

The opportunities and barriers of different employment models for persons with disabilities

Dr Stephen Beyer and Andrea Meek

Updated in October 2020

The opportunities and barriers of different employment models for persons with disabilities

Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Executive Summary | i |
| 1. Background | 7 |
| 1.1. Background to the study | 7 |
| 1.2. Employment models for persons with a disability in the EU | 7 |
| 1.3. Models of employment support for persons with disabilities | 8 |
| 2. Study methodology | 11 |
| 2.1. Literature review | 11 |
| 2.2. Case study survey | 11 |
| 2.3. Limitations of the study | 12 |
| 3. Review of the literature | 13 |
| 3.1. Models of employment identified | 14 |
| 3.2. Potential of various models for fostering participation of persons with disabilities in the labour market | 15 |
| 3.3. Opportunities and barriers for accessing each model | 33 |
| 3.4. People with different levels of disability | 35 |
| 3.5. Changing employment model and the consequences of that change | 36 |
| 3.6. Section Conclusions | 47 |
| 4. Case studies of opportunities and barriers from different models | 51 |
| 4.1. Models of employment identified among case studies | 51 |
| 4.2. Sheltered Workshops and Occupational Centres | 52 |
| 4.3. Supported Employment | 60 |
| 4.4. Social Firms/Inclusive Enterprises | 70 |
| 4.5. Vocational Rehabilitation/Training | 77 |
| 4.6. Factors that help or hinder model effectiveness | 80 |
| 4.7. Section Conclusions | 81 |
| 5. Conclusions | 84 |
| References | 86 |
| Appendix 1: Methodology for study literature search | 101 |

Acknowledgements

This is a report of the European Association of Service providers for Persons with Disabilities (EASPD).

Authors:

Dr Stephen Beyer, Honorary Lead for Learning Disability Employment at the Centre for Mental Health (NCMH) at Cardiff University.

Andrea Meek, Research Assistant with the Engage to Change research team at NCMH.

We would like to acknowledge the contribution of: Silvia Muñoz (Plena Inclusión), Marina Molina (Grup Fundació Ramon Noguera), Antonio García (Fundación Espurna); Eli Zurutuza (EHLABE) and from Spain; Markus Neuherz (DABEI) from Austria; the VTC Margarita, Theotokos Foundation, and the Hellenic Association of Supported Employment (ELETYPE) from Greece; and Katharina Bast (Bundesarbeitsgemeinschaft Werkstätten für behinderte Menschen e. V.) in Germany for their input the country case studies presented here. We would also like to thank Lea Rollins and Sabrina Ferraina for their input on behalf of EASPD and to EASPD for their financial support for this work. Any errors are ours alone.

Brussels, 2019

Updated in October 2020

Copyright © EASPD 2020

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system without the prior permission of the copyright owners.



This report was written with the financial support from the European Union Programme for Employment and Social Innovation “EaSI” (2014-2020). This publication reflects the view only of the author and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Executive Summary

Background

This study was commissioned by the European Association of Service Providers for Persons with Disabilities (EASPD) as part of its Annual Work Programme in 2019. EASPD wanted to examine the opportunities and barriers represented by different employment models for persons with disabilities across the EU. This involved a review of the literature and generation of State Case Studies.

Models

The study identified the following models in operation: Supported Employment; Individual Placement with Support (IPS); Vocational Rehabilitation and Training; Sheltered Employment including a range of workshops; Social Firms, Inclusive Enterprises, Cooperatives; Self-employment.

Results

We identified 12,373 articles and reports and refined this down to 884 articles reviewed in detail. We received five State case studies from our collaborators: Germany, Spain, Greece, Austria, and the United Kingdom. Together they included 29 examples of models of employment for people with a disability of a number of types.

Sheltered Employment: We found significant diversity of sheltered work in Europe. Even in the same State workshops can have different goals (employment, social, training), different client groups, and different organisational methods. Jobs in Sheltered Workshops can be stable, responsive to people's individual needs in task type and productivity demands. Quality and outcomes vary significantly across workshops types and workshops. Case study responses matched our review findings, with some weaknesses identified for the model in terms of **lower wages** and the **poorer match to people's career aspirations** delivered by sheltered workshops compared to some other models. **Rates of transition from sheltered work to open employment are also low.** Some of our case study respondents felt that there was potential to expand sheltered work as it was relatively easy to deliver and could have significant political support, depending on what type of workshop is being considered. **If high quality jobs were to be delivered through this mechanism in some States better funding, better selection of goals, better delivery organisation, and better legislation would be needed.** Very significant levels of funding would also need to be committed if this route was further developed and **cost-benefit data suggest that other models would be**

more cost-efficient per job. We recognise that in some States there remain significant barriers to accessing jobs in the open labour market. Also, we find that expansion of sheltered work is likely hinder people gaining jobs in the open labour market due to scarcity of overall resources for this sector.

Supported Employment/IPS: Across a range of client groups Supported Employment is found to deliver **relatively high employment rates**, and higher wages, hours and quality of life outcomes than other models. The process of Supported Employment delivery is crucial to outcome, however, with model coherent delivery such as job finding, job placement and job coaching, and job maintenance associated with these higher outcome levels. This is particularly important for people with intellectual disabilities, autism or mental health conditions where individualisation of approach is key to employment success. Some studies identify therapeutic outcomes for people with mental health conditions employed through IPS with health benefits. Supported Employment/IPS provision is patchy or virtually non-existent in some States. There remain cultural and attitudinal barriers to the employment of people with disabilities in the open labour market in some States which hampers the size of the Supported Employment sector, and the number of jobs that are delivered through it currently. **Poor legislation, lack of dedicated funding and inappropriate commissioning frameworks can lead to Supported Employment being a short- rather than a long-term support package**, which can disadvantage workers with disabilities who need intermittent support over longer periods and those with higher levels of disability. There appears to be **poor continuity** and linkage between Sheltered Work and Supported Employment which can disadvantage people with a disability exploring a transition from sheltered to the open labour market.

Social Firms/Social Enterprises: Social Firms provide normal jobs with regular contracts and wages for disabled people in economic enterprises where non-disabled people are also employed. There are relatively few evaluation studies of this model. We find they generally serve people with significant levels of disability and serve large numbers of people in a small number of States. A **wide range of types** of social enterprise exist, with a range of goals that are sometime unclear, and with **poor wage outcomes**. At best, wages can be good, with good adaptation to people's needs and jobs sustained. **Where successful, these enterprises can result in savings for health and social care budgets and deliver "social returns on investment"** driven by well-being and independence outcomes. In some States Social Firms/Social Enterprises have been the **mechanism for conversion of sheltered workshop**, introducing greater worker control and improved outcomes. **In private sector social**

enterprises, commercial pressures can lead to more able people being employed reducing access to people with wider needs.

Inclusive Enterprises: Inclusive Internships are a wide-spread model in a number of EU States. At their best they provide goods, services, and livelihoods hiring people with disabilities as equal workers with legally mandated wage levels and social participation in the workplace. The model is flexible enough to serve people with 30%-50% levels of disability. Between 30% to 80% of the employees in an Inclusive Enterprise are recognised as disabled workers. Again, there are a number of for-profit and non-profit variants of the model with different legal structures, making it very **flexible** and able to develop across different State contexts. In some States the sector is large enough to play an important role in the value chain of companies as suppliers, distributors, and retailers. There are relatively few evaluation studies of this model. While employment and business goals are central to the model, the guiding principles of the organisations are a concern with the social economy and outcomes for people rather than purely profit. However, **in private sector Inclusive Enterprises, commercial pressures can lead to more able people being employed reducing access to people with wider needs.**

Self-employment/micro-enterprise: Self-employment for the general population represents a very significant sector in Europe and an area with potential for inclusion of people with a disability. It is by nature sensitive to individual needs of the entrepreneur. We found a number of studies in Africa, and Asia which show sustainable, positive employment outcomes from micro-finance and self-employment schemes for people with a disability. They can make significant impact on employment and income in some areas. We found relatively **fewer studies of self-employment in Europe**. These do show that **self-confidence and motivation; technical and business skills; availability of resources including business support; and an enabling policy environment** are needed for these enterprises to be successful. If significant professional services, circles of business support, and co-worker support are made available the model can **serve people with quite complex needs**. Potential numbers of jobs generated are currently low.

Vocational Rehabilitation and Training: There are a wide range of interventions included under the Vocational Rehabilitation heading. It is a high-volume intervention working with large numbers of people with disabilities internationally. Our study shows that Vocational Rehabilitation offered through Vocational Training and Rehabilitation Centres in States can provide **routes for younger people** with a disability to access professional training where no mainstream routes exist in mainstream education, and it has helped workers have become

disabled while employed to regain jobs or retrain and qualify for other careers. However, **paid jobs are not always the outcome** of this model and it produces lower employment rates than other models for harder to place groups such as people with intellectual disability, mental health conditions and ASD.

