

**Fiscal Year 2007 Monitoring Report
on the Vocational Rehabilitation and
Independent Living Programs in the
State of
Rhode Island**



**U.S. Department of Education
Office of Special Education and
Rehabilitative Services
Rehabilitation Services Administration
September 7, 2007**

CONTENTS

	PAGE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
INTRODUCTION.....	5
CHAPTER 1: REVIEW PROCESS.....	7
CHAPTER 2: VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AND SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS.....	9
CHAPTER 3: FISCAL REVIEW OF THE VR PROGRAM.....	20
CHAPTER 4: INDEPENDENT LIVING PROGRAM.....	25
CHAPTER 5: INDEPENDENT LIVING FOR OLDER BLIND PROGRAM.....	27
CHAPTER 6: STATUS OF ISSUES RAISED IN PREVIOUS REVIEWS.....	29
CHAPTER 7: SUMMARY CONCLUSION.....	30
APPENDIX: DATA TABLES	37

Executive Summary

The Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) reviewed the performance of the following programs of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended (the Act) in the state of Rhode Island (RI):

- the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) Services Program, established under Title I;
- the Supported Employment (SE) Services Program, established under Title VI, Part B;
- the Independent Living (IL) Services Program, authorized under Title VII, Part B; and
- the Independent Living Services Program for Older Individuals Who Are Blind (OIB), established under Title VII, Chapter 2.

In RI the Office of Rehabilitation Services (ORS) is the agency responsible for administering the VR, SE, and OIB programs. ORS and the Statewide Independent Living Council (SILC) jointly administer the IL program under Title VII, part B.

RSA's review began in the fall of 2006 and ended in the summer of 2007. During this time, RSA's RI state team:

- gathered and reviewed information regarding each programs' performance;
- identified a wide range of VR and IL stakeholders and invited them to provide input into the review process;
- conducted two on-site visits, and held multiple discussions with state agency staff, State Rehabilitation Council (SRC) members, SILC members, and stakeholders to share information, identify promising practices, and discuss areas for improvement;
- provided technical assistance (TA);
- worked with ORS and stakeholders to develop goals, strategies, and evaluation methods to address performance and compliance issues; and
- identified the TA that RSA would provide to help improve program performance.

As a result of the review, RSA:

- identified promising practices;
- identified performance issues;
- worked with ORS to develop performance goals and strategies related to selected issues;
- identified the TA that it would provide to assist the agency to achieve the goals identified as a result of the review;

- made recommendations in the area of program improvement; and
- identified potential issues for further review.

ORS has the following strengths in the VR, SE, IL, and OIB programs:

- leadership and dedicated staff;
- collaboration with key partners;
- statewide presence through netWORKri centers;
- statewide cooperative partnerships in all school districts;
- transition services to youths;
- working with the CILs to coordinate VR and IL services; and
- contracting with a vendor to evaluate the OIB program.

ORS faces the following challenges in the VR, SE, IL, and OIB programs:

- providing individuals with disabilities services geared toward high quality employment outcomes with wages comparable to the RI state hourly wage;
- purchasing and implementing a computerized case management system;
- developing more meaningful employment opportunities for individuals who are blind and visually impaired;
- solidifying cooperation among ORS, the SILC, and the CILs; and
- limited funding sources for the OIB program.

ORS, RSA, and their stakeholders developed strategies to achieve the following goals:

- improve the quality of employment outcomes;
- improve the rehabilitation rate for transitioning youths;
- develop and implement a comprehensive quality assurance and improvement system;
- accurately report administrative costs;
- insure fiscal accountability by properly allocating indirect costs;
- understand roles and responsibilities of all partners in the IL programs; and
- secure new sources of funding and more effective ways to coordinate and provide OIB services.

Introduction

Section 107 of the Act requires the Commissioner of the RSA to conduct annual reviews and periodic on-site monitoring of programs authorized under Title I of the Act to determine whether a state vocational rehabilitation (VR) agency is complying substantially with the provisions of its State Plan under section 101 of the Act and with the evaluation standards and performance indicators established under section 106. In addition, the Commissioner must assess the degree to which VR agencies are complying with the assurances made in the Supplement for Supported Employment under Title VI of the Act and programs offered under Title VII of the Act are substantially complying with their respective state plan assurances and program requirements.

In order to fulfill its monitoring responsibilities, RSA:

- reviews the state agency's performance in assisting eligible individuals with disabilities to achieve high-quality employment and independent living outcomes;
- develops, jointly with the state agency, performance and compliance goals as well as strategies to achieve those goals; and
- provides TA to the state agency in order to improve its performance, meet its goals, and fulfill its state plan assurances.

Scope of the Review

RSA reviewed the performance of the following programs of the Act:

- the VR Services Program, established under Title I;
- the SE Services Program, established under Title VI, Part B;
- the IL Services Program, authorized under Title VII, Part B; and
- the OIB, established under Title VII, Chapter 2.

RI Administration of the VR, SE, IL, and OIB Programs

The RI Department of Human Services (DHS) is the designated state agency that administers the ORS. ORS is the designated state unit in RI for providing VR services to all eligible individuals with disabilities. ORS is comprised of the VR Services Program, the SE Services Program, the Services for the Blind and Visually Impaired Program, the Disability Determination Service, the Assistive Technology Access Partnership Program, the IL Services Program, and the OIB Services Program.

RSA also reviewed ORS' progress on the agency's Corrective Action Plan (CAP) that was established as a result of findings from RSA's FY 2004 Section 107 monitoring review.

For the four programs listed above, this report describes RSA's review of ORS, provides information on the agency's performance, identifies promising practices, identifies performance and compliance issues, and identifies the related goals, strategies, and TA that RSA will provide to ORS to address each of the issues identified during the review.

Appreciation

RSA wishes to express appreciation to the representatives of the RI DHS, the ORS, the SRC, the SILC, and the stakeholders who assisted the RSA monitoring team in the review of ORS.

Chapter I: RSA's Review Process

Data Used During the Review

RSA's data collections are finalized and available at different times throughout the year. During this review, RSA and the state agency used the most recent data that was available from the FY 2005 and FY 2006 collections. As a result, this report cites data from FY 2005 and FY 2006.

Review Process Activities

During the review process RSA:

- gathered and reviewed information regarding ORS' performance;
- identified a wide range of VR and IL stakeholders and invited them to provide input into the review process;
- conducted two on-site visits, and held multiple discussions with state agency staff, SRC members, SILC members, and stakeholders to share information;
- identified promising practices and areas for improvement;
- provided TA to ORS;
- worked with ORS to develop goals, strategies, and evaluation methods to address performance and compliance issues;
- made recommendations to ORS on areas of program improvement;
- identified potential issues for further review; and
- identified the TA that RSA would provide to help ORS improve its performance.

RSA RI State Team Review Participants

Members of RSA's RI state team included representatives from each of RSA's State Monitoring and Program Improvement Division's five functional units. The RSA RI state team was led by RSA's state liaison to RI, Joseph Doney (VR unit), and was composed of the following RSA RI team members: Thomas Kelley (IL unit), Regina Luster (fiscal unit), Charles Sadler (TA unit), and Yann-Yann Shieh (data unit).

