We need to know where we've been to understand where we are going. Over this past year, I have often recalled this phrase. While it probably was said in reference to understanding world history, it is also vital to understanding the history of how we have viewed work for people with disabilities.

I have been working with national leaders and advocates to raise the issue of eliminating the special minimum wage. This provision in the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) allows workers with disabilities to be paid at a rate lower than the minimum wage set for workers without disabilities. To truly understand the issue, we need to know where we've been.

Way back in the olden days, and I mean even before television and MTV, European and early American attitudes toward disability were similar. It was preferable, in polite society, not to see people who were "unsightly" on the street. However, there was an expectation that everyone who was capable of work, should work. Almshouses were places where beggars, people with disabilities and other undesirables were sent to work so they would be kept out of sight and out of mind. Conditions were generally very poor and the pay was minimal. Almshouses were the precursors to the modern day sheltered workshops.

In 1838, the first sheltered workshop for the blind was established. Forward thinkers of the day saw the need for people to learn a skill so that they could later go out and find jobs to support themselves in their communities. The workshop was seen as a training ground for vocational skills and blind workers were viewed as probably the most capable of being successful in this venture.

After WWII, the first vocational rehabilitation program served soldiers returning from the war. Before the Dust Bowl, the Depression and Woody Guthrie, the federal government began to assist people with disabilities in learning marketable skills that would help them find employment to support themselves and their families. The U.S. government was determined that these heroes of war would not be left in poverty upon their return from duty.

In 1938, the FLSA was passed and a minimum wage was established. Despite a bitter fight in Congress, the FLSA endured as a contract between the American society and its workers. It decreed that all workers were entitled to a certain standard of living, that would keep them and their families out of poverty. Even though the president of the United States had a disability, workers with disabilities were not included in this social contract. A special minimum wage provision was instituted to covered blind workers, as they were the primary recipients of workshop services.

In the 1950's, things began to change. Parent advocacy groups began sprouting up around the country. They began to press for services for their children, which allowed them to remain in their homes and communities. The civil rights movement inspired people to stand up for their rights, and this attitude slowly began to infiltrate into the disability community as well.

The number of WWII veterans with disabilities coming home and looking to reenter the workforce increased dramatically with the advent of huge advancements in medical techniques and treatments, enabling people with severe spinal cord injuries to live longer and more productive lives. Prenatal and neonatal care also made advances resulting in many more children with disabilities living beyond infancy. Polio survivors were numerous and thus the small, almost voiceless group of people with disabilities began to grow and its leaders began to emerge.
Office of Civil Rights Complaint and Sheltered Workshops in Colorado

The Developmental Disabilities Council has joined the efforts of the Arc of Colorado in the filing of an Office of Civil Rights complaint against the practice of placing and "employing" large numbers of individuals in sheltered workshops in Colorado. A variety of strategies have been used in the past to rectify the segregated work and lack of true income and community employment, however, none of them has decreased the number of individuals in such settings as of this date. The basic rationale in the filing of the complaint is that it is 2002 and such rulings as Olmstead, the ADA, and Section 504 of the 1973 Rehab. Act all require people to participate in the least restrictive setting i.e. the community. All mission statements within the developmental disabilities system identify community living and participation to be essential components of the agencies' missions, yet we still have people segregated in small settings that on an individual basis are not much different than daily institutional activities of yesteryear. Numerous strategies have been employed in the past to close such workshops. The former director of Colorado's Developmental Disabilities Services, Charlie Allinson, recommended approximately six years ago to the legislature's Joint Budget Committee (JBC) that no new allocations be allowed in such segregated settings. This recommendation was met with vehemence from the workshop and union in Pueblo. The JBC acquiesced and the placements of high school students and others into sheltered workshops continue. A group of community advocates and families has also tried to get sheltered workshops to be included in the state Olmstead Plan so that budgetary and resource allocations in the plan will decrease the number of people in workshops - again the strategy failed. Currently we have a system that in policy, practice, and funding mechanisms favors sheltered workshops, yet all of our federal court cases and current law do not support such practices. The Council has great hopes that the complaint will assist our practices in Colorado and bring us along to 2002!