Factors that help or hinder model effectiveness: **Systems to assess and classify disability** in populations can still bar some people with a disability from pursuing employment and accessing appropriate employment support. **Inflexible welfare benefit payments** and **preferential access to retirement benefits** can provide disincentives to people leaving sheltered workshops to enter the open labour market in some States. **Patchy availability of Supported Employment** and **lack of integration** of vocational rehabilitation, sheltered workshops and Supported Employment can hinder free flow of people from rehabilitation and sheltered work to the open labour market. **Pressures on private model** providers can lead to “creaming” of people with lower levels of disability into their service to maximise productivity can marginalise people with higher levels of disability from employment. In some States **people classified as needing significant support** to find a job are not able to access employment support at all.

Conclusions

It is clear that there is a difference in the outcomes that can be expected for people with a disability from different models of employment. At the macro-scale there has been shift in investment towards the inclusive labour market and away from more sheltered options. The **transition remains modest** however, and in many countries sheltered workshops remain the dominant pathway for people with a disability to enter paid employment. For some people with a disability, particularly people with ASD, an Intellectual disability or a mental health condition, the shift towards individually selected jobs, with skilled in-work job coach support, has increased their options for paid employment and their outcomes from employment. However, many are still served in sheltered and other congregate employment models. Those with less significant disabilities are served within the generalised vocational rehabilitation and training model, where outcomes for them are relatively poor.

We must not under-estimate the significant **contribution** sheltered employment and vocational rehabilitation approaches have had for many people with a disability over the years when **few other alternatives** were even being discussed. Sheltered workshops have also contributed to **maintaining incomes** for some people with a disability where community wages and welfare benefit rates have been low. It is also clear that there is

significant **diversity** in delivery within the sheltered employment sector (e.g. in procedures, ethos, goals, and in private and public sector delivery) as there is between employment models. They remain a dominant force and the most significant contribution to the employment and income of people with a disability in some European States, less so in others. We are also convinced that these **local models** are a reflection of local culture, history of employment delivery for people with a disability, and awareness of people's ability to contribute.

The evidence does suggest that the transition to more **individualised and open labour market approaches** must continue if we are to deliver the best financial, social inclusion and career progression outcomes for people with a disability. We must **build more effective Supported Employment pathways** for people to try open employment. These pathways must begin to serve those people in sheltered employment as well as those wanting to join the labour market for the first time, or to return to employment, if we are to support transition employment in the open labour market.

It is likely that the path pursued will necessarily need to be different across European States because of the scale of the transition from sheltered and other models required. There is a natural tension between economic stability (welfare benefit or sheltered employment) and inclusion (Supported Employment and open labour market) for people with a disability and a transition to open market will require rebalancing between these two poles if people are not to be disadvantaged.

Vocational rehabilitation must be a part of the response for people who become long-term sick or disabled and need help to return to their jobs or to change career. However, effective transition to open employment for the full range of people with a disability will require investment in job coach Supported Employment and IPS methods. Adequate support of open labour market employers will also benefit from direct employment services such as Supported Employment and IPS. This transition will also require changes in legislation, definitions of disability and capacity, and welfare benefit rules in some States to accommodate a move to open market jobs. Outcomes from existing employment focused sheltered work may need to be improved, at the same time as pathways to open employment are established, where there are poor prospects for immediate transition to open employment. Rights based frameworks are now well advanced across the EU and this provides opportunity for policies that favour employer accommodating the needs of people with a disability, with State financial backing to support for this, rather than providing wage subsidies that reinforce ideas that people with a disability have poor employment

productivity. Any use of additional employer-based subsidies will have to be creative and may be best targeted on employing people with very significant disabilities who may wish to enter employment and include subsidy for additional mentoring, supervision and partial participation.

In the EU context a continued move towards open employment is in line with goals of the European Pillar of Social Rights, Chapter 1: Equal opportunities and access to the labour market, *“the right to equal treatment and opportunities regarding employment”* and *“the right to timely and tailor-made assistance to improve employment or self-employment prospects.”* Any EU Implementation Plan for this Pillar will need to fully reflect the development of pathways to open employment across Member States.

Help for people to explore open employment would also help to promote UN Sustainable Development Goals 1 *“Ending poverty in all its forms,”* and 8 *“Decent Work and Economic Growth”* as well as Article 27 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Disabled Persons. The current European Disability Strategy seeks to significantly raise the share of persons with disabilities working in the open labour market and the re-negotiation of the Strategy will need to promote greater support for this goal.

Such a move is likely to require EU and State actions on the European Semester to include more social and economic goals related to greater employment of people with a disability in the open labour market. It is also likely to have significant implications for the future use of ESF funds if they are to assist in any development of pathways to the open labour market. Finally, the EU needs to Improve the coverage and consistency of its statistical information to assess progress to more inclusive employment for people with a disability.

1. Background

1.1. Background to the study

This study was commissioned by the European Association of Service Providers for Persons with Disabilities (EASPD) as part of its Annual Work Programme in 2019. EASPD wanted to examine the opportunities of, and barriers to, different employment models for persons with disabilities across the EU. In particular, EASPD wanted to answer these specific questions:

- a) What is the concrete potential of various models for fostering participation of persons with disabilities in the labour market;
- b) What are the opportunities and barriers for accessing each model;
- c) What does it take to change employment model and the consequences of that change (i.e. variation in welfare benefits, in support received, in working conditions, etc.);
- d) To understand the extent to which models are applicable to persons with disabilities with a range of support needs;
- e) To identify employment models from a selected number of European countries as case studies to illustrate these opportunities and barriers.

1.2. Employment models for persons with a disability in the EU

We want to draw on the experiences of a number of European countries to reflect geographical balance and the variety of social welfare models in Europe. We are grateful for the assistance of local rapporteurs on the situations in these States. To help deliver this information we have constructed the following questionnaire for colleagues to complete.

EASPD are interested in employment models and services that serve a wide range of persons with a disability. These would include, but are not restricted to, persons who experience:

- intellectual disabilities
- autism, or autistic spectrum conditions
- developmental disabilities (e.g. ADHD, dyslexia)
- hearing loss or impairment
- vision loss or hearing loss
- physical disabilities
- mental health issues
- brain injury
- invisible disabilities (e.g. disfigurement)

1.3. Models of employment support for persons with disabilities

In this study we are interested in models of employment for persons with a disability. Some will be specific settings offering employment to persons with a disability and others (e.g. sheltered work or social firms). For others, the place will be ordinary workplaces, but the model is one of support to find, get, learn and keep a job in an inclusive setting (e.g. IPS or Supported Employment are the most easily described). We are also interested in models that target ordinary jobs, and offer assisted job search only.

Some models may bridge these models such as models of collective contracting in ordinary jobs (e.g. Club House models). There may also be a place for models that use paid or unpaid work experience, with or without support, to transition people into a paid job, and government sponsored work-based training transitional programmes (Paid Apprenticeships or unpaid work experiences). We are aware of some models that blend approaches (e.g. the running of Social Firms providing public services that also provide training and transition of persons with a disability into external jobs).

We do not aim to include incentives or sanctions-based welfare benefit systems that encourage people to enter into paid work and leave welfare benefit, or other passive Labour Market Programmes, such as information systems or general careers guidance systems, general education and qualification systems, or employer disability awareness programmes.

We have identified these as possible models of employment (Thornton and Lunt 1996; Parmenter 2011. There may be others:

- **Supported Employment**- This is paid work where individuals receive commensurate pay for work carried out and, if a country operates a national minimum wage then the individual must be paid at least this rate or the going rate for the job. People with disabilities should be regular employees with the same wages, terms and conditions as other employees employed in businesses within the public, private or voluntary sectors. People receive ongoing support which is individualised and is provided as needed for both the employee and the employer. It may involve a Job Coach or an equivalent role.¹
- **Customised Employment**- This is competitive integrated employment, for an individual with a significant disability, that is based on an individualised determination of the strengths, needs, and interests of the individual and the business needs of the employer. It is carried out through flexible strategies, such as: job exploration by the individual; working with an employer to facilitate placement, including customising a job description based on current or unmet

¹https://www.base-uk.org/sites/default/files/%5Buser-raw%5D/10-09/european_supported_employment_toolkit.pdf

employer need; and providing services and supports at the job location which can include self-employment.²