Information Gathering

During FY 2007, RSA began its review of ORS by analyzing information including, but not limited to, RSA's various data collections, ORS' VR and IL state plans, and ORS' SRC's Annual Report. After completing its internal review, the RSA RI state team carried out the following information gathering activities with ORS and stakeholders in order to gain a greater understanding of ORS' strengths and challenges:

- conducted a series of individual teleconferences with the ORS management team as well as stakeholders;
- conducted five teleconferences with the ORS management;
- held two teleconferences with stakeholders;
- conducted two on-site monitoring visits: the first monitoring visit was conducted from April 24 through April 26, 2007 and the second monitoring visit was conducted June 18 through June 22, 2007; and
- held two on-site meetings focused on the SRC, services to individuals who are blind or visually impaired, and IL services.

Chapter 2: Vocational Rehabilitation and Supported Employment Programs

Program Organization

ORS coordinates VR and SE services through one central office located in Providence. ORS is a partner in the RI One-Stop System, netWORKri. Through this partnership, ORS provides VR and SE services at the six one-stop centers statewide. At the time of the review, ORS is staffed by 84 full-time equivalent (FTE) positions in the VR program, which includes 41 VR counselors. These VR counselors carry an average caseload of 144 individuals with disabilities. ORS has four vacancies for VR counselors and two vacancies for supervisors.

ORS has been unable to serve all individuals with disabilities eligible for the VR and SE programs in RI since 1992. ORS implemented an order of selection (OOS) for services as required under the Act in 1992 due to increases in the demand for VR and SE services, decreases in state and federal funding, and staff vacancies due to retirements, promotions, and other personnel actions. ORS is currently serving eligible individuals in two priority categories under the OOS.

Table 1 provides fiscal and program data for FYs 2002 through 2006. These data provide an overview of the VR program's costs, outcomes, and efficiency. The table identifies the amount of funds used by the agency, the number of individuals who applied, and the number who received services. It also provides information about the quality of the agency's employment outcomes and its transition services.

**Table 1
Performance Measures by Year**

RHODE ISLAND	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Total funds used	\$11,594,068	\$11,250,090	\$11,714,369	\$11,432,934	\$13,050,837
Individuals served during year	3,525	3,774	3,805	3,840	4,099
Applicants	2,319	2,110	2,350	2,241	2,322
Closed after receiving services	736	1,020	1,089	1,089	1,231
Closed with employment outcomes	571	605	635	700	736
Employment outcomes without supports in an integrated setting	394	461	451	514	567

RHODE ISLAND	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Average cost per individual served	\$3,289.10	\$2,980.95	\$3,078.68	\$2,977.33	\$3,183.91
Average cost per employment outcome	\$20,304.85	\$18,595.19	\$18,447.83	\$16,332.76	\$17,732.12
Employment outcomes per \$million spent	49.25	53.78	54.21	61.23	56.39
Competitive employment outcomes per \$million spent	44.16	51.02	49.26	55.45	52.33
Average hourly earnings for paid employment outcomes	\$9.15	\$9.87	\$9.83	\$9.80	\$10.17
Average state hourly earnings	\$16.74	\$17.50	\$17.93	\$18.49	\$19.27
Average hours worked per week for paid employment outcomes	26.66	27.10	27.11	27.51	28.31
Percent of transition age served to total served	26.63	21.18	21.12	26.91	28.68
Employment rate for transition age served	74.49	66.67	59.57	64.51	59.49
Average time between application and closure (in months) for individuals with successful paid employment outcomes	34.50	33.00	26.70	26.10	29.00
Average number of individuals served per total staff	45.78	51.00	49.42	49.87	51.24

ORS and the RSA RI team conducted a series of in-depth data analyses on performance measures related to Table 1. These analyses were incorporated into discussions about trends, outcomes, disability populations, and service programs throughout the course of the review process. The results of these analyses were used to formulate the goals and strategies developed by ORS and RSA.

These data tables are in the appendix of this report. ORS and RSA analyzed:

- individuals with disabilities served and rehabilitation rate broken down by disability;

- average hourly earnings and hours worked per week for paid jobs broken down by disability;
- employment status at closures broken down by disability;
- transition youths served and rehabilitation rate broken down by disability;
- transition youths' average hourly earnings and hours worked per week for paid jobs broken down by disability; and
- transition youths receiving post-secondary education services in the VR program broken down by disability.

Provision of Technical Assistance to the ORS VR and SE Programs During the Review Process

RSA provided TA to ORS in a number of VR and SE program areas during the review process. RSA:

- interpreted and provided TA on VR, SE, and IL regulations;
- provided specific regulatory interpretations pertaining to privatization and electronic signatures;
- presented, analyzed, and discussed specialized data analyses derived from agency-submitted data;
- provided a general overview of quality assurance activities and techniques and methods to develop a coordinated quality assurance program that involves staff, stakeholders, individuals with disabilities, and community partners;
- assessed service provider contracting processes;
- reviewed the memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the Veterans Administration and provided TA on implementing the agreement;
- verified the agency's RSA-911 case record data for FY 2004, FY 2005, and FY 2006;
- provided feedback regarding automated case management systems; and
- provided training on how to use RSA's Management Information System (MIS).

Promising VR and SE Practices Identified by ORS and Stakeholders During the Review Process

RSA's review process solicited input from ORS and stakeholders about promising practices. The following promising practices were identified:

1. "Shared Youth Vision Federal Collaborative Partnership"

ORS is a partner in a US Department of Labor systems change grant entitled "Shared Youth Vision Federal Collaborative Partnership." This program combines the local services of the Social Security Administration, the Department of Education, the Department of Labor, the Department of Housing and Urban

Development, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Division of Children, Youth and Families to serve disadvantaged youths that have been unsuccessful in school systems. The purpose of this systems change grant is to create state teams that will undertake strategic planning activities to develop a system that will improve services to youths by leveraging resources, aligning policy, and other activities. ORS anticipates serving 50 disadvantaged youths with disabilities in its initial year of the project.

2. Statewide Partnerships Leveraging Resources and Maximizing Access to Services for Transitioning Youths

ORS initiated its first project to serve youths in RI in 1962 and ORS believes it has successfully created a culture that provides improved services to youths with disabilities. ORS has maximized the required MOU between the RI Department of Education (RIDE) and the DHS/ORS to clarify the role of each partner in fostering a seamless service delivery system intended to achieve successful employment outcomes. The MOU expands on the requirements in the Act and delineates the collaborative services intended to assist students, parents, school personnel, public agencies, and private service agencies responsible for the effective delivery of transition services. A Collaborative Services Chart, included in the MOU, defines the roles and responsibilities of the local education agencies, ORS, and community services agencies in the delivery of assessments, career development, community living, assistive technology, auxiliary aid, medical, transportation, and case management services.

Under the MOU, five RI Regional Transitional Centers provide direct technical support, vocational evaluations, training and information on transition services to school personnel in each region statewide. The centers assist students with their personal career goals through career counseling, vocational testing and community work experiences.

RI Transition Academies, in contrast to the Transition Centers, offers ORS eligible youths the opportunity to complete their high school education on a college campus and/or in various employment and community settings. The academies provide youths with classroom and community instruction in academics, independent living, community mobility, self-advocacy, and behavior skills required for seeking, obtaining and maintaining employment. The ORS VR counselors in each school district serve as the single point of contact with the primary responsibility of coordinating the community services between school staff, students, families, and the academies.