In 1971, the special minimum wage provisions were amended to include all disabilities. This change dramatically increased the number of people in sheltered workshops, and the majority of the shelters’ workers were people with a diagnosis of mental retardation. The theory that people could learn skills in a workshop setting and, when they were ready, could transfer these skills to community jobs, was the foundation for workshop services. However, most people were never deemed ready, and spent their lives in segregation. The seventies (you remember, the glory days of rock and roll) were the years that spawned some of the greatest visions for the world of work for people with disabilities. In 1973, the Vocational Rehabilitation Act made it illegal for federal agencies and contractors to discriminate based on disability. This powerful legislation set the stage for the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and was modeled after the Civil Rights Act of 1965.

Those wonderful eighties brought us more than just the mullet and Madonna. This decade brought us the most significant advancement in rehabilitation philosophy ---Supported Employment. Finally, we had a method to produce the outcome. Thousands of people became successfully employment around the country. The readiness model was dead, or so we thought.

In 2001, the Department of Labor issued a report with the title, Incorrect Special Minimum Wages Are Being Paid to Workers with Disabilities. The executive summary stated: “Since the enactment of the FLSA in 1938, educational and employment opportunities for people with disabilities have increased dramatically. Programs and services are now available which provide people with disabilities increased access to employment and training programs.”

The history of work also includes my experiences as the director of Employment Services for the state developmental disabilities agency in Oklahoma. I visited literally hundreds of individuals working in sheltered workshops and what I saw continues to haunt me to this day. I routinely observed people sitting idle in large warehouses where work was only a faint hope. Workshop providers ensured that people were out of their houses for 6 hours a day. What they did at the workshop could seldom be called real work. As for real pay, I was asked by the director of the Department of Human Services to investigate a claim that a person in a workshop earned $1.57 in 50 hours of work. I am ashamed to say that this allegation proved to be true, and the quality assurance investigators refused to cite the agency for any significant violations. This was not an isolated incident. Abuses of the special minimum wage were routine in Oklahoma and as the 2001 DOL report indicted, there is a pattern of abuse throughout the country.

History offers a glimpse of where we have been and where we can go, if we have the vision to make it happen. All signs indicate that the next level of progression towards equality and community inclusion is ready to happen. We must call for the end of an antiquated provision that is wrapping a noose around the efforts of people with disabilities to break out of isolation, seclusion and poverty. We know where we have been and now we can see where we want to be. The time is right to add another date in history. End the special minimum wage now!

Judy Lapointe Jennings is a member of the Council’s Employment Committee, and is an advocate for real work for real pay for people with disabilities. Judy has worked in the field for 10 years.
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Successful supported employment for individuals with developmental disabilities can be complicated when job seekers must rely on the essential collaboration and communication between different systems and service providers. In Denver, the local Community Centered Board (CCB), Denver Options (DO), along with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR) and providers of employment services, have attempted to tackle this area, and the result has been a blended funding effort presently in place.

What are some of the factors that complicate smooth provision of supported employment services?

- Different rate structures/billing procedures
- Potential for duplication of services
- Dissimilar service provider standards requirements
- Timeliness of application processes
- Misconceptions about roles and responsibilities
- System requirements for plan development/amendments, etc.

Last year, the Center for Technical Assistance and Training (CTAT) brought together representation from Denver Options, the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, and service providers including Employment Link, Community Living Alternatives, Shalom, and others. A flow chart and a blended funding table were two tangible products that emerged from this work group.

The flow chart attempts to clarify all points in the process from the point at which a person identifies interest in becoming employed through job stabilization with extended supports in place. The concept is for referral to DVR to occur and for eligibility determination to be taking place while the person is selecting a service provider. Once this selection has been made, a key element in the program occurs - the Individual Marketing Profile (IMP). This holistic assessment documents the vocational planning process. Once the IMP is developed and the DVR eligibility process concludes, plan development can occur and job placement services initiate. The hope is that delays in the process are minimized by simultaneous activities occurring for the person interested in supported employment.