- **Individual Placement with Support (IPS)**- IPS supports people with severe mental health difficulties into employment. It involves intensive, individual support, a rapid job search followed by placement in paid employment, and time-unlimited support in and out of the workplace for both the employee and the employer. IPS has been shown to be more effective the more closely it delivers the following model: it gets people into competitive employment; it is open to all who want to work; it finds jobs consistent with people's preferences; it works quickly; it brings employment specialists into clinical mental health teams; it develops relationships with employers based upon a person's work preferences; it provides time-unlimited, individualised support for the person and their employer; welfare benefits counselling is included.³
- **Vocational Rehabilitation and signposting services**- Vocational rehabilitation is made up of a series of services that are designed to facilitate the entrance into or return to work by people with disabilities or by people who have recently acquired an injury or disability. Some of these services include vocational assessment and evaluation, training, upgrading of general skills, refresher courses, on-the-job training, career counselling, employment searches, and consulting with potential or existing employers for job accommodations and modification. These services may also vary depending on the needs of the individual.⁴
- **Sheltered Employment**- Sheltered Employment provide social and occupational integration, and rehabilitation. Some provide jobs through the production of goods and services. In some countries the norm is two coexisting types of institution: sheltered workshops exist alongside “enclaves” which employ disabled workers within ordinary enterprises; sheltered therapeutic workshops and sheltered production workshops; sheltered workshops and work-based assistance centres). In the majority of cases the structures are private establishments, usually run by 3rd Sector associations, as cooperatives or as genuine commercial enterprises.⁵
- **Social Firms, Social Enterprises**- A Social Firm is a business created for the employment of people with a disability or disadvantage in the labour market with the following criteria: market-oriented production of goods and services to pursue its social mission of more than 50% of its income being derived from trade; a minimum of 30% of its employees will be people with a disability; every worker is paid a wage appropriate to their work; work opportunities should be equal between disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged employees.⁶ Social Enterprises operate on a similar basis but may not adhere to strict Social Firm criteria. They may also provide skill training with the aim of moving people through into more inclusive employment.

²<https://www.apse.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/2015-APSE-poster.-Implementation-of-customized-employment-provisions-of-the-WIOA-within-Vocational-Rehabilitation-systems.pdf>

³ <https://www.centreformentalhealth.org.uk/what-ips>

⁴ <https://www.naric.com/?q=en/FAQ/what-vocational-rehabilitation>

⁵ <https://www.ilo.org/public/english/revue/download/pdf/visier.pdf>

⁶ <https://socialfirmseurope.org/social-firms/definition/>

- **Inclusive Enterprises-** An Inclusive Enterprise is an employment model for people with disabilities that is present in more than 13 European countries and involves more than 200.000 workers and 8.000 companies. They provide goods, services, and livelihoods hiring people with disabilities as equal workers; while also engaging an important part of the population in the value chain of companies as suppliers, distributors, and retailers. Between 30%-80% of the workforce will be people with a disability. The Inclusive Enterprise works as a vehicle to address the need of the majority of persons with disabilities for a dignified and productive life just like any individual. Equal employment provides income and social impact, generating opportunities for social participation which is especially important for persons with disabilities. People are paid at legally mandated salaries and receive long-term contracts. Inclusive Enterprises can be structured as a for-profit or non-profit organisation and may take a number of forms: a co-operative⁷; a mutual organisation; a social business; a benefit corporation; a community interest company; a company limited by guarantee; or a charitable organisation. The form depends on in which country the entity exists and the legal forms available there. They can also take more conventional structures. Inclusive Enterprises have both enterprise and social goals but focus on the employment of people with disabilities. Their social goal is embedded in their primary objective, which differentiates them from other organisations and corporations. An Inclusive Enterprise's main purpose is to promote, encourage, and make social change employing in their workforce the maximum of people with disabilities. The aim is to carry out this social purpose in a financially sustainable way over the long term.

We also included internship programmes within the open labour market, or sheltered options, with or without additional support:

- **Paid inclusive apprenticeships-** In an apprenticeship, a disabled person would spend time your time between learning in an education establishment and training in a company. Usually, the person will have a contract with the company and get paid for their work. At the end of the apprenticeship, the person would usually receive a recognised qualification and hopefully obtain a longer-term contract with the company.
- **Work experience or work trials (paid or unpaid) leading to employment-** These are usually time limited time spent in real workplaces to orientate the person with a disability to the world of work, to determine employment preferences, aptitudes and support needs.⁸
- **Self-employment or micro-enterprises-** Here people with a disability run their own companies. Often, they are sole traders, working on their own to deliver products or services into the market. They can employ others, have business plans and draw on formal sources of loans and investment. Micro-enterprises have come to mean sole traders operating very small, niche businesses often based on particular talents. Often capital investment is small and based on family or other informal sources of money.

⁷http://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---ifp_skills/documents/publication/wcms_194822.pdf

⁸<http://iea.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/files/IEA%20Self-employment%20web%20complete%2022.9.11.pdf>

2. Study methodology

2.1. Literature review

This study provides a structured (but not a fully systematic⁹) review of the relevant literature. Using standard search methods, relevant articles in the English language (or with English language abstracts) were identified, published between 1985 and 2019, from Search Engines using an inclusive keyword-based search strategy (see Appendix 1).

Searches were made of the following databases to identify previous relevant research articles: CINAHL, MEDLINE, ERIC, Embase, PsycINFO and EASPD, Social Policy and Practice. Further references have been generated from searches of article references and Google Scholar.

The articles identified were then screened for relevance and any clearly not relevant were discarded at each stage. Screening was carried out in the following way:

- Titles of articles were reviewed first
- Abstracts were reviewed next
- Duplicates were excluded
- Full articles were then acquired and reviewed in more detail

The final remaining set of articles were then sorted, evaluated and relevant themes were drawn from them to answer our central questions.

2.2. Case study survey

EASPD approached relevant member organisations to ask for their collaboration in generating case studies. Respondents from 6 countries took part in this stage of the study. Those coming forward were asked to describe the employment models in use in their country and to assess their strengths and weakness in relation to our main research questions. Respondents were asked to complete a web-based questionnaire. The key sections to this questionnaire covered the following elements:

- Defining disabilities for respondents
- A range of employment models that might be available in the country (Sheltered Employment; Supported Employment/Customised employment; Individual Placement with Support (IPS); Vocational guidance and signposting services; Social Firms; Social Enterprises; Cooperatives; Club House or Fountain House models; and a request to describe others in use).

⁹ A systematic review attempts to collate all empirical evidence that fits pre-specified eligibility criteria in order to answer a specific research question. The key characteristics of a systematic review are: a clearly stated set of objectives with pre-defined eligibility criteria for studies; an explicit, reproducible methodology; a systematic search that attempts to identify all studies that would meet the eligibility criteria; an assessment of the validity of the findings of the included studies; a systematic presentation, and synthesis, of the characteristics and findings of the included studies.

- Groups of people served by the model
- Numbers of persons served
- How it is delivered (State or Municipality level departments or contracted from other sectors)
- Funding approaches
- Assessment of various aspects of the quality of the model offered
- Description of factors helping or hindering the effectiveness of the model
- Identification of factors impacting on current access to the model
- Identification of factors impacting of increasing access to the model

2.3. Limitations of the study

There are of course caveats to our findings. The resources and time available restricted our literature searches to English language articles and chapters, and to a broad search strategy. Some of the literature is not published in peer reviewed journals, some are in report formats, which means that they are not fully amenable to a systematic review methodology. Some relevant papers were not publicly available and could not be included here. Our case studies are detailed but are selective and limited to particular countries. They do, however, represent a geographical spread of services and a range of the most common employment models for persons with disabilities operating in the EU.

We believe that the study provides a good level of information on which to make some judgements about the various employment models in use for persons with disabilities, their relative strengths and weaknesses, and that they can still provide us with information relevant to employment policy in this area.

3. Review of the literature

We know that people with a disability are disadvantaged in the labour market in every country and the gap between their employ rates and those of non-disabled people are high. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) reported in a 2010 study of 27 countries of employment rates of working-age persons with disabilities found that 44% were employed, compared with 75% for persons without disability. Also, the economic inactivity rate was 2.5 times higher for persons without disability (49%) than for non-disabled people (20%) (OECD, 2010).

An early comprehensive review of Active Labour Market Programmes aimed at integrating people with a disability into the workforce was carried out by Thornton and Lunt (1997). They identified some of the problems and inconsistencies that hampered the development of a consistent description of policy, programmes and outcomes. Relevant policy, and information on the effectiveness of the policy, can be fragmented across a number of Ministries and Departments, making it hard to obtain a full picture of provision. Also, people with a disability can be only one of a number of disadvantaged group of people served by a mainstream or generic programme or policy which can make it difficult to establish its impact on people with a disability alone. Definitions of disability can vary between departments and between States, depending on the purpose of the definition (to establish eligibility for services, eligibility for Rights legislation to apply, or capacity and productivity tests of service eligibility). In some countries there has been a trend to locating responsibility for employment of disadvantaged groups at regional or municipality level, which can add variation in approach within, as well as between, States. An extension of this problem for understanding models and outcomes is that delivery of models also reflects cultural and historical norms within different States. In some countries provision is delivered through the State, in others it is commissioned by the State but delivered by the not-for-profit 3rd sector, the for-profit sector, or both. This means that outcomes for people with a disability are influenced not just by the employment model, but also by the way it is delivered. Finally, the availability of standardised statistics on the employment of people with a disability also hampers our ability to gain an overview of the relative effectiveness and potential for growth of various employment models.

