\$7,004
Avg. cost per case closed unsuccessful	\$2,008	\$2,701	\$2,803	\$4,113	\$2,034	\$2,107	\$1,661	\$2,212
Avg. cost per case closed prior to plan	\$32	\$66	\$147	\$13	\$268	\$220	\$240	\$499

Table 124

Internal Case Data for Mental Health Impairment

	Mental health Impairments			
	2021	2022	2023	2024
Applications	1292	1666	2363	1719
Percent of all applications	52%	54%	55%	57%
Percent of apps found eligible	100%	100%	100%	99%
Percent of apps that had a determination made within 60 days	98%	97%	98%	90%
Significance of Disability				
Disabled	534	662	819	335
% of total	42%	41%	35%	18%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	323
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0
Significant	418	499	847	708
% of total	33%	31%	36%	39%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	688
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0
Most Significant	317	435	669	771
% of total	25%	27%	29%	43%

Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	750
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0
Percent closed prior to IPE development	34%	33%	34%	1%
Plans developed	826	1008	1469	350
Percent of plans developed within 90 days	95%	97%	95%	99%
Number of consumers in training by type				
Vocational	380	409	523	460
Undergraduate	258	257	309	309
Graduate	13	18	23	27
Credential attainment rate	55%	60%	60%	54%
MSG Rate	57%	55%	56%	67%
Number of cases closed rehabilitated	321	309	299	287
Employment rate at exit	35%	35%	32%	25%
Employment rate in 2nd quarter after exit	60%	62%	64%	64%
Employment rate in 4th quarter after exit	57%	61%	58%	61%
Median wages of all exited participants	\$4,174	\$4,295	\$5,128	\$6,020
Total number of cases served	3232	3466	4398	4359
Avg. cost of all cases	\$844	\$707	\$659	\$719
Avg. cost of cases closed rehabilitated	\$4,086	\$3,850	\$4,813	\$5,195
Avg. cost per case closed unsuccessful	\$1,254	\$1,111	\$975	\$1,551
Avg. cost per case closed prior to plan	\$86	\$95	\$95	\$83

Table 125*Internal Case Data for Transition Age and Supported Employment*

	Transition Age				Supported Employment			
	2021	2022	2023	2024	2021	2022	2023	2024
Applications	749	961	1207	895	260	246	284	0*
Percent of all applications	30.4%	31.1%	28.1%	29.8%	11.0%	8.0%	6.7%	0
Percent of apps found eligible	94.0%	95.4%	96.4%	95.2%	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Percent of apps that had a determination made within 60 days	97.0%	96.8%	96.8%	89.1%	96.9%	97.2%	98.2%	N/A
Significance of Disability								
Disabled	240	263	318	118	0	0	0	0
% of total	34.3%	29.6%	27.5%	13.6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	110	0	0	0	0
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Significant	191	278	368	218	0	0	0	0
% of total	27.3%	31.2%	31.5%	25.2%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	212	0	0	0	0
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most Significant	268	349	481	529	250	246	285	7
% of total	38.3%	39.2%	41.2%	61.2%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	513	0	0	0	2
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent closed prior to IPE development	23.%	21.%	26.%	0.%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Plans developed	535	657	841	181	240	245	274	72
Percent of plans developed within 90 days	94.6%	97.0%	94.3%	97.8%	94.6%	94.7%	89.8%	93.1%
Number of consumers in training by type								
Vocational	166	182	208	198	2	5	3	7
Undergraduate	314	302	352	368	1	0	2	4
Graduate	10	17	14	13	0	0	0	0
Credential attainment rate	54.9%	58.5%	56.2%	51.6%	29.4%	43.9%	35.4%	5.9%
MSG Rate	60.6%	58.9%	62.8%	72.5%	28.6%	33.3%	36.4%	37.5%
Number of cases closed rehabilitated	234	192	170	202	140	134	133	128
Employment rate at exit	34.9%	33.8%	27.5%	29.7%	52.8%	54.9%	51.2%	48.5%
Employment rate in 2nd quarter after exit	64.0%	66.1%	64.9%	61.3%	61.2%	62.2%	59.4%	56.5%
Employment rate in 4th quarter after exit	60.6%	64.9%	63.0%	63.4%	49.8%	60.4%	59.7%	60.5%