Students with disabilities also benefit from social security benefits counseling that occurs early in the rehabilitation process so the youths with disabilities and their families are educated in the impacts of work on benefits. The Training Supervisor coordinates this service in partnership with the Social Security Administration.

VR and SE Issues Identified by ORS and Stakeholders During the Review Process

RSA's review process solicited input from ORS and stakeholders about VR and SE performance and compliance issues. The following issues were identified:

- average hourly wages for individuals with disabilities achieving a competitive employment outcome compared to the average state hourly wage have trended downward over the past five years;
- outcomes for individuals with disabilities achieving homemaker outcomes are 4.1 percent higher than the national average;
- the need to improve the quality of employment outcomes;
- average cost spent per employment outcome is 22 percent lower than the national average;
- number of individuals with disabilities receiving postsecondary services is low compared to the national average;
- average number of individuals with disabilities served per staff is higher compared to the national average;
- expanding the scope of the quality assurance system; and
- the need to automate and computerize ORS' case management system.

Following compilation and discussion of these issues, RSA worked with ORS to address as many of these issues as possible either directly or by consolidating the issue into a broader issue area.

VR and SE Performance Issues, Goals, Strategies, and Technical Assistance

RSA and ORS agreed on the following performance goals, strategies to achieve those goals, and TA that RSA would provide to assist ORS achieve each goal. These goals and strategies will be considered for inclusion in ORS' FY 2009 state plan and if they are included, progress on achieving these goals will be reported in ORS' FY 2010 annual state plan submission.

1. Employment Outcomes

Issue: ORS and its stakeholders indicated an inconsistency in job development services delivered to individuals with disabilities in RI. ORS contracts out to vendors most of the job development in RI, but does not provide vendors with training and/or education geared toward job development. All vendors have an opportunity to participate in training programs related to job development through the New England Rehabilitation Continuing Education Program (NERCEP) and the Sherlock Center at Rhode Island College. Vendors do a good job of training individuals with disabilities in occupational skills but vendors lack the ability to provide training-related employment after the occupational training. At the point of referral to vendors for job development, the IPE goal is shared as part of the

referring information with specific time frames, and the employment outcome as a measurement of success.

SE services are vended by ORS and stakeholders indicated that the vendor payment system is inconsistent and confusing to bill against. Some vendors expressed a reluctance to work with ORS' eligible individuals with disabilities because the billing guidelines for job coaching services resembled those of the Division of Development Disabilities. In addition, ORS indicated that there are a limited number of SE vendors in RI.

The ratio of average hourly wage to average state hourly wage declined beginning in FY 2001 and continued through FY 2006 (see Table 5 in the Appendix). The average hours worked per week for paid employment outcomes was 16 percent lower than the national average (see Table 6 in the Appendix). In FY 2005, 54.5 percent of ORS' employment outcomes were without supports in an integrated setting, which was 15 percent lower than the national average (see Table 6 in the Appendix).

VR program Performance Indicator for 1.5 indicates the average hourly wage earned by individuals achieving employment outcomes who earned at least minimum wage as a ratio to the state average hourly wage earned by all workers with earnings in RI. The minimum performance level for general and combined state VR agencies is a ratio of 0.52. ORS' performance on Indicator 1.5 gradually declined from 0.57 in FY 2003 to 0.53 in FY 2006 (see Table 5 in the Appendix). ORS is concerned about its declining performance on Indicator 1.5 and the impact of low wages on the lives of individuals with disabilities.

ORS and its stakeholders noted that ORS achieves a limited number of competitive employment outcomes in its blind and visually impaired program. Upon review, RSA found that in FY 2005 the percent of homemaker outcomes was 6.43 percent of the total agency as compared to the national average of 2.25 percent.¹ During FYs 2004 – 2006, 208 individuals with visual impairments achieved employment outcomes. One hundred thirty-four individuals with visual impairments, or 66 percent, achieved homemaker outcomes (see Table 7 in the Appendix).

Stakeholders and ORS indicated difficulties managing the BEP in RI due to limited resources, a consistent pool of qualified individuals with disabilities, and a need to revise policies and procedures. RSA found that between FY 2004 and FY 2006, ORS' BEP had five individuals with disabilities achieve employment in their own businesses in RI (see Table 7 in the Appendix).

RSA found that the overall rehabilitation rate dropped from 64.28 percent in FY 2005 to 59.79 percent in FY 2006 (see Table 8 in the Appendix). Upon further analysis, it was found that the rehabilitation rate for consumers with

¹ RSA Annual Review Report, FY 2005, table 8.

communicative impairments rose slightly while the rate for visual impairments, physical disorders, cognitive impairments, and mental and emotional disabilities decreased. Further, consumers with physical disorders tended to have lower rehabilitation rates than other disability populations (see Table 8 in the Appendix).

ORS' stakeholders indicated that VR counselor caseloads are extremely high, decreasing the amount of time staff spend rehabilitating individuals with disabilities. Table 1 indicates that the average number of individuals with disabilities served per total staff has increased consistently from FY 2004 through FY 2006. In FY 2005, ORS' average number of individuals served per total staff was 49.87 as compared to the national average for general and combined agencies of 41.84 or 16 percent higher than the national average for general and combined agencies.²

Stakeholders indicated that diversity within the ORS staff was minimal, noting one Spanish speaking VR counselor. ORS indicated the RI state budget and personnel processes contributed to delays in hiring replacement staff. The RI House and Senate have proposed licensing legislation that may impact the future hiring of qualified rehabilitation personnel.³ Additionally, ORS estimated that over the next five years, approximately 20 professional staff would be eligible for retirement. These situations will create opportunities for ORS to recruit, hire, and train professional staff reflecting RI's minority populations.

Goal: Improve the quality of competitive employment outcomes.

Strategies:

1. Focus staff education and training on competitive, career-oriented employment outcomes.
2. Work with vendors to develop clear, concise guidelines for contracting services.
3. Strengthen working relationships with vendors to enhance VR service delivery.
4. Provide vendors with training seminars related to employment outcomes and increasing consumer earnings;
5. Increase incentives to job placement providers to place VR participants in employment.
6. Investigate and evaluate alternative funding sources.
7. Develop a timeline and a plan to decrease homemaker outcomes.
8. Update and implement BEP program policies.
9. Recruit, hire, and retain qualified rehabilitation staff.

² RSA Annual Review Report, FY 2005, tables 1, 2, and 19.

³ RI House Bill 5021, "An Act Relating to Health and Safety – Licensing of Rehabilitation Counselors" and RI Senate Bill 132, "An Act Relating to Business and Professionals – Licensing of Rehabilitation Counselors".

10. Increase diversity within professional staff.

Methods of Evaluation:

1. Increases in the average hourly wages of consumers closed with competitive employment outcomes.
2. Improved performance on Standard & Indicator 1.5.
3. Increases in the rehabilitation rate in FY 2008, FY 2009, and FY 2010.
4. Decreases in the number of individuals with disabilities achieving homemaker outcomes.
5. Increased stability in the BEP following revision of program policies and procedures.
6. Review progress filling all FTE vacancies.
7. Review of progress in hiring diverse professional staff.