Thornton and Lunt (1997) identify welfare benefit policy as critical to the effectiveness of employment inclusion policy for people with a disability. If programmes exist, their impact can be influenced by the extent to which welfare benefit regulations make people better off in work. Successful employment inclusion is also affected by other policy areas and services such as transport, education, housing, health and social care services but these are beyond the scope of this paper to review. Compulsory measures, such as employer quotas for the recruitment and employment of people with a disability, were common at this point but diminishing.¹⁰ Systems associated with anti-

¹⁰ Quota systems were applied in Austria, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Lithuania, Luxemburg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, and Spain at this time, with partial systems also operating in Belgium, Cyprus, Ireland, and Slovenia

discrimination legislation requiring people to be treated fairly in recruitment and in the workplace were becoming more common, although only in a few countries. The majority picture was still of fragmented departmental policy making with, at times, policies that did not support each other, nor the goal of employment of people with a disability.

By 2011, employment rates still varied considerably for people with different disabilities and individual intellectual disabilities or with mental health conditions experienced the lowest employment rates (WHO 2011). Geiger et al. (2017) reports European disability employment rising by 7.6% from 2006 to 2011/12 (net of changes between employment, unemployment and economic inactivity), with a corresponding reduction in the employment gap between people with a disability and the general population of 4.9%, measured using the European Social Survey. The overall gap remained 22% on this measure with employment rates ranging from 31.4% to 64.9% (mean 46.2%), and the disability employment gap ranging from 9.4% to 28.8% (mean 16.4) across 23 European countries (Geiger et al. 2017, Appendix A2).¹¹ By 2016 the situation in Europe had moved forward, the relevant employment rates for the EU being 48.1% for people with a disability and 73.9% for the general population (European Commission 2019). This provides the background for the review of the literature that follows.

3.1. Models of employment identified

There has been an increasing emphasis in many countries over the last 25 years on policies that reduce inequality in access to the open labour market. The trend to employment as a Right has spread with the wider adoption of the UN CRPD and also an agenda to unify rights within the EU. With this, more emphasis has been placed on helping people with a disability to take action to become employed, based partly on the benefits to their health and the independence of becoming employed, but also to reduce the welfare benefit bill in some countries.

Shima et al. (2008) has identified a number of broad models of employment of people with a disability underlining the increasing employment rates of people with disabilities in EU member States: the “mainstreaming disability model,” implying not special employment services and employment measures for persons with disabilities in all policy domains; or “special and separate employment” such as sheltered workshops; and the “dual and multi-model system” which is a combination of the two previous approaches. Changes have been complex. By 2008 unemployment for people with a disability had fallen in some countries based on increases in employment, but also by increases economic inactivity. In the United Kingdom, there had been an increase in employment and a decline in both unemployment and inactivity. In Poland, however, employment,

¹¹ How one measures disability employment is another important variable across EU States and different employment rates are found depending on use of European Social Survey, EU- Statistics on Income and Living Condition or the EU Labour Force Survey.

unemployment and economic inactivity all fell, representing a reduction in the number of people recorded as being disabled (Shima et al. 2008).

While sheltered employment, largely in the form of sheltered workshops or enterprises remained dominant in many States but there had been a shift over the period towards open labour market employment. A variant in some States has been use of Inclusive Enterprises. There has been an increase in “on-the-job training” in preference to pre-vocational training, summarised in the Supported Employment or Individual Placement with Support (IPS) approaches. Priority has also been given to people with a disability in vocational guidance and training programmes. Social Firms and Enterprises have grown as an employment sector and it is attractive to many people with a disability who require support and understanding to get a paid job. Social Firms are unequally distributed across the E.U and wider countries and are highly dependent on networks of entrepreneurs and a supportive infrastructure to prosper and become more available. We know also that self-employment represents a significant proportion of jobs in the E.U and that self-employment is under-developed for people with a disability across many countries. Self-employment has recognised advantages for people with different disabilities such as psychiatric disabilities (Ostrow et al. 2019), intellectual disabilities (Thoresen 2018) and people with a disability generally (Pagan 2009). Self-employment ranges in its contribution to the employment rate of people with a disability across EU States, but it is a significant employment model and must be included in our consideration of the effectiveness of model options. How we help people to make a smooth transition into a job of their choice after school or tertiary education depends on what models of support we prioritise to be there to help people. There are clear trends in the data on what works for the employment of young people with a disability.

3.2. Potential of various models for fostering participation of persons with disabilities in the labour market

We wanted to examine the contribution of the various models identified to the employment of people with a disability in the labour market, and their potential for greater delivery, building on the models identified in Section 1.3. We consider these models in turn.

Sheltered Employment

Sheltered employment, in its varied formats is one of the most widely used employment measures for people with disabilities across Europe (Mallender et al. 2015). However, there are many versions of what sheltered workshops are and it remains difficult to define what it is. The ILO consider that sheltered workshops are more of a conceptual idea rather than a definite employment policy (OECD 2003). May-Simera (2018, p1) suggests that sheltered workshops should be thought of as the “act of placing predominantly people with intellectual disabilities in sheltered employment or work facilities

where they are subject to atypical working conditions, for an extended period of time.” The complexities of definition can be seen by considering two categorisations. EASPD has recognised four types of sheltered workshop: *On-site work* outside the open labour market (work performed in a workplace which can be open to the general public, e.g. laundries, garden centres etc.); *Secondment* (temporary or permanent transfer of a person to another assignment outside the open labour market); *Outplacement* (placement in the open labour market under the conditions of a sheltered workshop); and *Mobile units* (small teams hired by external organisations or the public). The OECD (2010) identified four types of sheltered workshop across 19 countries: *Strong focus, with significant transition rates*; *Strong focus, but largely permanent employment*; *Intermediary focus, with some ‘new’ attempts*; and *Intermediary focus, ‘traditional’ programme*. Sheltered workshops can be placed on this spectrum ranging from *Intermediary focus, ‘traditional’ programme* (traditional largely on-site work) to *Strong focus, with significant transition rates* (transitional models, with a strong focus on moving people with disabilities from sheltered workshops into the open labour market). The OECD (2010) reported that, by 2010, most States ran Sheltered Workshops in more traditional *Intermediate* category, with few delivering throughput into the open labour market. When we add that sheltered workshops with a strong focus on transition will often deliver elements of Vocational Education and Training and Supported Employment services to maximise that transition, and that delivery can be by State, NGOs or private sector companies, then the complexity of the picture across States and Regions is clear.

In 2015 the European Parliament noted that in the previous 15 years an expansion of initiatives to help disabled people move into the open labour market had taken place, some through a shift to more transitional forms of workshop involving Vocational Rehabilitation and Training, and some through alternative Supported Employment programmes (European Parliament 2015). For some States the driver was that **more** traditional sheltered workshops were not socially inclusive and acted as a barrier to people’s integration into employment. For other governments there were economic pressures for them to encourage more people with a disability into paid jobs, either to reduce costs or to improve life chances and health, leading to withdrawal of support for traditional sheltered workshops.

Numbers and potential to deliver jobs

In the post-Second World War period, there is clear evidence of the major contribution that the sheltered employment model has made to the participation of persons with disabilities in the labour market across a wide range of countries, albeit not the open labour market. The scale of their delivery can be illustrated by data from a number of countries.

European Parliament (2015, p24) describes the scale of Sheltered Workshops in the EU. A case study of Member States showed the following number of organisations offering Sheltered Workshops and the numbers of people served: Belgium (67 entities serving 16,000 people); Germany (724 entities serving 297,670 people); Spain (14,000 entities serving 11,000 people); Sweden (370 entities serving 20,000 people); UK (64 entities, people numbers not available). In addition, there were 92 Sheltered

Workshops in the Netherlands, 1,345 in France. In Italy there were 6982 legal entities but this figure includes “Social Co-operatives” which do not provide services to people with a disability exclusively, making client numbers difficult to determine. Despite uncertainties, these are significant populations, underlining the importance of the Sheltered Employment to the employment of people with a learning disability.

Shima et al. (2008) confirm that the highest rates of sheltered workshop use in Europe were found in Belgium, Italy and Spain. Germany and the Netherlands had significant Sheltered Workshop sectors. In Spain, Poland, Sweden and the Czech Republic the OECD report that sheltered employment was declining. In France, Sweden and Austria Sheltered work represent about a third of participants with disability. In Switzerland, Netherlands, Poland, Germany and Belgium about 10% of disability welfare benefit recipients are in special programmes, primarily served by sheltered workshops. They also note that in Norway, Korea, Denmark and Australia, there is more of a mix in programmes including open labour market support and wage subsidies.