The blended funding table breaks down and defines the process — especially for the service providers who must coordinate with two systems for reimbursement. All potential services, their definitions, reporting requirements, and allowable fees have been documented in this table. The workgroup has purposefully determined separateness of services so that providers can re-coup the maximum amounts of money for the services they provide while distinctly billing DVR and DO for the needed services along the way. DO has used a “phases” concept over the last few years, so all of the employment services a person may need are structured in the table within these phases.

This is how the program works, “in a nutshell”: DO pays for quality indicators when a job is located such as completion in three months or less, employment of choice, etc. DVR then reimburses for the initial, extensive job coaching and then the actual placement fee once the job is stabilized. From there, DO takes over and provides for the extended supports necessary for job retention.

It is critical for all parties to know “who is paying for what and when.” One of the tools used to clarify when extensive, DVR-purchased job coaching services have concluded and DO extended services are initiating is an Intent to Transfer form. The service provider initiates this form when job-coaching services have reduced. DVR and DO sign off so that there are no gaps in funding the job supports necessary for the individual.

Is it always working? Is the communication where we all want it to be? The answer is probably no - but we’re getting there! Liaisons from DVR and DO come together once every 4-6 weeks to discuss problems and come up with solutions. The local DVR office is generating periodic reports to let DO coordinators know where people are at in the process. DVR provides on-going technical assistance to service providers at SLS meetings.

If you are interested in reviewing any of the documents mentioned in this article, please request by e-mail to: karen.ferrington@state.co.us.

Karen Ferrington is a certified rehabilitation counselor and supervisor of the Denver East DVR office. Previously, she was a counselor for seven years in the Northglenn DVR office.

European Union Adopts 2003 as the European Year of People With Disabilities

The European Union adopted 2003 as the European Year of People with Disabilities, and thousands of activities and events will commemorate the Year throughout 2003 in the different participating countries. A European Campaign will begin in Greece in January 2003, go through all the Member States of the European Union, and end in Italy in December 2003. Activities, events and actions supporting the European campaign and at all levels in the Member States will be organized with the involvement of the disability movement. For information about the European campaigns and national and local level activities, visit http://www.eypd2003.org.

For basic information on the Year, visit http://europa.eu.int/comm/employment_social/disability/year_en.html

Quick Results from Advocacy

Your local Sam Goody or Media Play store may have been selling, for a brief period of time, a T-shirt with the following phrase emblazoned on it:

Cheerleaders are dancers who have gone retarded

It was only a matter of days before the T-shirts were pulled from shelves nationwide. How did that happen? People from all over the country called the company’s main office in Minnesota to complain, to insist the T-shirts not be sold, and the company responded!
much of the citizenry of Colorado have recently been talking of the upcoming immanent budget cuts, now that we have ceased discussing the other recent cuts to the nation's 401K funds. In our discussions, there are sadly non-monetary elements of service provision that are not being heard and bars below which members of the Council thought we would certainly never go. Here are some offerings for the discussions that will ensue after the elections and when the Governor chooses to announce the details of his cuts. The primary starting point in all discussions about programs and policy should be the extent to which spending promotes the prerequisites for full participation in neighborhoods and communities. Debates regarding whether a program is more expensive than another, or if Medicaid match is involved, should not progress if the program itself is below the bar of the mission of the Council or those myriad other agencies with similar community oriented missions. Cost, in other words, is relevant only when similar types of supports, those in support of individualized participation in neighborhoods and communities, are compared against each other, not when compared with dissimilar programs that do not support individual participation. In terms of carrying the point to a clear definition, the Council should not be debating the cost of sheltered work or congregate "community" participation programs as an option given potential budget cuts. Cheaper is not better or necessarily even true. The discussion needs to remain way above the bar of health and safety and focused on what our mission dictates we support. Some of the problems with the commodification of individuals include the following:

1) There is a false assumption of rationality in the debate. Facts indicate that there is money to be made in congregate settings but they nursing homes, group homes, or other settings. Sometimes true freedom of choice means less money for owners of these agencies because few people would actually choose to live in a large congregate setting.

2) Community supports for some individuals may require more money than for a congregate setting. Does this mean that people deserve nothing more than a life of congregation because they are not cost-effective?

3) In our age of managed care organizations, when the profit margin is top priority in the cost-effectiveness model, cutting corners is encouraged. Neglect spreads and the cheapest public policy becomes doing nothing at all.