Median wages of all exited participants	\$3,963	\$4,300	\$4,597	\$4,422	\$1,660	\$1,340	\$1,519	\$1,349
Total number of cases served	\$2,343	\$2,366	\$2,753	\$2,637	\$827	\$792	\$820	\$556
Avg. cost of all cases	\$1,220	\$975	\$940	\$1,252	\$1,623	\$1,838	\$1,934	\$2,987
Avg. cost of cases closed rehabilitated	\$6,025	\$5,510	\$6,742	\$8,699	\$6,543	\$6,865	\$8,301	\$9,166
Avg. cost per case closed unsuccessful	\$2,035	\$1,950	\$1,671	\$2,465	\$3,276	\$4,688	\$3,640	\$3,559
Avg. cost per case closed prior to plan	\$98	\$131	\$134	\$98	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Table 126

Internal Case Data for SSA Beneficiaries and American Job Center

	SSA BENEFICIARIES				American Job Center			
	2021	2022	2023	2024	2021	2022	2023	2024
Applications	788	877	1056	782	179	207	307	2
Percent of all applications	32.0%	28.4%	24.8%	26.0%	7.3%	6.7%	7.2%	0.1%
Percent of apps found eligible	96.1%	97.3%	98.4%	98.0%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Percent of apps that had a determination made within 60 days	98.7%	98.8%	99.4%	96.9%	98.3%	98.6%	98.4%	100%
Significance of Disability								
Disabled	6	3	8	4	0	3	2	0
% of total	0.8%	0.4%	0.8%	0.5%	0.0%	42.9%	25.0%	0.0%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Significant	382	448	520	218	5	2	3	0
% of total	50.9%	52.2%	50.8%	28.1%	55.6%	28.6%	37.5%	0.0%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	210	0	0	0	0
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most Significant	362	407	495	555	4	2	3	0
% of total	48.3%	47.4%	48.4%	71.4%	44.4%	28.6%	37.5%	0.0%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	553	0	0	0	0
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent closed prior to IPE development	28.3%	29.1%	30.7%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Plans developed	567	595	684	161	5	10	8	1
Percent of plans developed within 90 days	94.9%	94.8%	92.5%	96.9%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of consumers in training by type								
Vocational	165	155	142	113	59	79	108	72

Undergraduate	109	95	105	113	25	24	20	22
Graduate	13	9	12	11	1	1	0	1
Credential attainment rate	35.2%	45.0%	50.8%	46.7%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
MSG Rate	55.2%	60.0%	51.0%	63.5%	46.4%	45.7%	42.7%	53.8%
Number of cases closed rehabilitated	246	230	211	201	12	6	7	14
Employment rate at exit	37.8%	37.5%	34.9%	33.1%	36.4%	18.2%	23.3%	30.4%
Employment rate in 2nd quarter after exit	54.0%	56.9%	54.3%	46.5%	14.5%	6.9%	3.7%	13.8%
Employment rate in 4th quarter after exit	45.3%	54.3%	54.2%	47.8%	11.1%	0.0%	6.1%	3.6%
Median wages of all exited participants	\$2,420	\$2,152	\$2,450	\$2,057	\$5,155	\$3,094	\$2,373	\$9,552
Total number of cases served	2185	2136	2295	2096	16	17	17	10
Avg. cost of all cases	\$999	\$1,033	\$1,099	\$1,282	\$718	\$399	\$897	\$1,670
Avg. cost of cases closed rehabilitated	\$4,511	\$5,027	\$6,891	\$7,204	Null	\$45	\$440	\$892
Avg. cost per case closed unsuccessful	\$1,531	\$1,522	\$1,295	\$2,507	\$1,913	\$931	\$2,414	\$702
Avg. cost per case closed prior to plan	\$174	\$215	\$229	\$272	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Table 127

Internal Case Data for Race/Ethnicity White and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander

	White				Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander			
	2021	2022	2023	2024	2021	2022	2023	2024
Applications	2296	2867	3979	2765	27	36	34	19
Percent of all applications	93.2%	92.7%	93.3%	92.0%	1.1%	1.2%	0.8%	0.6%
Percent of apps found eligible	93.8%	94.4%	95.7%	94.6%	85.2%	91.7%	97.1%	94.7%
Percent of apps with determination made within 60 days	97.0%	97.3%	97.1%	89.2%	91.3%	100%	93.9%	83.3%
Significance of Disability								
Disabled	861	1029	1389	580	14	17	11	6
% of total	40.4%	39.6%	36.9%	21.1%	63.6%	50.0%	31.4%	33.3%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	540	0	0	0	6
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Significant	678	838	1303	949	5	12	11	7
% of total	31.8%	32.2%	34.6%	34.5%	22.7%	35.3%	31.4%	38.9%

Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	917	0	0	0	7
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most Significant	593	734	1076	1225	3	5	13	5
% of total	27.8%	28.2%	28.6%	44.5%	13.6%	14.7%	37.1%	27.8%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	1195	0	0	0	5
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent closed prior to IPE development	30.1%	29.4%	29.5%	0.8%	22.7%	44.1%	28.6%	0.0%
Plans developed	1518	1722	2528	603	15	21	19	8
Percent of plans developed within 90 days	96.4%	97.0%	95.5%	98.3%	93.3%	100%	89.5%	100%
Number of consumers in training by type								
Vocational	605	615	751	675	5	8	10	7
Undergraduate	496	483	556	567	4	8	7	7
Graduate	31	40	46	46	0	1	1	1
Credential attainment rate	56.9%	61.4%	59.7%	56.6%	50.0%	40.0%	50.0%	0.0%
MSG Rate	58.5%	58.0%	57.6%	69.7%	55.6%	50.0%	57.9%	64.3%
Number of cases closed rehabilitated	740	646	637	713	5	7	4	4
Employment rate at exit	41.4%	40.3%	37.8%	34.8%	33.3%	36.8%	30.8%	19.1%
Employment rate in 2nd quarter after exit	63.4%	64.8%	65.3%	61.8%	83.3%	69.2%	57.9%	75.0%
Employment rate in 4th quarter after exit	57.4%	62.7%	61.2%	60.8%	63.6%	40.0%	64.3%	52.9%
Median wages of all exited participants	\$4,474	\$5,033	\$5,348	\$5,754	\$3,278	\$4,244	\$8,539	\$3,722
Total number of cases served	5953	6130	7555	7246	61	74	69	62
Avg. cost of all cases	\$982	\$830	\$803	\$1,017	\$795	\$782	\$218	\$648
Avg. cost of cases closed rehabilitated	\$4,269	\$4,084	\$5,198	\$5,796	\$5,503	\$4,435	\$2,499	\$3,080
Avg. cost per case closed unsuccessful	\$1,350	\$1,241	\$1,087	\$1,787	\$1,202	\$768	\$143	\$1,392
Avg. cost per case closed prior to plan	\$96	\$116	\$114	\$78	\$64	\$160	\$184	\$0

Table 128*Internal Case Data for Race/Ethnicity American Indian and Asian*

		American Indian			Asian			
	2021	2022	2023	2024	2021	2022	2023	2024
Applications	100	145	204	132	35	58	63	56
Percent of all applications	4.1%	4.7%	4.8%	4.4%	1.4%	1.9%	1.5%	1.9%
Percent of apps found eligible	87.0%	86.9%	94.1%	93.2%	91.4%	96.6%	98.4%	92.9%
Percent of apps that had a determination made within 60 days	97.7%	95.2%	98.4%	91.1%	96.9%	96.4%	95.2%	88.5%
Significance of Disability								
Disabled	32	49	68	19	16	19	25	15
% of total	36.8%	45.4%	34.9%	15.1%	51.6%	35.2%	43.9%	27.3%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	18	0	0	0	14
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Significant	28	42	79	52	8	17	16	16
% of total	32.2%	38.9%	40.5%	41.3%	25.8%	31.5%	28.1%	29.1%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	51	0	0	0	15
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most Significant	27	17	48	55	7	18	16	24
% of total	31.0%	15.7%	24.6%	43.7%	22.6%	33.3%	28.1%	43.6%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	55	0	0	0	24
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent closed prior to IPE development	33.3%	36.1%	31.3%	0.0%	16.1%	22.2%	14.0%	0.0%
Plans developed	48	75	124	22	27	34	51	12
Percent of plans developed within 90 days	95.8%	94.7%	97.6%	100%	77.8%	100%	100%	100%
Number of consumers in training by type								
Vocational	27	24	36	29	7	11	8	8
Undergraduate	13	12	18	27	10	12	16	21
Graduate	1	2	2	4	2	5	3	2
Credential attainment rate	46.7%	52.4%	50.0%	62.5%	85.7%	46.2%	33.3%	57.1%