In the Netherlands, Zijl et al. (2002) reported that the WSW¹² programme offered sheltered employment to people with a physical, mental or psychological disability. The WSW was focused on offering permanent sheltered employment for people with a disability, with substantial and stable numbers of people being served. The number of people with a WSW place was almost 100,000 by the year 2000, with a mean duration of a WSW job being around 12 years. However, it is clear that Sheltered Workshops have not been a significant mechanism for helping people into the open labour market. From 1998 onwards in the Netherlands there was a plan in place to stimulate transition of sheltered employees into regular employment. However, only 5% of people in sheltered employment moved out into open employment up to 2002.

In the UK, at the high point of UK sheltered workshop provision in 2000/01, there were 255 government funded factories run by Local Authorities (N=116), Voluntary Agencies (N=29) and by Remploy, a specialist national provider (N=110). The factories served 10,768 people with a wide range of disabilities: 38% people with an intellectual, 20% with a Mobility/Dexterity, 7% with Hearing or Speech, 5% with a mental health and 5% with visual disabilities.

In China, in 1978 there were 869 “welfare workshops,” a sheltered workshop equivalent operating nationwide and offering people with disabilities engagement in craft work with the capacity of accommodating 48,200 people with disabilities (Huang et al. 2009). However, at that time this represented a small employment rate and a very wide gap between this and the rate for the general working-age disability population. In the 1990’s, reflecting the move to a market economy, welfare workshops were reformed into independent business enterprises participating in free-market competition. Government moved from providing unconditional subsidies to welfare workshops to providing tax reduction and exemption, shifting them to be “welfare enterprises,” and allowing local

¹² WSW is provision under The Sheltered Employment Act (1998) providing subsidised jobs for disabled people who can only work under special conditions.

communities and state-owned enterprises to launch them. By 1995, a million people with disabilities were working in 60,000 welfare enterprises. Even with a shift to a market economy, Sheltered Workshops in China were not focused on moving people into the open labour market. To pursue this, from 1995 to 2005 there was a significant investment in alternative job pathways. A 1.5% quota scheme, with financial penalties on non-compliant companies, delivered 1 million jobs in the community by 2000 (Huang et al. 2009).

Sheltered workshops have been evolving in some countries to better reflect the social expectations and equality aspirations of consumers. In 2001, the New Zealand government launched the “Pathways to Inclusion” initiative to increase the participation of people with disabilities both in the workforce and in communities (New Zealand Department of Labour 2009). Again, significant numbers were employed through sheltered work. While at that time many people with disabilities working in Sheltered workshops had been paid less than the minimum wage, the proportion of services providing segregated employment paying at least the minimum wage all or most of the time increased to 10% of providers by 2004. A total of 10,577 people used vocational services by then.

Wage outcomes

The outcomes delivered by sheltered work have been established by many researchers. A survey of 5,000 workers in sheltered workshops in 24 states in the US revealed that people with disabilities in sheltered workshops earned US\$101 per month based on an average of 74 work hours (NCI, 2008). In a study of 112 people in the US, Cimera (2011) found that workers spent significant time in sheltered workplaces but lower than full time (mean-73 hours per month) and that wages were low, averaging \$164.79 per month. The sheltered workshop was a relatively expensive model costing \$11.04 to produce \$1 of worker earnings.

Wage rates must be contextualised in relation to the income people might get through the welfare benefits system. For example, in Hungary a cost-benefit analysis has been conducted on a Civitan sheltered workshop, and it showed that individuals do achieve some financial benefit from being employed there. Sheltered employees earned around HUF 20,000-100,000 more than they would receiving disability benefits, working an average of 25 hours a week for minimum wage making it financially viable for them.

Other outcomes

Parmenter (2011) has drawn attention to strong arguments made for the benefits of sheltered employment models. For some a benefit can be seen in terms of avoidance of perceived physical risks in the outside world (Dudley and Schatz 1985; Migliore et al. 2007). Parmenter (2011) has argued that in some countries sheltered employment can provide employment across the person’s

life span without affecting the disability benefits received by workers, an important consideration to many, and in some States income can be comparable to an open labour market wage for their skill set.

The complexity of jobs in open employment has undoubtedly become more complex in the last 20 years, and can, it is argued, be beyond the skills range and psychological capacity of people with intellectual disabilities (McConkey and Mezza 2001; Visier, 1998). Sheltered workshops are seen to provide a safety net of meaningful engagement for people who fail to secure or maintain employment in the open labour market. There is evidence that sheltered workshops can provide greater opportunities for the development of friendships than the reality of some open labour market jobs (Dudley and Schatz 1985; Weikle 2008).

This is in part confirmed by Gascon (2009), who compared scores on a worker loneliness measure for people with an intellectual disability who were in sheltered employment and those in regular work. Results indicated that the participants working in sheltered workshops felt themselves to be significantly less lonely than those in regular work environments. However, there were no significant differences between the participants on a social dissatisfaction measure, nor in measures of self-esteem. This suggests that sheltered workshops can help counter social isolation to a greater extent than those in the open labour market. The author also notes that people with mild learning disabilities can have their self-esteem raised in a mixed ability sheltered employment setting, but also in an open labour market where their competence can be a source of pride. Similarly, social satisfaction can be delivered in both sheltered work and the open labour market.

A study by Surinak (2008) found significant differences between people with an intellectual disability in sheltered workshops and those in Supported Employment in how they were performing their job duties Sheltered Workshop workers scoring higher than the supported work group, suggesting that they felt they were doing significantly better in this regard. Supported Employment worker scored higher on work related behaviours than sheltered workers, suggesting they were more adjusted to the open market, and there was no difference in scores between the groups on their perceived need for support. The data suggest that there are qualitative differences in aspects of work-related competence between sectors, but not in overall support need.

Supported Employment

Numbers and potential to deliver jobs

Thornton and Lunt (1997, p 386) identified expansion of the Supported Employment model in Australia, USA, Canada the UK and other EU countries by the time of their review. Supported Employment developed in the US as an alternative to sheltered workshops and other rehabilitation programmes which had had limited success in getting people with intellectual disabilities and other severely disabled people into mainstream, integrated employment. In Australia Supported Employment was originally developed as part of a move away from segregated employment services.

In the USA and Australia, Supported Employment was supported by underpinning legislation and public funding. In most EU countries there are Supported Employment initiatives rather than fully fledged policies and legislation. These are far from uniform in delivery, some being developed by NGOs, some by state services, some services developed from sheltered employment services. There is no dominant model of Supported Employment, although clear definitions and fidelity models are available (Becker et al. 2015). Thornton and Lunt (1997) note that different approaches to Supported Employment operate side-by-side in some States. Since this seminal review, there have been more evaluations of Supported Employment and efforts to coordinate provision.

While Supported Employment is not universally available as a support mechanism, and where it is available it is not always serving enough people to make a great impact on employment rates, experience in the US, Canada, Australia and other countries does show that it can be implemented at great scale with relatively consistent results. In the US, Shafer et al. (1990) were able to report on Supported Employment in 27 states receiving Federal Supported Employment grants and found 1,400 programmes operating. In a national survey West et al. (1992) reported on 42 states where 74,960 individuals participated in Supported Employment in 1991.

The numbers of people served by Supported Employment/IPS has grown over the last 20 years (OECD 2018). While they have extended employment opportunities for people with a disability, this provision has not so far overtaken sheltered employment in size of provision in many countries. However, research studies and reports suggest that Supported Employment is a significant source of employment for people with a disability. In the UK, at the high point of UK the Supported Employment Programme in 2000/01, the government funded 382 community-based employment programmes, offering a range of wage subsidy, job finding and Supported Employment approaches. These programmes provided open labour market jobs, with different levels of support, for 15,770 people with a wide range of disabilities.

In a randomized controlled trial across six European countries (Groningen (Netherlands), London (UK), Rimini (Italy), Sofia (Bulgaria), Ulm-Gunzburg (Germany), and

Zurich (Switzerland), Knapp et al. (2009) investigated the economic case for IPS for people with severe psychosocial disabilities (schizophrenia and schizophrenia-like disorders, bipolar disorder, or depression with psychotic features) compared to standard vocational rehabilitation. 312 people were randomized to receive either IPS or standard vocational services and followed for 18 months. IPS delivered better outcomes than alternative vocational services at lower cost overall to the health and social care system. Individuals assigned to vocational services were significantly more likely to drop out of the service (45%) and to be readmitted to hospital (31%) than people in the IPS arm of the trial (13% and 20%, respectively). A benefit-cost analysis showed that IPS represented a more efficient use of resources than its comparator for taxpayers. The authors suggest that *“When public bodies seek to introduce policies to improve employment rates among people with mental health needs, they do not tend to devote much attention to people with the most severe needs”....and.... “IPS appears to provide an effective and cost-effective means of helping many people with a serious mental illness to*

come closer to achieving their employment goals” (Knapp et al. 2013; p 67)

Cimera (2010b) studied 104,213 people across the US with an intellectual disability who had Supported Employment as a vocational goal on their Individual Plan for Employment, Workers were better off in paid work and the workers returned \$1.21 of benefits to taxpayers for every \$1.00 of service costs. This is a very significant study as it was carried out at such a large scale and over a significant time period. The positive implications for taxpayers investing in inclusive employment were clear in the US context.

