This brief summarizes a 5-brief series outlining a model of supports for employment consultants. The model emerged from interviews with employment consultants known for their effectiveness, their supervisors, family members, and job seekers who found paid individual employment.

What is it?
The comprehensive model of support is a map that visualizes key support activities recommended for assisting job seekers to achieve a job match.

Why is this model important?
Having a clear vision about a comprehensive strategy is important for guiding your decisions about the supports you provide to job seekers.

What’s the core of the model?
The model revolves around achieving and maintaining a quality job match. Everything you do should align with this goal.

Why is a quality job match important?
A quality job match will lead to greater job satisfaction and inclusion in the workplace, more natural supports, better job retention, and increased chances for career advancement of the person you support.

How do I achieve a quality job match?
Read about building trust, getting to know job seekers, addressing other supports before hire (supports planning), searching for tasks/jobs, and providing support after hire.

Are any of these supports more important than others?
Not necessarily. Each support activity builds on and strengthens the others. You may work on them simultaneously or revisit an element at any point.

Can you give an example?
Yes! Let’s look at building trust. This is central to gaining a job seeker’s full confidence in your positive intentions and ability to help them. You should continue building trust while addressing other elements of the model.

What else?
A sample of employment consultants reported investing an average 30% of their day (2.5 hours/day) in supports leading to hire (see chart). Is that enough? How much time do you invest in supports leading to hire, every day? Discuss the chart with your team.
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