4) Commodification is susceptible to the whim of the market and what is cost effective today may not be tomorrow thus any victory based on finances alone is a tenuous win.

5) The dependency model promotes thankfulness for what is given, not necessarily what is necessary. What society gives to individuals becomes only what is deserved, again putting people at the whim of a fluctuating budget. The definition of 'deserved' is then based on the values of the policy makers of the time. Commodification then becomes the lot of the people.

6) Attempts to merge programmatic issues and civil/human rights issues into the cost discussion are critical. All too often of late we hear talk of the cost of the square footage of office space rather than of the well being of the people we are here to serve.

7) Budget discussions should lastly center on alternative ways of delivering services rather than on a more narrow vision of rearranging the chairs on the Titanic within the current service model. Now is the prime time for creating new alternatives that dovetail with the Olmstead decision, the Independence Plus waiver, and Bush's New Freedom Initiative.

"Never be afraid to try something new. Remember that a lone amateur built the Ark. A large group of professionals built the Titanic."

--by Marcia Tewell

\[\text{TOKEN}\]

By Gail Bottoms

I've been called a lot of names, Retard, Simple, downright Plain.

Now a new one I can claim,

Add Token to my name

A token they say sits on boards and committees and such,

You listen to plans but do not touch.

They have you there it is clear and plain

To be a symbol - consumer, guy or dame.

You're just a Token - they want your name.

We have a consumer on our board - we're good birds

But you're not given a chance to say a word.

If you say something, you're not heard.

You're just a Token - nothing more.

I guess of the names I can recall,

I hate Token most of all.

This poem was developed as part of the September 25, 2001 TASH Teleconference: Effective Strategies for Ensuring Self-Advocates are Involved in All Aspects of the Service/Support System.

\[\text{NINE ELEVEN}\]

Only your tragedy just killing every death and tumble in the ashes for the single severed souls of the people like absent appendages dared to die

The buried arms and legs that can't run now killed forever to be alive again get a clue and be glad you're gone your world is not worthy

Ghosts rectify the deed but never rest weeping families you fly on the wings of divine intervention this country loves you
Elling

The film traces the lives of two men just released from a Norwegian mental hospital and their new lives in the community. Some might wonder why the authorities decided to give these two their own state-funded apartment in the center of a busy urban city such as Oslo. Strangers intimidate Elling as well as do ringing phones and his roommate, Kjell. Kjell is blissfully unaware of his need to change his underwear and is plagued by terrible insecurities. The two are slowly encouraged by their gloomy and bossy social worker toward independence. Many hard won victories occur during the transition from institutional to community life for these two men. Some of the setbacks and progress of both Elling and Kjell are classic - Kjell spends 4000 crowns on phone sex at the same time Elling relishes being able to finish a complete meal at a restaurant and listening to his own classical music at home. Each forward step is celebrated with Elling commenting, “I made a friend with out help from the Norwegian government.”

U.S. viewers who are familiar with former mental patients living on the streets may interpret the film like a fairy tale, however, in the film’s homeland of Norway, it plays more like reality. The film is a must see rated 5 stars by the staff of the Council.

Ticket to Work in Colorado

The Ticket to Work and Self-Sufficiency Program was created with the signing of the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act on December 17, 1999. The program is designed to assist people with the training and support they need to go to work. SSA beneficiaries with disabilities can find employment, vocational rehabilitation (VR) and other support services from public and private providers, Employment Networks (EN). An EN is in the business of accepting people’s “tickets” and helping the ticket holders find jobs. Employment Networks receive pay incentives to do so. The EN, upon accepting a ticket holder into their services, works with the ticket holder to design an Individual Work Plan (IWP) that will outline the services to be provided to enable the ticket holder to reach his or her employment goal.

According to information in the Project WIN newsletter of August 2002, 84,974 tickets have been mailed in Colorado to those eligible under the Ticket to Work guidelines. A ticket holder must find an EN that will take their ticket and help them find a job. So far, 73 people (.08%) have assigned their tickets to an EN. The low rate of response reflects people’s concerns that going to work might jeopardize their SSA benefits, and reflects the financial disincentive to EN’s in accepting tickets from people who might need creative and time-consuming planning for supports. Listed below are the 24 EN’s that are registered to provide service to ticket holders in Colorado.