Jordán de Urrías Vega et al. (2014) carried out a cost-benefit analysis of people working in Supported Employment and a Special Employment Center based on a sample of 24 workers in regular employment in each case. Supported Employment workers, had higher hourly earnings than workers in the Special Employment Centre. Supported Employment generated greater financial benefit than costs (+315% return on investment) compared to the Special Employment Center (83.14% return). The results show that Supported Employment workers, working the same number of hours, have higher hourly earnings (€9.22 vs €4.99) than workers in the Special Employment Center. Supported employees also generated less costs to their employing company than the Special Employment Center. Supported Employment was more beneficial in terms of cost-benefit for the individual, business and society when compared to the Special Employment Center.

The scale of development of Supported Employment varies significantly across countries. In the Netherlands, under the 1998 WSW programme, municipalities could place people with a disability into Sheltered Workshops but could also place people with regular employers. Supported Employment is also offered to place people with open labour market employers, with municipalities supporting the work through a wage cost subsidy, financial compensation for extra support by a job coach agency, and financial compensation to employers for any workplace adjustments needed. At that time, only 15% of people with a disability went into a regular job. Lower productivity was found in Finland where regular surveys of the state of Supported Employment have been conducted since 1998 (Saloviita and Pirttimaa, 2007). By 2003, of 93 responding organisations only 22 had workers in Supported Employment. However, numbers placed through each service were low at first and no more than 100 people had been supported since the introduction of Supported Employment programmes in 1995. A comparative study of Supported Employment in ten countries of Europe, undertaken in 2006-2007 found that 35.3% of users of Supported Employment services were people with intellectual disabilities (Jordan de Urries, Beyer and Verdugo, 2010).

Comparisons of Sheltered Workshops and Supported Employment models have generally been favourable for Supported Employment. In the US, Cimera (2011) found that workers in Supported Employment did stay in employment for less time (44.91 hours) on average than those in sheltered work (73 months) and worked fewer hours (58.95 hours vs 65.7 hours per month). However, Supported Employment provided higher wages (\$390.96 per month) than Sheltered Workshops (\$164.79 per month). The service cost per dollar earned was much lower for Supported Employment (\$2.01 per month) than Sheltered Workshop (\$11.38 per month).

An evaluation of the Pathways to Inclusion programme in New Zealand from its start in 2001 until 2007 found a shift from sheltered employment to Supported Employment (Centre for Social Research and Evaluation 2008). Sheltered employment, with advice were financed to shift operations to include Supported Employment and community participation services. By 2007 sheltered employment had now largely replaced by Supported Employment services. The numbers being supported through open labour market and Supported Employment had contributed to an increase in employment for people with a disability. The number of people participating in vocational services increased from 10,577 in 2003 to 16,130 in 2007 with more participants either moving off benefits or declaring earnings while remaining on benefits. The service had become more effective also, the number of service users moving off benefits or declaring earnings within 12 to 24 months of starting the service also increasing.

Supported Employment has also been demonstrated to provide effective paid employment outcomes for people with mental health conditions in the US using the IPS version. IPS is also successful in the European context. Burns et al. (2008) conducted a Randomised Control Trial of IPS compared to “train-and-place” vocational rehabilitation in six European centres with a variety labour market, health and social care conditions. A sample of 312 individuals with psychotic illness were randomly allocated to centres and services and followed up 18 months later. IPS was more effective than the Vocational Services for all vocational outcomes, doubling the access to work of people with psychotic illnesses, with 54.5% working for at least one day compared to 27.6% of Vocational Service patients. They were significantly less likely to be re-hospitalised.

In a meta-review of outcomes of return-to-work interventions for people with severe mental health conditions, Van Rijn et al. (2016) found that for 12 of 16 studies identified, the intervention was Individual Placement and Support (IPS). Some further studies used a derivate of IPS called Compensated Work Therapy (CWT) (Kashner et al. 2002) Assertive Community Treatment with Individual Placement Support (Act-IPS) (Gold et al. (2006) or integrated Supported Employment combined with work-related social skills training (Tsang et al. 2010). In all of the studies, a control group received traditional vocational rehabilitation which consists of pre-employment training and medical care as usual. The percentage of competitive employed ranged from 13% to 55% in the intervention groups compared to 6% to 28% in the control groups suggesting better employment rate outcomes for the IPS model. On psychiatric and mental health outcomes the review showed some indications that “place-then-train” models had a positive effect on quality of life with a pooled effect size of 0.28 (95% CI 0.04 to 0.52)¹³. There was no evidence for benefits concerning mental health and functioning.

Dowler and Walls (2014) in a review of Supported Employment Services found 23 studies and concluded that Supported Employment services were demonstrated to enhance employment outcomes in all of the studies. When comparing IPS to any other treatment (e.g. DPA, VR), the

¹³ In this context, the Effect Size is a measure of the strength of association between the intervention and outcome.

competitive employment rate was higher for IPS than any other treatment. Employment under the IPS model ranged from 57% to 98% compared to 19% to 34% for comparison approaches, a statistically significant difference in favour of IPS.

While IPS is understood to be more effective at helping people with a mental health problem into paid employment, IPS is not universally available across the EU. In the Czech Republic only a few NGOs offer IPS and there are no effective support mechanisms for this provision at national or regional level (Kondrátová and Winkler 2017).

Wages

Wage rates greater than for sheltered work (Lewis et al. 1992; Noble et al, 1991; Mcgaughey et al. 1995). Kregel and Dean (2002) also showed that annual earnings for persons in the open labour market was at least twice of that earned by people in sheltered workshops.

Lewis et al. (1992) studied 11 Supported Employment services in Minnesota involving 856 people with a range of employment options (inclusive and sheltered). They reported a benefit:cost ratio of 5.62:1 for individual people with disabilities, indicating a significant rise in income for participants. The researchers also identified positive, but unquantified, benefits from employment through increased integration, quality of life and self-esteem.

Relative gain in income through Supported Employment is generally positive. This can be country specific however, Beyer et al. (1996) in a UK study finding that just over half of all workers increasing their income by less than 60%, only 2% of workers more than doubled their income, and 17% experienced no change in income at all on moving in to open market paid employment through this mechanism. Beyer (2008) found that people with an intellectual disability were on average 94.8% financially better off after becoming employed through Supported Employment.

Studies of wages relative to the general workforce are not common. However, Gilmore et al. (2000) found that in the US wages of people in Supported Employment over a 10-year period increased but did not keep up with inflation and general wage levels over the period. Mills (2006) in a study of 25 US States found that wage rates generally matched prevailing community pay rates but, like Gilmore, found that the wages of people in Supported Employment do not grow at the same rate as other workers over time, suggesting a lack of career development.

Dowler and Walls (2014) also found in their US studies that earnings were higher after receipt of Supported Employment services catering across all client groups than for alternative vocational rehabilitation programmes. When wages were similar, the number of hours worked per week was greater for those using Supported Employment, and therefore the actual income for Supported Employment participants was higher than for control groups working fewer hours per week.

In addition, Nord et al. (2013) note that it is necessary to provide training to equip employment professionals with knowledge and skills to support people with IDD effectively (Conley, 2003; Hill et al., 2007; Migliore, Butterworth, Nord, Cox, & Gelb, 2012). Effective training can deliver more community-based job placements and job placements with high wages and more work hours per week (Butterworth, Migliore, Nord, & Gelb, 2012). The authors also report that research evidence suggests a link to the implementation of customized employment practices and better outcomes for people with IDD, including higher wages, more hours, and greater job retention (Butterworth, Migliore, et al., 2012; Rogers, Lavin, Tran, Gantenbein, & Sharpe, 2008). Nord et al. (2013) note that research showed that workers with IDD employed in the community typically earn wages near the national minimum and work about 20 hours per week on average (Cimera, 2010b; Cimera & Burgess, 2011; Human Services Research Institute & The National Association of State Directors of Developmental Disability Services, 2012), representing an income below the national poverty line. This understood, people with IDD specifically still benefited more financially by working in their community than working in a sheltered workshop. These findings have been confirmed in more recent studies, some of which replicated the cost-accounting methodologies used in earlier research (Cimera, 2009; Cimera, 2010b; Cimera 2012; Cimera & Burgess, 2011).

West et al. (2005) in a study of the Best Buddies¹⁴ service created jobs and social activities for people with an intellectual disability with: hours at 15% higher; pay 30%-50% higher pay; and higher job retention rates than the national average. In a large study of 19,555 over 2001-2003 people with an intellectual disability Howarth et al. (2006) found that delivering Job Coaching to people was associated with people entering paid work. McInnes et al. (2010), in a study of 57,979 people, found that those people who received of Job Coaching as a part of their support service gained a paid job at 3 times, and received wages that were 1.5 times, the rate of people who did not receive job coaching. Austin et al. (2014) in a study of 3,627 people found that people who received Supported Employment services were more likely to gain paid employment than those who received personal services only.

