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Decline in the Provision of Facility-Based Work Services for People with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities

By Jean E. Winsor and Alberto Migliore

Facility-based work services are vocational services provided in settings where the majority of people have a disability and receive continuous job-related supports and supervision. Facility-based work services are also referred to as sheltered work, work activity services, or extended employment programs.

In 2001, the Rehabilitation Services Administration formally eliminated sheltered employment as a successful outcome for clients of state vocational rehabilitation agencies. Since then, IDD agencies have been among the few state-level agencies that have continued to authorize and fund facility-based work outcomes. Several factors may influence participation in facility-based work for individuals with IDD, including state IDD agency funding and policy priorities, growth in community integration service options, selection of services at transition by individuals and their families, and the priority placed on integrated employment outcomes by state systems.

Data over the past ten years from 17 states\(^1\) demonstrate that the percentage of individuals reported by state IDD agencies that have received facility-based work services declined from 36.0% in FY1999 to 26.4% in FY2009. The number of individuals reported in facility-based work also declined during this period (Table 1). However, there was not a corresponding increase in integrated employment outcomes in these states, and the percentage of people reported in integrated employment declined slightly, from 26.1% to 24.2%.\(^2\) During this same time period, non-work services have continued to grow at the expense of integrated employment. The percentage of individuals receiving non-work services increased from 41.8% in FY1999 to 50.4% in FY2009, an increase of more than 30,000 individuals in these 17 states. These data demonstrate that despite the decrease in facility-based work services, state IDD agencies need to place a greater emphasis on integrated employment outcomes.

Table 1. Distribution of individuals by service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total served</th>
<th>Integrated employment</th>
<th>Facility-based work</th>
<th>Non-work services</th>
<th>Integrated employment</th>
<th>Facility-based work</th>
<th>Non-work services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>168,419</td>
<td>43,999</td>
<td>60,660</td>
<td>70,396</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>169,511</td>
<td>42,445</td>
<td>57,069</td>
<td>74,812</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>183,583</td>
<td>41,484</td>
<td>53,864</td>
<td>90,993</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>186,023</td>
<td>43,483</td>
<td>53,626</td>
<td>93,285</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>187,370</td>
<td>48,999</td>
<td>54,089</td>
<td>95,679</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>200,345</td>
<td>48,405</td>
<td>52,951</td>
<td>101,002</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 States were included in this analysis if they provided data on the number served in integrated and facility-based work and non-work services between 1999 and 2009. The states were: AL, CT, IN, MA, NC, NH, NV, NY, OH, OK, OR, SC, SD, VA, VT, WA, and WY.

2 Beginning in 2007, the number and percentage of people in integrated employment is inflated slightly by the inclusion of the state of Washington. Because of the implementation of the Working Age Adult Policy in 2006, approximately 2,000 individuals are included in integrated employment who are on a pathway to employment but are not yet working for pay. The authors assume that in all states a small percentage of individuals who are reported in integrated employment services are looking for work or otherwise between jobs and not working for pay, but this gap is larger in Washington.