AAATAKECHARGE TO COLLECT 75% OF YOUR TICKET
(800) 896-5573 — www.aaatakecharge.com
ABILITY FORUM.COM
www.abilityforum.com
ADAMS COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTER
Commerce City — (303) 853-3500
ARAPAHOE/DOUGLAS MENTAL HEALTH NETWORK
Centennial — (303) 547-6427
ASPEN DIVERSIFIED INDUSTRIES
Colorado Springs — (719) 572-6080
AURORA MENTAL HEALTH CENTER
Aurora — (303) 617-2586
BAYAUD INDUSTRIES, INC.
Denver — (303) 830-6886
CAREER EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES, INC.
Greeley — (970) 689-1770
COLORADO DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION
Denver — (720) 884-1234
COLORADO GOODWILL
Colorado Springs — (719) 635-4483
COLORADO OPTIONS, INC.
Denver — (303) 758-5545
COLORADO REGIONAL MENTAL HEALTH, INC.
Glenwood Springs — (970) 241-6023
COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY BASED SERVICES, LLC
Denver — (303) 671-6042
CP OF COLORADO/EMPLOYMENT WORKS
Denver — (888) 417-4873
DISABILITY CAREERS, INC.
Denver — (303) 399-0443
EXPEDITER CORPORATION
Pittsburgh, PA — (800) 369-4693
GENEX SERVICES, INC.
Wayne, PA — (866) 275-9313
GLICK & GLICK CONSULTANTS, LLC
Rowlett, TX — (800) 222-8582
IMAGINE!
Lafayette — (330) 665-7789
INTEGRATED DISABILITY RESOURCES
Bloomfield, CT — (888) 683-4950
LARADON HALL
Denver — (303) 296-2400
MENTAL HEALTH CORPORATION OF DENVER
Denver — (303) 504-1722
PREMIUM PRODUCTS AND SERVICES, INC
Mount Holly, NJ — (609) 702-5781
PROJECT: RETURN TO WORK, INC.
Boulder — (303) 415-9187
PUEBLO DIVERSIFIED INDUSTRIES
Pueblo — (719) 564-0000
For more information go to:
http://www.yourtickettowork.com
http://www.uchsc.edu/projectwin/
http://www.state.co.us/ticket/
Put me in Coach, I’m ready to Play: Mentoring for Rehabilitation Leaders

By Cary Griffin, Director of Special Projects

Why on earth does Tiger Woods have a coach? Woods is perhaps the greatest living golfer, having achieved more in his young life than most professional golfers accomplish in a lifetime. What could Tiger Woods possibly learn from a coach—a coach who is largely unknown to the public, who has never won the Masters, who is not a multi-millionaire, who doesn’t have lucrative endorsement deal from Nike? What Tiger Woods knows is what so many leaders and career-trackers know: advice and support from an experienced coach, or mentor, are powerful tools for improvement.

The Industrial Society reports in a 1999 study that over 80% of 300 companies surveyed found that coaching and mentoring improved their employee performance and profitability. Coaching, (which by definition focuses on achieving specific goals) and mentoring (which focuses on open and evolving issues) are closely related activities, and for the purposes of this short article are considered synonymous. HR Quarterly reports that business and executive coaching are the most effective tools leaders have for achieving sustainable growth, change, and the development of quality staff, teams, and organizations.

Many of us use coaches, and quite a few of us provide coaching to others, as we grow to understand the importance of that role. I learn as much as I teach from several people I mentor. My long-term mentor works in the rarified air of a multi-national corporation, but he knows leadership and complexity, and offers regular down-to-earth advice and counsel. I do not always take his advice, though. He knows that neither of us have a monopoly on management know-how. But I use him regularly as a sounding board and external conscience. I have many friends and colleagues as well, whom I rely on for guidance and decision-making. I have always found that my personal and professional network is a priceless resource that sustains me when hard decisions have to be made.