In a review, Nicholas et al. (2015) identified 8 studies of Supported Employment for people with Autism which found positive outcomes in obtaining and retaining a paid job, receiving higher incomes and high levels of job satisfaction. Cimera, Wehman, West and Burgess (2011) conducted a study of people with ASD who attended sheltered workshops before entering Supported Employment programs, to determine if they had better outcomes than those who did not receive sheltered employment services. This study found no differences between these groups for employment rates. Adults previously in sheltered workshops received lower wages (US\$129.36 compared to US\$191.42 per week) and were more expensive to serve (US\$6,065.08 compared to US\$2,440.60), compared with the group who had not been in sheltered workshops prior to

¹⁴ Best Buddies Jobs Program works with people who have an intellectual disability and provides an individualised job match, employer support in hiring and ongoing support to both employer and employee

Supported Employment. This study concluded that individuals with ASD had better vocational outcomes if they did not enrol in sheltered workshops before entering Supported Employment.

Social inclusion

Beyer et al. (1995) found that when people with an intellectual disability moved from traditional day centres into on labour market through Supported Employment their interaction became more like the those observed for their non-disabled co-workers. The levels of social interaction can also be similar to other workers (Parent et al. 1992; Rusch et al. 1994). The evidence is inconclusive on whether people make lasting friendships with co-workers outside work, some studies showing some do and others showing that people generally do not (Rusch et al. 1994; Rusch et al. 1995; Chadsey and Beyer 2001). Supported Employment procedure can be important here, as use of the “natural support” of work colleagues, and supporting natural internal recruitment and training procedures, can lead to greater social inclusion for people with a disability compared with support by a job coach only (Lee et al. 1997; Mank et al. 1997a, b, 1998).

Cheng et al. (2018) found four studies that examined the impact of Coworker involvement on Supported Employment outcomes. Cimera (2001) found that there was no relationship between co-worker involvement and any outcome. Mautz (2001) input of job coaching and community development work improved the level of social inclusion of workers. Farris et al. (2001) found that co-worker involvement increased the rate of employment of people in their study, improved social attitudes towards, and the social involvement in the workplace, of people with an intellectual disability.

Other outcomes

Bond et al. (2001) perform secondary analysis on data from the RCT of IPS conducted in Washington, DC (Drake et al., 1999). This study is innovative in its attention to effect size, which is an important topic in studies of interventions where clinical significance and statistical significance are not always the same. The authors explore the non-vocational outcomes – self-esteem, quality of life and psychiatric symptoms, of four groups of service users who did: a substantial amount of competitive (inclusive) work; sheltered work; those who did a minimal amount of competitive work; and those who did none. Over 18 months, people in inclusive employment showed a greater improvement in psychiatric symptoms, as well as other broad quality of life outcomes, none of which showed any improvement in people who did sheltered work or a minimal amount of open work. The findings indicate that it is long-term employment, rather than a short exposure to employment, that has positive effects. Bond et al. (2001) also demonstrated that work did not appear to lead to deterioration in psychiatric symptoms, and for work in inclusive employment settings, that it could improve.

Kober and Eggleton (2005), in a study of 117 people in Supported Employment (55%) or Sheltered Workshops (45%) in Western Australia found that participants employed in open employment report

statistically significantly higher total quality of life scores compared with those employed in sheltered employment (including in the sub-dimensions of empowerment/independence and social belonging/community integration). These differences came from people with high functional work ability, people with low functional work ability showing no difference in total or dimensions of quality of life.

Nord et al. (2013) in a review of the literature, identified characteristics of State systems that are high performing in providing employment for people with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (IDD) have been identified. They include: the use of flexible employment service policies highlighting employment as the preferred outcome with flexibility for service providers to be innovative; delivery of flexible funding to accommodate people's individual employment support needs; effectively weaving and braiding funding sources together to be used effectively; use of incentives to promote the service delivery system to deliver integrated employment services; and using data to monitor and evaluate progress (Cohen, Butterworth, Gilmore & Metzel, 2003; Hall, Butterworth, Winsor, Gilmore & Metzel, 2007; Hall, Freeze, Butterworth, & Hoff, 2011).

A scoping review carried out by Cheng et al. (2018) found 22 studies that investigated methods of employing people with an intellectual disability (20 from the US, 1 from the UK and 1 from Australia). Twenty-one covered open employment and one a sheltered workshop. These both highlighted the importance of the detailed content of support in any particular model. At its best, support is individual, with support services including: job search assistance, on-the-job supports, job placement assistance, job readiness training for those who can benefit from it, diagnosis and treatment, vocational rehabilitation counselling and guidance, transportation, job maintenance support, and miscellaneous training Cheng et al. (2018).

Hedley et al. (2017) reviewed articles on employment programmes that provided for people with autistic spectrum disorder relating to 58,134 people. They identified three relevant previous reviews of articles. Shattuck et al. (2012) identified one relevant employment intervention study for people with ASD. The results from these studies were generally positive, suggesting that job placement outcomes, job retention, and satisfaction among clients and employers, as well as social participation are positive for Supported Employment (Howlin et al. 2005). Mawhood and Howling (1999) who found that Supported Employment for people with ASD achieved better employment outcomes than those without this support.

Headley et al. (2015) in a review, examined studies using the US Vocational Rehabilitation services' RSA-911 database. Inputs included: counselling, assessment and diagnosis, job search assistance, assistive technology and on-the-job training. Studies using this source have found a range of both positive and negative outcomes. The following positive outcomes were identified: improved employment outcomes for service recipients with ASD; Supported Employment results in increased earning potential, reduced service cost and higher likelihood of gaining competitive employment compared to sheltered employment. Transition-aged adults with ASD: work fewer hours per week; earn less and cost more to service when compared to individuals without ASD; males and females

with ASD benefit equally from on-the-job supports; employment was positively associated with on-the-job supports; predictors of successful case closure for individuals in competitive employment (paid job outcome) included receiving job finding, job placement and employment maintenance services. Negative outcomes included: transition-aged young adults with ASD work fewer hours per week, earn less and cost more to service when compared to individuals without ASD; that counselling and guidance, job search assistance and other services such as job licences, tools and equipment and medical care, may be more beneficial for males rather than females.

The review by Headley et al. (2015) found a number of specific Supported Employment programmes focusing on ASD achieved positive employment outcomes. TEACCH (US), offered job coaching in ordinary workplaces and achieved a 96% employment rate for 100 people with an 89% job retention rate for people with ASD and intellectual disabilities (42% of participants). Project SEARCH offers a 9-month internship programme to people with Developmental Disabilities with a large employer, supported by onsite job coaching and education focussed on a paid job. The review found research on five services and 87.5% of participants achieved competitive employment compared to 6.25% in a comparison group, and an 18-month retention rate of 84% compared to 55% retention when compared to individuals receiving Supported Employment services generally. The Project SEARCH sites generated higher wages and took less intervention hours to get to employment. The National Autistic Society's Prospects Supported Employment service had a successful paid employment rate of 68% between 1995 and 2003. In a further study, Prospects delivered better employment outcomes compared to a non-random control group.

In a review, Van Rijn et al. (2016) found observational studies that have provided evidence that entering paid employment can improve health and decrease psychiatric treatment. Mueser et al. (2014) as well as Bond et al. (2012) showed in Randomised Control Trials that after 18 months participants with severe mental illness gaining competitive employment had less psychiatric symptoms, better overall functioning and higher self-esteem. The authors suggest that "policymakers and healthcare providers must be aware that paid employment can be seen as a therapeutic intervention and can contribute to reducing socioeconomic health inequalities" (Van Rijn et al. 2016)

Further evidence for costs favouring IPS/SE development, a six-site European controlled trial Burns et al. (2007) in which 312 patients were randomly assigned to either IPS-SE or an alternative "train-and-place" vocational programme. Over an 18-month follow-up period, patients in IPS/SE were significantly less likely to be hospitalized (20% versus 31%), and the percentage of time spent in the hospital was lower for the IPS-SE group (4.6% versus 8.9%). This indicates that the cost of moving from broader vocational rehabilitation programmes for people with significant mental health conditions can also be offset from savings in health related services.

Burns et al. (2008) and colleagues presented evidence that differences between the working and non-working groups in non-vocational outcomes, including the probability of hospitalisation, were consistently larger for the train-and-place (IPS/SE) group. The authors interpreted this finding as suggesting that "IPS was more successful in getting less well functioning and symptomatic patients

into employment.” This finding is difficult to substantiate fully from other studies as level of psychiatric disability is often not controlled for in the studies but suggests that IPS/SE has wide applicability across people with mental health conditions.