Technical Assistance:

1. Provide information and TA on federal grant programs to expand services, i.e., Family Independence Program/Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.
2. Provide TA on high-performing BEP practices, policies, and procedures.
3. Provide TA and information on state agencies that have lowered the number of individuals with disabilities achieving homemaker outcomes.
4. Provide TA on the effects of RI legislation geared toward licensing of VR counselors.
5. Provide TA on the use of internships for recruitment purposes.

2. Transition Services

Issue: ORS and its stakeholders indicated that transition services in RI are efficiently coordinated through an MOU with the RIDE. This MOU supports transition services throughout the state and ORS has staff on-site at all schools to provide transition services. However, stakeholders noted that individuals with disabilities are not encouraged to pursue postsecondary education or advanced degrees by ORS' VR counselors. Stakeholders noted that increases in average hourly wages result from employment in higher paying occupations, often as a result of the provision of postsecondary education services. Illustrated in Table 9, of the 189 transition age youths with employment outcomes in FY 2005, 21 individuals with disabilities, or 11.1 percent, received postsecondary services. Comparatively, the national average for transition age youths with employment outcomes in FY 2005 for general and combined agencies was 19.6 percent.

ORS submitted data from FY 2002 through FY 2006 indicates that the percent of transition age youths served has increased slightly since FY 2004 (see Table 1). The rehabilitation rate dropped from 64.51 percent in FY 2005 to 59.49 percent in FY 2006. Further, the rehabilitation rate fluctuated from 58.31 percent in FY 2004 to 64.28 percent in FY 2005 to 59.79 percent in FY 2006. This fluctuation is comparable to the overall rehabilitation rate reported for non-transition age consumers for the same period. The reasons for this fluctuation are unknown but ORS and RSA discussed data collection and study methods for future analysis of this issue.

Goal: Improve the rehabilitation rate of transitioning youths.

Strategies:

1. Increase and strengthen transition services to youths who are exploring their career options.
2. Train VR staff to use postsecondary education services for transition age youths when appropriate.
3. Develop a longitudinal data tool to effectively measure the impact of postsecondary education services.
4. Maximize access to postsecondary education services for transition age youths.

Methods of Evaluation:

1. Increases in the number of transition age youths receiving postsecondary education services.
2. Increases in the average hourly wages of transition age youths achieving competitive employment outcomes.
3. Improvements in the rehabilitation rate of transitioning youths.

Technical Assistance: RSA will provide TA resources on samples and designs for longitudinal data set development that ORS can use to analyze the impact of postsecondary education services.

3. Quality Assurance and Improvement

Issue: ORS and its stakeholders indicated that the current quality assurance system is predicated on RSA's previous monitoring system. It focuses solely on the service record review process and compliance with federal requirements. The ORS quality assurance system measures case file documentation and does not align strategic goals and priorities with leadership and management goals.

ORS does not assign the full-time responsibility of quality assurance to one or more staff persons due to limited staff resources. General oversight of the quality

assurance process is the responsibility of the assistant administrator who has multiple programmatic, management, and administrative roles.

Although ORS conducted comprehensive in-depth customer satisfaction surveys in 2002 and 2004, ORS does not obtain regular feedback from individuals with disabilities about their satisfaction with VR programs.

Goal: Develop and implement a comprehensive quality assurance and improvement system that will assist ORS in improving the VR program.

Strategies:

1. Develop a comprehensive, integrated, and systematic quality assurance system.
2. Develop a mechanism for tracking strategic goals and objectives through the system.
3. Purchase and implement an automated case management system;
4. Conduct a comprehensive statewide assessment that meets the regulatory requirements at 34 CFR 361.29.
5. Develop measurable goals.

Methods of Evaluation:

1. Development and implementation of a comprehensive quality assurance system that is tied into ORS strategic goals and objectives.
2. Purchase and implementation of an automated case management system.
3. Conducts a comprehensive statewide assessment that meets the regulatory requirements at 34 CFR 361.29.
4. Development of measurable state plan objectives.

Technical Assistance:

1. Provide TA resources and examples of promising practices in quality assurance.
2. Provide TA resources and promising practices that integrate various reporting mechanisms into an overall quality assurance system.
3. Provide TA resources and samples of effective comprehensive statewide assessments.
4. Discuss with ORS management and the SRC the relationship between comprehensive statewide assessment and the development of measurable state goals.

VR and SE Issues for Further Review

RSA plans on conducting further review of the following VR and SE issues:

1. During the review, ORS brought to RSA's attention the Governor's 2008 budget, which proposed cost savings by privatizing certain state functions. Although the initiative was not favorably considered by the legislature, RSA and ORS discussed the potential impact of privatization on the VR program. As a result, RSA agreed to monitor the progress of the initiative with respect to the VR program and assist the agency as needed.
2. An MOU between ORS and the Veterans Administration for returning war veterans was signed in December, 2005. The MOU is gradually being implemented due to staff turnover at the Veterans Administration. RSA will continue to follow up with ORS on the implementation of this MOU and provide information on promising practices from other state agencies.
3. ORS and its stakeholders expressed a future interest in developing performance-based contracts with vendors for the purpose of increasing accountability. RSA will provide information on promising practices from other state agencies and TA if necessary.
4. ORS indicated an interest in developing a staff succession-plan as a long-term strategic objective. RSA will provide resources and information on promising practices from other state agencies.
5. At the time of the review, the RI House and Senate were reviewing pending legislation on two bills that initiate licensing for VR counselors. If enacted, these bills could potentially impact ORS' ability to hire and retain qualified rehabilitation personnel that meet the requirements in the Act for the comprehensive system of personnel development (CSPD). Therefore, RSA will review these bills and provide input and TA to the agency with respect to their potential impact on the CSPD requirements.

Chapter 3: Fiscal Review of the VR Program

RSA reviewed ORS' fiscal management of the VR program. During the review RSA provided TA to the state agency to improve its fiscal management and identified areas for improvement. RSA reviewed the general effectiveness of the agency's cost and financial controls, internal processes for the expenditure of funds, use of appropriate accounting practices, and financial management systems.

The data in Table 2, taken from fiscal reports submitted by the state agencies, shows the overall fiscal performance of the agency. The data related to matching requirements are taken from the fourth quarter of the respective fiscal year's SF-269 report. The maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement data are taken from the final SF-269 report of the fiscal year (two years prior to the fiscal year to which it is compared). Fiscal data related to administration, total expenditures, and administrative cost percentages are taken from the RSA-2.

Table 2
Fiscal Data for ORS for FY 2002 through FY 2006

Rhode Island (C)					
Fiscal Year	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Grant Amount	9,053,337	9,218,477	9,730,057	9,895,114	9,972,213
Required Match	2,450,268	2,494,963	2,633,421	2,678,093	2,698,960
Federal Expenditures	6,194,552	6,052,069	5,154,097	3,493,181	3,455,296
Actual Match	2,451,796	2,494,963	2,634,421	2,678,093	2,698,960
Over (Under) Match	1,528	0	1,000	0	0
Carryover	2,858,785	3,166,408	4,575,960	6,401,933	6,516,917
Program Income	241,882	205,888	23,779	107,167	196,900
Maintenance of Effort (MOE)	2,321,259	2,370,810	2,450,268	2,494,963	2,633,426
Administrative Costs	2,724,172	2,744,984	2,700,595	2,278,571	2,495,431
Total Expenditures	11,594,068	11,250,090	11,714,369	11,432,934	13,050,837
Percent Admin Costs to Total Expenditures	23.50%	24.40%	23.05%	19.93%	19.12%

Explanations Applicable to the Fiscal Profile Table

Grant Amount: The amounts shown represent the final award for each fiscal year, and reflect any adjustments for MOE penalties, reductions for grant funds voluntarily relinquished through the reallocation process, or additional grant funds received through the reallocation process.