MSG Rate	52.9%	43.6%	49.2%	61.8%	52.4%	61.3%	71.8%	81.8%
Number of cases closed rehabilitated	23	26	25	29	6	20	13	17
Employment rate at exit	34.3%	42.6%	31.3%	31.9%	31.6%	57.1%	43.3%	41.5%
Employment rate in 2nd quarter after exit	56.9%	59.7%	59.3%	52.1%	48.2%	76.5%	64.5%	84.0%
Employment rate in 4th quarter after exit	51.8%	50.8%	57.5%	60.0%	64.0%	60.7%	75.0%	71.4%
Median wages of all exited participants	\$4,031	\$4,565	\$4,305	\$7,315	\$3,278	\$4,640	\$7,065	\$5,110
Total number of cases served	243	265	352	323	96	122	139	150
Avg. cost of all cases	\$655	\$608	\$738	\$954	\$449	\$1,123	\$771	\$1,950
Avg. cost of cases closed rehabilitated	\$2,341	\$3,366	\$4,527	\$6,209	\$4,346	\$5,252	\$4,147	\$1296 6.47
Avg. cost per case closed unsuccessful	\$1,061	\$823	\$1,044	\$1,542	\$676	\$1,157	\$1,727	\$2,574
Avg. cost per case closed prior to plan	\$50	\$56	\$95	\$1	\$4	\$167	\$28	Null

Table 129

Internal Case Data for Race/Ethnicity Hispanic/Latino and African American

Item	Hispanic/Latino				African American			
	2021	2022	2023	2024	2021	2022	2023	2024
Applications	261	350	528	348	63	77	128	103
Percent of all applications	10.6%	11.3%	12.4%	11.6%	2.6%	2.5%	3.0%	3.4%
Percent of apps found eligible	93.1%	91.7%	95.5%	92.5%	90.5%	87.0%	91.4%	94.2%
Percent of apps that had a determination made within 60 days	95.9%	97.5%	98.6%	86.0%	98.3%	97.0%	98.3%	90.7%
Significance of Disability								
Disabled	119	126	165	82	22	30	43	30
% of total	46.7%	42.1%	33.8%	25.0%	38.6%	44.8%	39.8%	30.0%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	77	0	0	0	28
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Significant	79	89	197	125	21	17	40	34
% of total	31.0%	29.8%	40.4%	38.1%	36.8%	25.4%	37.0%	34.0%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	123	0	0	0	33

Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most Significant	57	84	126	121	14	20	25	36
% of total	22.4%	28.1%	25.8%	36.9%	24.6%	29.9%	23.2%	36.0%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	118	0	0	0	37
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent closed prior to IPE development	30.2%	33.1%	32.2%	0.3%	28.1%	32.8%	24.1%	1.0%
Plans developed	154	213	303	75	38	42	68	24
Percent of plans developed within 90 days	95.5%	97.7%	96.0%	100%	94.7%	97.6%	95.6%	100%
Number of consumers in training by type								
Vocational	78	84	112	103	21	17	19	16
Undergraduate	49	47	60	74	6	8	12	11
Graduate	1	3	4	5	3	1	0	0
Credential attainment rate	52.7%	60.0%	56.9%	70.2%	38.5%	73.3%	62.5%	40.0%
MSG Rate	60.9%	61.6%	53.3%	65.6%	57.7%	33.3%	59.4%	50.0%
Number of cases closed rehabilitated	65	71	73	64	16	17	10	21
Employment rate at exit	42.5%	41.8%	39.5%	27.8%	37.2%	41.5%	24.4%	36.8%
Employment rate in 2nd quarter after exit	58.5%	70.1%	68.0%	69.8%	42.9%	65.9%	59.5%	61.3%
Employment rate in 4th quarter after exit	52.5%	63.3%	64.6%	68.6%	52.0%	54.1%	62.8%	63.0%
Median wages of all exited participants	\$4,775	\$5,571	\$6,249	\$7,406	\$3,104	\$3,473	\$4,337	\$5,915
Total number of cases served	595	693	928	892	159	165	217	242
Avg. cost of all cases	\$786	\$714	\$710	\$920	\$1,219	\$810	\$475	\$768
Avg. cost of cases closed rehabilitated	\$4,539	\$3,671	\$5,434	\$6,807	\$3,983	\$4,910	\$3,334	\$3,922
Avg. cost per case closed unsuccessful	\$901	\$1,021	\$769	\$1,617	\$2,205	\$713	\$1,004	\$1,755
Avg. cost per case closed prior to plan	\$56	\$120	\$147	\$30	\$307	\$232	\$62	\$171