I am always shocked to find how few upper-level managers and executive directors in our field have mentors. Through numerous conversations I have learned that many of us work in isolation; we guard our indecision and confusion about complex problems; or we rely on our peers for guidance. Of course, our peers are often just as sheltered from support. Such isolation leads to routine, and often bad, decision-making; status quo preservation; restrained risk-taking; and internal focus instead of community building. The challenges that now face the rehabilitation field are enormous and we all need assistance and thought-provoking guidance from smart people.

There are many places to look for a coach. There are professional coaches: my friend and colleague Katherine Carol at Tango Consulting (www.tangoconsulting.org) is one of the best. There are Service Corps of Retired Executive (SCORE) (www.score.org) members who can fit this role. There are friends and family, your banker, local entrepreneurs, and politicians. People love to give advice, so look for people who make tough and successful decisions in their lives and ask if they might help you.

Coaching received from an outsider offers you the opportunity to learn from other's experiences and make connections in other fields and sectors. Relationship building and network development is the best sustainable business model.

Coaching increases your political savvy; it teaches you to slow down and consider the consequences of your actions; it improves your negotiation and problem-solving skills by offering you a confidential environment for exploring problems and solutions.

Coaching improves your communication skills through the repeated exercise of explaining difficult information to an outsider.

Coaching improves your conflict management skills because good mentors will question your motivation for action (revenge, punishment, power politics) and will offer advice on anxious situations. Sometimes the simple act of talking with your coach buys you time and lets the situation cool down.

Coaching forces you to confront your motivations and beliefs, thereby forcing you to check your integrity and honesty.

Coaching illustrates to others who look up to you that asking for guidance and advice is a superior way of managing; it builds team work and collegiality and helps destroy class warfare in organizations.

Coaching broadens your vision and compels smart strategy. Getting advice and counsel forces you to look at other perspectives and approaches to similar challenges.

Coaching supports experimentation, adventure, innovation, and making the hard choices that your peers in the field may not be brave enough to make. Mentors help us take calculated risks by working through various scenarios before we act, thus preparing us to face unforeseen hazards with previously considered solutions.

Coaching and mentoring are not, of course, the solutions to all the problems and challenges that befall leaders. They are, however, wonderfully liberating approaches to sharing the pain and pleasure that management responsibility brings. For assistance with Executive Coaching, please contact Cary at cgriffin@selway.umt.edu

Cary Griffin works with The University of Montana Rural Institute: A Center for Excellence in Disabilities Education, Research, and Service
When Dollars Aren't Enough

Whether it’s through the Community Imperative (http://www.cdhs.state.co.us/opi/cddpc/ci_main.htm), or through principles of Self Determination, ideas that promote full participation in the community have been with us for decades. Though familiar, these ideas are not necessarily easy to implement. Concerns about limited dollars tend to limit our thinking when what we really need is creativity in implementing the principles of self-determination and community building.

What are the principles of self-determination?

1. **Freedom** to live in the community, with supports if necessary, and with control over the choices of where to live, with whom to live, where to work and how to spend time.
2. **Authority** to control money needed for support and the priorities for spending it.
3. **Support** to organize the resources, with help, as needed, not supervision or staffing.
4. **Responsibility** for the wise use of public dollars. This means that dollars are seen as an investment in a person’s life, not as resources to purchase services or slots.
5. **Confirmation** of the leadership of self-advocates.

How do these principles come into play when we think about employment? First of all, it’s clear that employment for people with disabilities needs to be thought of in the same context as employment for anyone: real jobs for real pay! Often, even with supported employment and the assumption that everyone who wants to work can work in the community, people with disabilities are placed in the “classic three” jobs: food, filth and flow-ers. The result is that the principles of self-determination are circumvented—other people do the decision-making and planning. Also, the classic three jobs are low paid, physically demanding and have low status. No surprise that people who are placed in such jobs in a process that excludes them from the planning and decision-making don’t stay in the jobs too long! If we encourage people to dream, and listen intently, we open ourselves to the possibility for people to have interesting jobs and a livable wage.