Match (Non-Federal Expenditures): The non-federal share of expenditures in the Basic Support Program, other than for the construction of a facility related to a

community rehabilitation program, was established in the 1992 Amendments to the Rehabilitation Act at 21.3 percent. As such, a *minimum* of 21.3 percent of the total allowable program costs charged to each year's grant must come from non-federal expenditures from allowable sources as defined in program and administrative regulations governing the VR Program. (34 CFR 361.60(a) and (b); 34 CFR 80.24)

In reviewing compliance with this requirement, RSA examined the appropriateness of the sources of funds used as match in the VR Program, the amount of funds used as match from appropriate sources, and the projected amount of state appropriated funds available for match in each federal fiscal year. The accuracy of expenditure information previously reported in financial and program reports submitted to RSA was also reviewed.

Carryover: Federal funds appropriated for a fiscal year remain available for obligation in the succeeding fiscal year only to the extent that the VR agency met the matching requirement for those federal funds by September 30 of the year of appropriation. (34 CFR 361.64(b)) Either expending or obligating the non-federal share of program expenditures by this deadline may meet this carryover requirement.

In reviewing compliance with the carryover requirement, RSA examined documentation supporting expenditure and unliquidated obligation information previously reported to RSA to substantiate the extent to which the state was entitled to use any federal funds remaining at the end of the fiscal year for which the funds were appropriated.

Program Income: Program income means gross income received by the state that is directly generated by an activity supported under a federal grant program. Sources of state VR program income include, but are not limited to, payments from the Social Security Administration for rehabilitating Social Security beneficiaries, payments received from workers' compensation funds, fees for services to defray part or all of the costs of services provided to particular individuals, and income generated by a state-operated community rehabilitation program. Program income earned (received) in one fiscal year can be carried over and obligated in the following fiscal year regardless of whether the agency carries over federal grant funds. Grantees may also transfer program income received from the Social Security Administration for rehabilitating Social Security beneficiaries to other formula programs funded under the Act to expand services under these programs.

In reviewing program income, RSA analyzed the total amount (as compared to the total percentage of income earned by all VR agencies and comparable/like VR agencies), sources, and use of generated income.

Maintenance of Effort (MOE): The 1992 Amendments revised the requirements in section 111(a)(2)(B)(ii) of the Act with respect to maintenance of effort provisions. Effective federal FY 1993 and each federal fiscal year thereafter, the maintenance of effort level is based on state expenditures under the title I State plan from non-federal sources for the federal fiscal year two years earlier. States must meet this prior year expenditure level to avoid monetary sanctions outlined in 34 CFR 361.62(a)(1). The match and maintenance of effort requirements are two separate requirements. Each must be met by the state.

In reviewing compliance with this requirement, RSA examined documentation supporting fiscal year-end and final non-federal expenditures previously reported for each grant year.

Administrative Costs: Administrative costs means expenditures incurred in the performance of administrative functions including expenses related to program planning, development, monitoring and evaluation. More detail related to expenditures that should be classified as administrative costs is found in VR Program regulations at 34 CFR 361.5(b)(2).

Provision of Technical Assistance During the Review Process

RSA provided TA to ORS in a number of fiscal areas during the review process. RSA:

- after providing a synopsis of each requirement, shared its assessment of the agency's compliance with specific financial requirements, i.e., match, MOE, carryover, reallotment, program income, liquidation of outstanding obligations and grant closeout;
- reviewed administrative costs procedures;
- analyzed sufficiency of FY 2007 and FY 2008 matching resources;
- discussed allowed ability of utilizing VR Program funds to establish a position for a Benefits Counselor and paying student stipends;
- reviewed documentation requirements for program income transferred to other formula grant programs and reporting additional in-service training expenditures on Financial Status Reports for the VR Program;
- discussed strategies to utilize the considerable federal carryover and growing program income receipts, and obtaining match for additional federal funds received through the reallotment process;
- addressed cash management concerns and internal issues affecting the drawdown of VR Program funds;
- reviewed with financial staff the status of FY 2002 through FY 2007 financial reports entered into RSA's MIS; and
- discussed allowable innovation and expansion (I&E) authority expenditures, e.g., using VR Program funds to support the funding of the SRC and the SILC's resource plan.

Fiscal Issues, Goals, Strategies, and Technical Assistance

1. Administrative Costs

Issue: RSA examined the reporting of ORS' VR program administrative costs. RSA's analysis of supporting documentation disclosed that non-administrative or program costs were erroneously reported in this category. RSA found a wide variance between ORS' administrative costs and those reported by other VR agencies. Specifically, data reported in the RSA-2 for FY 2006 indicates that ORS' administrative costs represented 19.12 percent of the total expenditures compared with 9.60 percent nationally. Further analysis indicated that ORS' administrative costs have consistently been high during the last four years, ranging from 24.40 percent in FY 2003 to 19.12 percent in FY 2006. RSA found discrepancies in ORS' reporting of administrative costs. ORS indicated that the discrepancies were due to recent staff turnover in the fiscal management department. The newly appointed financial management staff was not fully knowledgeable in the RSA reporting requirements.

Goal: ORS will accurately report administrative costs on the RSA-2 (Annual Vocational Rehabilitation Program/Cost Report).

Strategies:

1. Review and comply with the instructions for the completion of the RSA-2 report and the definition of administrative costs found in 34 CFR 361.50.
2. Discuss with RSA any report areas requiring further guidance or TA.
3. Manage internal mechanisms to accurately capture expenditures in designated report categories.
4. Revise administrative expenditures previously reported for FY 2007 after RSA review and approval.

Method of Evaluation: ORS will be successful if it submits an accurate RSA-2 report.

Technical Assistance: RSA will provide TA related to the completion of the RSA-2 Report.

2. Cost Allocation

Issue: ORS and RSA reviewed the proper allocation of indirect costs at all levels of the VR program. ORS and RSA reviewed the financial reports submitted by ORS and addressed issues surrounding program income, cash management, program carryover, training expenditures, and I&E. RSA found discrepancies in indirect costs submitted by ORS due to staff turnover in the fiscal management department. Newly appointed financial management staff was not fully knowledgeable in the RSA reporting requirements.

Goal: ORS will insure fiscal accountability by properly allocating statewide and departmental/division indirect costs to RSA's formula grant program.

Strategies:

1. Arrange a meeting with staff from ORS, RSA and the U.S. Department of Education's Indirect Cost Group to discuss federal requirements and review ORS' existing documentation supporting the charging of indirect costs to RSA's formula grant programs.
2. Revise the current methodology to ensure compliance with federal requirements.
3. Obtain cognizant agency approval of revised cost allocation methodology.

Method of Evaluation: ORS will be successful if it maintains fiscal accountability by properly allocating all indirect costs.