Table 130*Internal Case Data for CRP and Disability Priority*

Item	CRP				Disability Priority			
	2021	2022	2023	2024	2021	2022	2023	2024
Applications	475	454	504	1	968	1238	1485	567
Percent of all applications	19.3%	14.7%	11.8%	0.0%	39.3%	40.0%	34.8%	18.9%
Percent of apps found eligible	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99.9%	99.5%
Percent of apps that had a determination made within 60 days	97.3%	97.4%	98.6%	100%	96.0%	97.1%	95.9%	87.6%
Significance of Disability								
Disabled	47	47	58	0	924	1110	1471	637
% of total	10.1%	10.0%	11.1%	0.0%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	595
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Significant	110	105	117	4	0	0	0	0
% of total	23.6%	22.4%	22.3%	21.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most Significant	310	317	349	15	0	0	0	0
% of total	66.4%	67.6%	66.6%	79.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent closed prior to IPE development	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	32.6%	32.7%	27.8%	0.6%
Plans developed	474	451	526	110	604	713	1055	179
Percent of plans developed within 90 days	95.6%	95.6%	94.1%	95.5%	98.0%	98.6%	98.0%	99.4%
Number of consumers in training by type								
Vocational	60	60	45	28	276	301	379	294
Undergraduate	29	25	23	18	197	202	257	247
Graduate	3	1	2	1	11	22	20	25
Credential attainment rate	48.4%	58.9%	53.2%	43.3%	62.1%	62.8%	60.9%	59.3%
MSG Rate	50.5%	56.2%	54.4%	60.0%	62.0%	57.0%	58.3%	70.8%
Number of cases closed rehabilitated	336	268	231	229	302	295	320	366
Employment rate at exit	51.6%	51.5%	48.7%	44.0%	49.4%	49.6%	48.7%	46.0%

Employment rate in 2nd quarter after exit	64.7%	66.5%	64.5%	63.4%	69.5%	75.0%	76.2%	72.4%
Employment rate in 4th quarter after exit	55.5%	64.1%	61.6%	60.2%	64.9%	71.1%	70.4%	70.7%
Median wages of all exited participants	\$2,682	\$2,637	\$2,484	\$2,564	\$7,225	\$7,358	\$8,556	\$8,714
Total number of cases served	1723	1527	1511	1038	2005	2196	2662	2106
Avg. cost of all cases	\$1,501	\$1,415	\$1,746	\$2,406	\$651	\$604	\$624	\$1,196
Avg. cost of cases closed rehabilitated	\$4,821	\$4,877	\$7,301	\$6,590	\$2,520	\$2,665	\$3,149	\$4,322
Avg. cost per case closed unsuccessful	\$3,075	\$3,385	\$3,917	\$3,396	\$788	\$795	\$812	\$1,759
Avg. cost per case closed prior to plan	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$45	\$54	\$34	\$17

Table 131

Internal Case Data for Significant Disability and Most Significant Disability Priorities

	Significant Disability Priority				Most Significant Disability Priority			
	2021	2022	2023	2024	2021	2022	2023	2024
Applications	876	1092	1609	1186	637	785	1208	1286
Percent of all applications	35.6%	35.3%	37.7%	39.5%	25.9%	25.4%	28.3%	42.8%
Percent of apps found eligible	100%	100%	99.9%	86.4%	100%	100%	99.9%	100%
Percent of apps that had a determination made within 60 days	98.2%	97.8%	98.1%	86.8%	97.0%	97.1%	97.6%	91.3%
Significance of Disability								
Disabled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Significant	725	907	1403	1037	0	0	0	0
% of total	100%	100%	100%	100%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	1005	0	0	0	0
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most Significant	0	0	0	0	632	782	1154	1320
% of total	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1289
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Percent closed prior to IPE development	34.9%	33.5%	36.7%	0.5%	20.3%	21.2%	23.1%	1.0%
Plans developed	494	563	824	217	517	576	818	243
Percent of plans developed within 90 days	96.0%	97.2%	95.5%	99.5%	94.0%	95.0%	92.5%	96.7%
Number of consumers in training by type								
Vocational	257	254	302	283	112	106	133	142
Undergraduate	193	188	206	218	129	116	130	152
Graduate	14	15	22	25	10	9	9	4
Credential attainment rate	54.6%	63.2%	61.4%	53.8%	51.3%	50.0%	49.1%	45.5%
MSG Rate	55.9%	56.0%	55.0%	67.5%	56.5%	58.7%	59.8%	68.8%
Number of cases closed rehabilitated	191	172	147	159	280	223	217	228
Employment rate at exit	31.2%	32.0%	27.7%	23.1%	42.8%	38.7%	34.6%	32.5%
Employment rate in 2nd quarter after exit	61.3%	62.4%	60.5%	55.7%	59.9%	58.5%	58.4%	55.0%
Employment rate in 4th quarter after exit	57.1%	61.6%	58.9%	56.7%	51.8%	57.2%	55.5%	54.3%
Median wages of all exited participants	\$4,631	\$4,982	\$4,217	\$5,747	\$2,663	\$2,371	\$2,488	\$2,601
Total number of cases served	1982	2024	2617	2544	2125	2097	2554	2952
Avg. cost of all cases	\$929	\$740	\$656	\$867	\$1,390	\$1,225	\$1,184	\$1,027
Avg. cost of cases closed rehabilitated	\$3,691	\$4,224	\$5,303	\$6,084	\$6,496	\$5,969	\$7,768	\$7,797
Avg. cost per case closed unsuccessful	\$1,589	\$1,142	\$944	\$1,852	\$2,077	\$2,290	\$1,919	\$2,211
Avg. cost per case closed prior to plan	\$81	\$115	\$154	\$103	\$273	\$234	\$200	\$273