“People who are vulnerable, exploited, excluded, or labeled do not always ‘need’ human services. More often, they may need justice, income and community.” (John McKnight, Do No Harm: Policy Options that Meet Human Needs, 1989)

---by Marna Ares Thompson

---

Employment Resources for People with Disabilities

- US Dept. of Labor's Office of Disability Employment Policy funds the Job Accommodation Network (JAN), a toll-free consulting service. Anyone can call JAN for information about job accommodation and the employability of people with functional limitations. 1-800-526-7234 or jan@jan.jcri.wvu.edu or visit their website at: http://www.jan.wvu.edu The Small Business and Self-Employment Service provides information, counseling and referrals about self-employment and small business ownership opportunities for people with disabilities. www.jan.wvu.edu/ssbes/

- Rural Facts - Paychecks and SSI Benefits, an overview for students receiving SSI and Medicaid. Includes information on the PASS Plan. The Rural Institute at: http://ruralinstitute.umt.edu or 406-243-5467 Voice/TTY. Cary Griffin is the Director of Special Projects with the Rural Institute at the University of Montana. His next book, co-written with Dave Hammis, is a self-employment manual for transition age youth and adults to be published by Brookes in 2002. He speaks internationally and can be reached at cgriffin@selway.umt.edu.

- A Plan for Achieving Self-Support (PASS) allows a person with a disability to set aside income and/or resources for a specific period of time to realize a work goal. Any person who receives SSI benefits, or receives SSDI and could qualify for SSI, may be able to have a plan. There is no limit to the number of successful PASS plans a person may receive in a lifetime.

You may find additional information by going to Social Security Administration web page: www.ssa.gov or go directly to the SSA site on Plan for Achieving Self-Support:

http://www.ssa.gov/work/ResourcesToolkit/pass.html

- New Publication on Self-employment
  - No Lone Wolves: Partnering for Self-Employment Success, is a small book that provides 11 brief profiles of business owners with disabilities succeeding in Montana. Featured enterprises range from Edelen’s Glass business (that grossed $750,000 last year!), to a retail store operated on a Reservation, to a vending machine operation, and a new beef Jerky company. This publication is a valuable resource for people with disabilities contemplating business start-ups. Send $15 to Nancy Maxson, Rural Institute, 634 Eddy St., University of Montana, Missoula, MT 59812
  - More info: cgriffin@selway.umt.edu

New Employment Information Web Sites

The Institute for Community Inclusion is pleased to announce two new web sites:

1. http://www.onestops.info - The web site for the new National Center on Workforce and Disability, a USDOL funded training and technical assistance center for One-Stops, Workforce Boards, and workforce development. This site is chock full of information on employment of people with disabilities, including a brand new publication on Ticket to Work and One-Stops. On this site you can also sign up for NCWDs bi-weekly e-newsletter, which we promise will be short, sweet, and full of useful information.

2. http://www.serviceandinclusion.org - The web site of the new National Service Inclusion Project (NSIP), the Corporation for the National and Community Service (Corporation) training and technical assistance provider. NSIP builds connections between disability organizations and state commissions, offices, and service programs. The goal is to better include people with disabilities in national service programs. The National Service Inclusion project is a cooperative agreement between The Corporation for National and Community Service, collaborative effort of the Institute for Community Inclusion at UMass Boston, and the Association of University Centers on Disabilities.

National Collaborative on Workforce and Disability for Youth http://www.ncwd-youth.info/ is the web site for the USDOL funded consortium of organizations that offers comprehensive expertise in disability, education, employment and workforce development issues. They assist state and local workforce development systems to integrate youth with disabilities into workforce investment service strategies.
Harvard University preferred the results-based payment system to a fee-for-service system.

Percent of TANF recipients who have mental health problems: 25-33%

Percent of those who have left TANF, are not working, and have mental health problems: 20%

Reincarceration rate among women at Bedford Hills Correctional Facility (NY) who participated in the prison college program: 7.7%

Reincarceration rate among women who did not participate in the college program: 29.9%

--source: http://www.changeminds.ws/brochure/, citing a 1997-2000 study by the Graduate Center of the City University of New York and the NY State Dept. of Correctional Services

"About 20 percent of young black men between the ages of 16 and 24 are neither in school, nor working--compared to only 9 percent of young white men. Despite the 'economic boom' of the nineties, this percentage has not fallen substantially over the last ten years."