Technical Assistance: RSA and the Indirect Cost Group staff will provide TA related to the charging of indirect costs to RSA-funded programs.

Fiscal Issues for Further Review

ORS indicated an interested in TA on fiscal management processes geared toward strategic planning. RSA will assist ORS with TA in fiscal strategies related to the strategic planning process when requested.

Chapter 4: IL Program

Program Organization

ORS provides IL services to individuals with significant disabilities through Part B federal funds and state matching funds to both CILs in the state. Each of the centers covers all of the five counties in the state and provides the IL services primarily at the consumers' homes. This approach provides consumers with flexibility and choice in accessing needed services. In addition, ORS provides federal funds to the SILC.

Table 3
IL Sources and Amounts of Funding (FY 2006)

	Amounts of Funding
Part B Funds	301,477
Older Blind	225,000
Other Federal Funds	0
State Funds	619,330
Local Government	0
Private/Other Funds	35,033
Total	1,180,840

Provision of Technical Assistance to the IL Program During the Review Process

RSA provided technical assistance to ORS in a number of IL program areas during the review process. RSA:

- provided a PowerPoint presentation to ORS to use as a guide in defining roles and responsibilities of SILC in developing the FY 2008-1010 SPIL; and
- held a teleconference with stakeholders to review and provide comments on an early draft of the State Plan for Independent Living (SPIL).

IL Issues Identified by ORS and Stakeholders During the Review Process

RSA solicited input from ORS and stakeholders about IL performance and compliance issues. The following issue was identified:

- ORS and stakeholders identified the need to improve cooperation among ORS, the SILC and the CILs.

RSA worked with ORS to address this issue.

IL Performance Issues, Goals, Strategies, and Technical Assistance

As a result of the review, RSA and ORS agreed on the following IL performance goal, strategies to achieve this goal, and technical assistance that RSA would provide to assist ORS achieve the goal.

1. Oversight and Service Delivery Capacity-Building

Issue: ORS, the SILC, and stakeholders indicated a need to improve working relationships among ORS, the SILC, and CILs. RSA notes that this is a common issue in states and is best addressed by having a process in place to educate all entities involved in the implementation of the SPIL and IL service delivery and to ensure that all are aware of their roles and responsibilities.

Goal: All members of ORS, the SILC, and CILs will understand their roles and responsibilities in the provision of IL services and the development, implementation and evaluation of the SPIL.

Strategy: The SILC and ORS will identify and make available to SILC members and CILs trainings and training materials that will increase their knowledge and understanding of IL philosophy as well as their understanding of their respective roles and responsibilities in administering the program.

Method of Evaluation: Develop and implement a SILC capacity-building plan focused on the fulfillment of SILC duties, responsibilities, and other requirements by September 30, 2009.

Technical Assistance: RSA will assist ORS, the SILC, and the CILs in better understanding their respective roles and responsibilities.

Chapter 5: OIB Program

Program Organization

Rhode Island Services for the Blind and Visually Impaired (RISBVI) received \$225,000 for its FY 2006 OIB program (see Table 3). RISBVI provides OIB services directly through the state agency.

Promising OIB Practices Identified by RISBVI and Stakeholders During the Review Process

RSA's review process solicited input from ORS and stakeholders about promising practices. The following promising practice was identified:

1. Program Assessment

RISBVI enlists an outside contractor to perform an evaluation of the program. The evaluator is chosen through a request for proposals issued by RISBVI. The outside evaluator also processes the consumer evaluation forms and incorporates the results in the final report. The use of an outside contractor to evaluate the OIB program has proven to be an effective way to monitor the use of funds to serve older blind and low vision consumers.

OIB Issues Identified by RISBVI and Stakeholders During the Review Process

RSA's review process solicited input from RISBVI and stakeholders about OIB performance and compliance issues. The following issues were identified:

- lack of funds to meet the needs of all consumers requesting services;
- coordinating services may enhance service delivery; and
- rising demand and costs limit access to assistive technology (AT).

Following compilation of this list, RSA worked with RISBVI to address as many of these issues as possible either directly or by consolidating the issue into a broader issue area.

OIB Performance Issues, Goals, Strategies, and Technical Assistance

As a result of the review, RSA and RISBVI agreed on the following OIB performance goal, strategies to achieve this goal, and technical assistance that RSA would provide to assist RISBVI achieve the goal.

Increased availability of OIB program resources

Issue: Level federal funding and reduced state funding are not keeping up with the increasing demand for OIB services. The OIB program serves 720 consumers

and limited staff resources pose significant service delivery challenges, particularly in the provision of AT.⁴

Goal: To secure new sources of funding and more effective ways to coordinate and provide services.

Strategies:

1. Pursue, as the situation dictates, funding from the state legislature.
2. Explore options for coordinating services with other entities serving individuals with disabilities, particularly CILs who may be able to provide independent living skills training.
3. Explore practices in other states to identify more effective ways to access and provide assistive technology to consumers.

Method of Evaluation: Increase in funds or number of people served as reported in the 7OB annual report beginning in 2009.

Technical Assistance: RSA will coordinate TA resources with the RISBVI OIB program from the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Blindness and Low Vision at Mississippi State University, the IL training grant, and other resources as appropriate.

⁴ RISBVI OIB Final Evaluation Report, FY 2006, page 2.

Chapter 6: Progress on Issues Raised in Previous Reviews

As a result of the RSA review conducted with ORS in FY 2003-2004, the agency developed a CAP. A summary of the progress that ORS has made on the CAP is described below.

Corrective Action Plan

Through the implementation of its CAP, ORS has successfully resolved all compliance findings related to the following topics:

- presumptive eligibility;
- extension of time for eligibility determination;
- employment outcomes stated in IPE;
- written policies; and
- absolute spending limits in policy.

Chapter 7: Summary Conclusion

RSA found ORS to be a well-managed state agency with strong leadership and staff committed to delivering high quality VR, SE, IL, and OIB services to Rhode Islanders with disabilities. ORS has reputable collaborative relationships with key partners and stakeholders in RI to assist its individuals with disabilities and support their individual VR and IL goals.

ORS has a cooperative presence at all six statewide One-Stop Career Centers that allow individuals with disabilities direct access to VR counselors, employment opportunities, and employment-related support services. Its cooperative agreement with the RIDE allows VR counselors in every school district to coordinate VR services for youths with disabilities statewide. MOU's with the state colleges and institutions of higher education enhance this partnership. When fully implemented, a recently signed MOU with the RI Veterans Administration will deliver VR services to war veterans with disabilities. Its community rehabilitation program partners, such as the Sherlock Center on Disabilities, the Ocean State Center for Independent Living (OSCIL), and the PARI Independent Living Center further augment VR and IL service delivery to consumers with the most significant disabilities. IL services are provided statewide by OSCIL and PARI. RISBVI contracts with a vendor, through a competitive bid process, to evaluate the OIB program. This has proven to be an effective method to monitor the use of funds to serve individuals who are older blind and have low vision.

ORS, its partners, and its stakeholders face challenges in providing individuals with disabilities with VR, SE, and IL services geared toward high quality employment outcomes with wages comparable to the RI state hourly wage. The purchase and implementation of an automated, computerized case management system will enhance high quality service delivery. ORS can provide more meaningful employment opportunities for individuals who are blind and visually impaired by reorganizing its BEP and working with individuals with disabilities on competitive, integrated employment goals. ORS, the RI SILC, and their stakeholders identified the need to improve cooperation and coordination of IL services to better enhance the lives of Rhode Islanders with disabilities.