Table 132

Participants Served in Urban and Rural Counties

	Urban				Rural			
	2021	2022	2023	2024	2021	2022	2023	2024
Applications	1965	2458	3370	2451	491	620	868	542
Percent of all applications	79.8%	79.5%	79.1%	81.6%	19.9%	20.1%	20.4%	18.0%
Percent of apps found eligible	93.3%	93.6%	95.5%	94.8%	94.5%	96.1%	96.2%	93.7%

Percent of apps that had a determination made within 60 days	96.8%	97.5%	97.4%	89.7%	97.6%	96.3%	96.2%	86.0%
Significance of Disability								
Disabled	719	874	1095	434	204	228	354	106
% of total	39.6%	39.5%	34.4%	17.7%	44.2%	39.7%	43.1%	20.0%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	396	0	0	0	96
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Significant	579	729	1141	821	143	173	255	170
% of total	31.9%	32.9%	35.9%	33.5%	31.0%	30.1%	31.0%	32.1%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	800	0	0	0	161
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Most Significant	517	610	947	1196	115	173	213	253
% of total	28.5%	27.6%	29.8%	48.8%	24.9%	30.1%	25.9%	47.8%
Added to Waitlist	0	0	0	1175	0	0	0	249
Removed from Waitlist	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent closed prior to IPE development	30.1%	30.5%	30.3%	11.8%	29.4%	26.8%	26.9%	11.9%
Plans developed	1275	1466	2074	521	338	380	605	116
Percent of plans developed within 90 days	95.8%	96.9%	95.5%	98.5%	97.0%	97.4%	95.9%	98.3%
Number of consumers in training by type								
Vocational	472	491	572	516	169	166	227	196
Undergraduate	352	349	410	437	162	154	173	165
Graduate	25	35	41	39	10	11	10	13
Credential attainment rate	55.9%	59.6%	58.5%	53.9%	57.9%	63.4%	62.9%	59.9%
MSG Rate	58.8%	56.6%	56.9%	69.8%	58.1%	58.1%	60.6%	67.3%
Number of cases closed rehabilitated	604	555	536	561	168	134	145	188
Employment rate at exit	41.7%	41.0%	38.2%	33.3%	39.6%	38.1%	36.1%	38.5%
Employment rate in 2nd quarter after exit	63.6%	66.0%	63.9%	61.4%	61.8%	62.6%	70.1%	62.7%
Employment rate in 4th quarter after exit	56.4%	63.1%	61.3%	60.7%	60.2%	62.4%	62.3%	61.9%

Median wages of all exited participants	\$4,055	\$4,649	\$5,208	\$5,915	\$5,629	\$5,823	\$5,755	\$5,425
Total number of cases served	4960	5181	6358	6193	1369	1369	1694	1562
Avg. cost of all cases	\$970	\$857	\$787	\$973	\$950	\$710	\$830	\$1,090
Avg. cost of cases closed rehabilitated	\$4,371	\$4,281	\$5,154	\$6,047	\$3,826	\$3,487	\$4,863	\$4,922
Avg. cost per case closed unsuccessful	\$1,297	\$1,216	\$1,031	\$1,723	\$1,416	\$1,189	\$1,273	\$1,915
Avg. cost per case closed prior to plan	\$95	\$109	\$107	\$73	\$113	\$127	\$125	\$83