Table 4
Summary of ORS Goals, Strategies, and Technical Assistance

Agency: ORS		
Program: VR		
Goal	Strategies	Technical Assistance
1. Improve the quality of employment outcomes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ORS will focus staff education and training on competitive, career-oriented employment outcomes. • ORS will work with vendors to develop clear, concise guidelines for contracting services. • ORS will strengthen working relationships with vendors to enhance VR service delivery. • ORS will provide vendors with training seminars related to employment outcomes and increasing consumer earnings. • ORS will increase incentives to job placement providers to place VR participants in employment. • ORS will investigate and evaluate alternative funding sources. • ORS will develop and implement a plan to decrease homemaker outcomes. • ORS will update and implement BEP program policies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RSA will provide information and TA on federal grant programs to expand services, i.e. Family Independence Program/Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. • RSA will provide TA on high-performing BEP practices, policies, and procedures. • RSA will provide TA and information on state agencies that have lowered the number of individuals with disabilities achieving homemaker outcomes. • RSA will provide TA on the effects of RI legislation geared toward licensing of VR counselors. • RSA will provide TA on the use of internships for recruitment purposes.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ORS will recruit, hire, and retain qualified rehabilitation staff. • ORS will increase diversity within professional staff. 	
2. Improve the rehabilitation rate of transitioning youths.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ORS will increase and strengthen transition services to youths who are exploring their career options. • ORS will train VR staff to use postsecondary education services for transition age youths when appropriate. • ORS will develop a longitudinal data tool to effectively measure the impact of postsecondary education services. • ORS will maximize access to postsecondary education services for transition age youths. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RSA will provide TA resources on samples and designs for longitudinal data set development that ORS can use to analyze the impact of postsecondary education services.
3. Develop and implement a comprehensive quality assurance and improvement system that will assist ORS in improving the VR program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ORS will develop a comprehensive, integrated, and systematic quality assurance system. • ORS will develop a mechanism for tracking strategic goals and objectives through the system. • ORS will purchase and implement an automated case management system; • ORS will conduct a comprehensive statewide assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RSA will provide TA resources and examples of promising practices in quality assurance. • RSA will provide TA resources and promising practices that integrate various reporting mechanisms into an overall quality assurance system. • RSA will provide TA resources and samples of effective comprehensive statewide

	<p>that meets the regulatory requirements at 34 CFR 361.29.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ORS will develop measurable goals. 	<p>assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RSA will discuss with ORS management and the SRC the relationship between comprehensive statewide assessment and the development of measurable state goals.
VR Issues for Further Review:		
1. Monitor privatization of RI state government agencies.		
2. Monitor the implement of an MOU between ORS and the Veterans Administration for returning war veterans.		
3. Promote and monitor ORS' development of performance based contracts with vendors.		
4. Monitor ORS' development of a staff succession plan.		
5. Monitor RI legislation on VR counselor licensing.		
6. Monitor alignment of state plan goals with strategic operating goals.		
Program: Fiscal		
Goal	Strategies	Technical Assistance
1. Accurately report administrative costs on the RSA-2 report.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ORS will review and comply with the instructions for the completion of the RSA-2 report and the definition of administrative costs found in 34 CFR 361.50. • ORS will discuss with RSA any report areas requiring further guidance or TA. • ORS will manage internal mechanisms to accurately capture expenditures in designated report categories. • ORS will revise administrative expenditures previously reported for FY 2007 after 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RSA will provide TA related to the completion of the on RSA-2 report.

	RSA review and approval.	
2. ORS will insure fiscal accountability by properly allocating statewide and departmental/division indirect costs to RSA's formula grant program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ORS will arrange a meeting with staff from ORS, RSA and the U.S. Department of Education's Indirect Cost Group to discuss federal requirements and review ORS' existing documentation supporting the charging of indirect costs to RSA's formula grant programs. • ORS will revise the current methodology to ensure compliance with federal requirements. • ORS will obtain cognizant agency approval of revised cost allocation methodology. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RSA and the Indirect Cost Group will provide TA related to the charging of indirect costs to RSA-funded programs.

Fiscal Issues for Further Review:

1. Monitor fiscal management processes geared toward strategic planning.

Program: **IL**

Goal	Strategies	Technical Assistance
1. All members of ORS, the SILC, and CILs will understand their roles and responsibilities in the provision of IL services and the development, implementation and evaluation of the SPIL.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SILC and ORS will identify and make available to SILC members and CILs trainings and training materials that will increase their knowledge and understanding of IL philosophy as well as their understanding of their respective roles and responsibilities in administering the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RSA will assist ORS, the SILC, and the CILs in better understanding their respective roles and responsibilities.

	program.	
Program: OIB		
Goal	Strategies	Technical Assistance
1. RISBVI will secure new sources of funding and more effective ways to coordinate and provide services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RISBVI will pursue, as the situation dictates, funding from the state legislature. • RISBVI will explore options for coordinating services with other entities serving individuals with disabilities, particularly CILs who may be able to provide independent living skills training. • RISBVI will explore practices in other states to identify more effective ways to access and provide assistive technology to consumers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RSA will coordinate TA resources with the RISBVI OIB program from the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Blindness and Low Vision at Mississippi State University, the IL training grant, and other resources as appropriate.

Appendix:

Table 5
Seven-Year Summary of Results on Standards 1 and 2

RHODE ISLAND-C											
RSA Minimum Performance Level	Computational Data & Results										
	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002	FY 2003	FY 2004	FY 2005	FY 2006	Met (M)	Did Not Meet (DNNM)		
Indicator 1.1 Difference in the number of individuals with employment outcomes from prior year for general and combined agencies or prior two years for blind agencies	644	539	571	605	635	700	736				
Current year employment outcomes											
Prior year employment outcomes	540	644	539	571	605	635	700				
	104	-105	32	34	30	65	36	M	M	M	M
Equal or exceed											
Indicator 1.2 Percent with employment outcomes after services											
Employment outcomes	644	539	571	605	635	700	736				
Individuals served	950	673	736	1,020	1,089	1,089	1,231				
	67.79%	80.09%	77.58%	59.31%	58.31%	64.28%	59.79%	M	M	M	M
Primary Indicators (1.3, 1.4, & 1.5)											
Indicator 1.3 Percent of all employment outcomes that were competitively employed											
Employed competitively	456	388	512	574	577	634	683				
Employment outcomes	644	539	571	605	635	700	736				
	70.81%	71.99%	89.67%	94.88%	90.87%	90.57%	92.80%	M	M	M	M
72.6%											
Indicator 1.4 Percent of individuals with competitive employment outcomes who had a significant disability											
Significantly disabled	450	380	503	571	577	634	683				
Employed competitively											
Employed competitively	456	388	512	574	577	634	683				
	98.68%	97.94%	98.24%	99.48%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	M	M	M	M
62.4%											

Table 5 (Continued)
Seven-Year Summary of Results on Standards 1 and 2

	RSA Minimum Performance Level	RHODE ISLAND-C												
		Computational Data & Results												
		FY 2000		FY 2001		FY 2002		FY 2003		FY 2004		FY 2005		FY 2006
Indicator 1.5														
Ratio of average hourly VR wage to average state hourly wage		\$8.29	\$9.28	\$9.25	\$9.89	\$9.95	\$9.97	\$10.24						
Average hourly wage of competitively employed State average hourly wage		\$15.68	\$16.15	\$16.74	\$17.50	\$17.93	\$18.49	\$19.27						
	0.52	0.529	0.575	0.553	0.565	0.555	0.539	0.532	M	M	M	M	M	M
Indicator 1.6														
Difference Between Percent Self-Supporting at Closure and Application														
Competitive Employment Outcomes		456	388	512	574	577	634	683						
Primary Support is Own Income at Application		58	63	53	85	97	98	100						
% self-support at application		12.70%	16.24%	10.35%	14.81%	16.81%	15.46%	14.64%						
Primary Support is Own Income at Closure		251	237	312	425	445	498	545						
% self-support at closure		55.00%	61.08%	60.94%	74.04%	77.12%	78.55%	79.80%						
	53.0	42.32	44.85	50.59	59.23	60.31	63.09	65.15	M	M	M	M	M	M
Indicator 2.1														
Ratio of minority to non-minority service rate														
Non-Minorities Exiting VR		1,313	987	1,201	1,481	1,604	1,487	1,785						
Non-Minorities Who Received Services		798	569	622	857	896	851	929						
Non-Minority service rate		60.8%	57.6%	51.8%	57.9%	55.9%	57.2%	52.0%						
Minorities Exiting VR		303	251	253	328	378	459	626						
Minorities Who Received Services		152	104	114	163	193	238	302						
Minority service rate		50.2%	41.4%	45.1%	49.7%	51.1%	51.9%	48.2%						
	0.80	0.825	0.719	0.870	0.859	0.914	0.906	0.927	M	M	M	M	M	M

Table 6
FY 2005 Program Highlights Compared to National Averages

Agency Agency Abbreviation	RI (C) ORS	National Average
<u>FY 2005 Program Highlights</u>		
Total funds used	\$11,432,934	--
Employment outcomes per \$million spent	61	62
Competitive employment outcomes per \$million spent	55	60
Employment outcomes without supports in an integrated setting	73.4%	86.6%
Applicants	2,241	--
Individuals served	3,840	--
Closed after receiving services	1,089	--
Closed with employment outcomes	700	--
Percent of transition age served to total served	26.9%	26.4%
Employment rate for transition age served	64.5%	59.5%
Average hourly earnings for paid employment outcomes	\$9.80	\$9.74
Average state hourly earnings	\$18.49	\$18.64
Average hours worked per week for paid employment outcomes	27.5	32.7
Average cost per employment outcome	\$16,333	\$20,879
Average time between application and closure (in months) for individuals with successful paid employment outcomes	27.1	24.1
Average cost per individual served	\$2,977	\$3,996
Average number of individuals served per staff	49.9	42.2
Average number of employment outcomes per staff	9.1	8.9
On Order of Selection	Yes	--
Number of individuals on waiting list	21	1,853

Source: RSA-2, RSA-113, RSA-911.

Table 7
ORS Employment Status At Closures by Disability:
FY 2004 to FY 2006

Disability	Employment status at closure	FY 2004		FY 2005		FY 2006	
		N	%	N	%	N	%
Visual impairments	Employment without Supports in Integrated Setting	22	30.56	17	26.15	20	28.17
	Self-employment			2	3.08	1	1.41
	BEP	1	1.39	2	3.08	2	2.82
	Homemaker	46	63.89	41	63.08	47	66.20
	Employment with Supports in Integrated Setting	3	4.17	3	4.62	1	1.41
	Total	72	100.00	65	100.00	71	100.00
Physical disorders	Employment without Supports in Integrated Setting	106	93.81	135	95.07	122	96.83
	Self-employment			2	1.41	1	0.79
	BEP						
	Homemaker			3	2.11		
	Employment with Supports in Integrated Setting	7	6.19	2	1.41	3	2.38
	Total	113	100.00	142	100.00	126	100.00
Communicative impairments	Employment without Supports in Integrated Setting	48	92.31	59	96.72	60	93.75
	Self-employment	1	1.92				
	BEP						
	Homemaker						
	Employment with Supports in Integrated Setting	3	5.77	2	3.28	4	6.25
	Total	52	100.00	61	100.00	64	100.00
Cognitive impairment	Employment without Supports in Integrated Setting	116	70.73	139	73.54	176	81.48
	Self-employment	1	0.61	2	1.06		
	BEP						
	Homemaker						
	Employment with Supports in Integrated Setting	47	28.66	48	25.40	40	18.52
	Total	164	100.00	189	100.00	216	100.00
Mental and emotional (psychosocial) disabilities	Employment without Supports in Integrated Setting	159	67.95	164	67.49	189	72.97
	Self-employment	4	1.71	2	0.82	2	0.77
	BEP						
	Homemaker			1	0.41		
	Employment with Supports in Integrated Setting	71	30.34	76	31.28	68	26.25
	Total	234	100.00	243	100.00	259	100.00

Source: RSA-911.

Table 8
ORS Consumers Served and Rehabilitation Rate By Disability:
FY 2004 to FY 2006

Disability	Closure	FY 2004			FY 2005			FY 2006		
		N	%	Rehab rate	N	%	Rehab rate	N	%	Rehab rate
Visual impairments	3	72	64.86	78.26%	65	72.22	89.04%	71	59.17	78.89%
	4	20	18.02		8	8.89		19	15.83	
Physical disorders	3	113	29.27	46.69%	142	36.98	59.41%	126	31.11	57.53%
	4	129	33.42		97	25.26		93	22.96	
Communicative impairments	3	52	66.67	77.61%	61	46.56	64.21%	64	41.29	65.98%
	4	15	19.23		34	25.95		33	21.29	
Cognitive impairment	3	164	37.36	62.84%	189	36.84	64.29%	216	30.95	61.36%
	4	97	22.10		105	20.47		136	19.48	
Mental and emotional (psychosocial) disabilities	3	234	34.56	54.80%	243	37.44	62.63%	259	29.53	54.76%
	4	193	28.51		145	22.34		214	24.40	
Total	3	635	32.04	58.31%	700	35.97	64.28%	736	30.53	59.79%
	4	454	22.91		389	19.99		495	20.53	

Source: RSA-911.

Note. Closure 3: Exited with an employment outcome • Closure 4: Exited without an employment outcome after receiving services.

Table 9
ORS Transition Youths Receiving Postsecondary Education Services
in VR Program By Disability: FY 2004 to FY 2006

Disability	FY 2004		FY 2005		FY 2006	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Visual impairments	1	50.00	2	28.57	1	16.67
Physical disorders	2	16.67	5	26.32	6	28.57
Communicative impairments			2	13.33	1	5.88
Cognitive impairment	8	10.67	3	3.19	7	5.98
Mental and emotional (psychosocial) disabilities	2	6.25	9	16.67	7	14.29

Source: RSA-911.

Please take a moment to participate in a survey about RSA's performance on the FY 2007 monitoring of Vocational Rehabilitation agencies.

Visit <http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/rehab/107-reports/2007/survey.html>