Supported Employment provides jobs for people with Intellectual Disabilities, but there is evidence that the model provides more commonly for people with lower levels of disability. Kober and Eggleton (2005) carried out a study in Western Australia for people with IDD and found that participants in Supported Employment had more people with high, rather than low, functional work ability, while those in Sheltered Workshops employed more people with low, rather than high, functional work ability. Statistical tests showed differences in between participants in Supported Employment and Sheltered Employment were older, had longer job tenure and lower average hourly and weekly wages. The majority of people for both open and sheltered employment were employed in physical labouring positions (81%), this trend being similar for both forms of employment. However, labouring positions were more common for sheltered employment than for open employment (96% vs 67% of employees respectively).

Social Firms

Numbers and potential to deliver jobs

Parmenter (2011, p23) describes social enterprises as “businesses which trade for a social or environmental purpose, with the profits being reinvested into the company to help them achieve this purpose. The specific social purpose of social firms is to create jobs for people who find it hardest to get them.”

The sector is a significant force in providing jobs for people with a disability in some States, O’Brien and Dempsey (2004) noting that the development of Social Firms and Social Enterprises as has gained momentum throughout Europe in recent years. Spear and Bidet (2005) identified 14,209 “work integration social enterprises” (WISE) companies across European 12 countries supporting nearly 240,000 staff and beneficiaries. In the UK they identified 1,030 organisations, including Co-ops, Social Firms, Community Businesses, Independent Labour Market Organisations and quasi-state Social Enterprises. In the UK, the authors identified 38 Social Firms serving 380 people. In addition, they identify a further 154 “emerging” Social Firms in the UK. However, the number of people with disabilities is not known. Social Firms Scotland (2008) confirmed that the number of Social Firms was growing in the UK, the number of Social Firms rising from 5 to 151 between 1997 and 2007 providing 1600 (FTE) jobs. Half of these jobs were held by severely disadvantaged people, the majority of whom have mental health problems or intellectual disabilities.

Social enterprises have been established in Germany, providing normal jobs with contracts and wages for disabled people in economic enterprises where non-disabled people are also employed. While originally created primarily for people with mental health problem, now about one third are of the people served have mental health problems, about half are people with sensory and physical

disabilities and the remainder are people with intellectual disabilities. Italy is the best-known State for offering Social Businesses, commonly though worker co-operatives. Italian work integration co-operatives are self-managed and operate on principles of solidarity. They too largely serve people with mental health problems, alongside other disadvantaged and disabled people. In Ireland and in Germany, the viability of Social Enterprises depends on wage subsidies.

The evidence on outcomes for Social Firms is currently weak. Schemes report that enterprises can make savings in health and social care budgets, as well as delivering social returns on investment (SRI) in the form of increased well-being and independence. An analysis of the Six Mary's Place guesthouse project in Edinburgh (Durie and Wilson 2007) suggested that £5.87 was returned for every £1 invested, in the form of savings in mental health and welfare benefits, increased tax income, and personal income. Research on outcomes for Inclusive Enterprises is also weak at present.

Wages

There are few studies that have evaluated wage outcomes for Social Firms or compared them with other models. Beyer and Seeböhm (2003) carried out a financial net cost research study that looked at the three public authorities (two local authorities and one health authority) at different stages in the development of their social enterprises: a bakery; a contract gardening service; and a professional printing service. Each were compared with a "counterfactual" service. All services served people with an intellectual disability except for the printing service which served people with mental health problems. Individuals from each enterprise had a net benefit of 4.2p, 23.4p and 54.0p per £1 spent over their comparators. From a Taxpayer perspective, for every £1 spent on service, a return of 0.5p, 3.3 and 50.8p per enterprise over their comparators. Only the fully operational Social Firm made a significant net benefit over their comparators.

Other outcomes

Warner and Mandiberg (2006) carried out a review and survey of Social Firms (or affirmative businesses for people with mental health issues). They identified significant strengths in the model, including: Empowerment compatible with psychiatric recovery principles; opportunity for developing community in the workplace; belief in the organisation's social mission enhancing worker participation and promoting organisational success; Social firms can build a sense of purpose among their workforce resembling a social movement. Warner and Mandiberg (2006) note that these elements of a supportive atmosphere may explain why the rate of transition from Social Enterprises into competitive employment is low in most countries.

In a study of an Irish Social Firms initiative, McKeown et al. (1992) found that mental health and social functioning indicators increased whilst the need for medical services and treatment reduced among people with a mental health problem in their workforce. Forrester-Jones, McGill and Gwillim (2008) compared individuals with a learning disability working in a social enterprise and others attending day centres. People in Social Enterprises scored significantly higher on measures of life

experience, self-esteem, satisfaction and differences in knowledge of employment rights than comparators. The authors concluded that Social Enterprises were better training settings for future employment compared to day centres. There were no differences in either group's social network size or density and authors conclude that social inclusion was still inadequate for people within Social Enterprises and day centres.

There is relatively little data on the effectiveness of Social Firms and key outcomes for their workers. What data we have suggests that there are be significant high-level outcomes in terms of independence, control at work and personal satisfaction and esteem. Cost benefit appears to be low unless the Social Firm is well developed and delivering on trading income for a significant proportion of their income. Inclusive Enterprises are likely to rely significantly on public subsidy. However, this can vary across States and in Germany, public sector subsidy is 20% or less.

Vocational Rehabilitation

There are distinctions in the approach taken to Vocational Rehabilitation between States, primarily based on whether Vocational Rehabilitation can be accessed on a voluntary basis or it attendance is mandatory if the person is to receive welfare benefits. In Austria, Denmark, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland, and to an extent in Germany, Norway and Poland, registration for rehabilitation is mandatory before welfare benefit is agreed. In the US it is a voluntary programme. Assessing the effect of Vocational Rehabilitation on employment outcomes for people with a disability is complex, as in some States Vocational Rehabilitation services include access to Supported Employment and other models. Sheltered Workshops with a strong focus on transition to the open labour market often incorporate Vocational Rehabilitation and Training into their programmes to enhance people's prospects of an open labour market job. These combinations make it difficult to separate into component effects the impact of expenditure on Vocational Rehabilitation services.

While a feature of some outward looking "transitional" sheltered Workshops, Vocational Rehabilitation and Training is not successful with all client groups, especially people with an intellectual disability. McCuller et al. (2002), in a US study, found that 70% of Vocational Rehabilitation programmes studied offered pre-employment social skills training, usually using a classroom environment. However, Clement-Heist et al. (1992) demonstrated that social skills improved following on-site training in addition to simulated training received prior to commencement of work. This shows that having the workplace as a context for developing social skills is important, particularly for people with more severe intellectual disabilities. Researchers have found that social skills can be improved through on-site training alone (Hyun-Sook and Gaylord-Ross 1989) and that social skills training programmes are more effective if they incorporate the natural cues that occur within the real working environment than simulated ones (Huang and Cuvo 1997).

Shattuck et al. (2012) in a review found that Vocational Rehabilitation programmes (Hilier et al. 2007; Cimera et al. 2009) are positive for delivering paid jobs, job retention, and satisfaction among clients and employers, as well as social participation for people with autistic spectrum disorders.

Youth Transition

There have been a number of literature reviews that have explored the effectiveness of pre-graduation interventions aimed at people with a learning disability or ASD to shape their behaviours, social interactions, and skills that result in paid employment. A number of studies have looked at what helps people with disabilities become employed as they graduate from post-16 education in school or college. Test et al. (2009) reported on a meta-analysis of such transition studies, identifying 42 variables that predict successful post-high-school out-comes for youth with diverse disabilities, including people with intellectual disabilities. Young people who experienced paid employment or work experience while at school more often gained employment post-school. Receiving support from a vocational education programme or occupational course, or support from a transitional employment programme led to higher rates of employment. Benz, Lindstrom, & Yovanoff (2000) also found greater paid job outcomes for those who participated in vocational education and paid work experience while at school, alongside a range of skills, qualifications and planning interventions (Benz, Lindstrom, & Yovanoff 2000).

Having summer or part-time supported job experience while at school, providing vocational-technical training (rather than academic teaching), and spending significant time in work-based-based training, spending time with non-disabled peers, and use of a job coach deliver better taxpayer benefit:cost ratios than for young people who did not (Cimera 2010c). A large-scale Vocational Education and Training study has reported unclear outcomes from current VET approaches for young people with disabilities in transition from school to adult life. The study concluded that better approaches were required including: job coaching and other employment focused staff throughout transition; supervised practical training in inclusive workplaces; follow-up activities to maintain the learners' inclusive employment in companies; being linked to an employer before leaving school (Hoerner & Wehrley, 1995; Bailey & Hughes, 1999; Wehman, 2001; Colley & Jamison, 1998; Luecking & Fabian, 2000; Nord et al. 2013; Warner et al. 2006; Scuccimarra & Speece 1990; Hasazi et al. 1985; Phelps & Hanley-Maxwell 1997; Humes & Brammer 1985; White and Weiner 2004; Howarth et al. 2006).

Data from Project SEARCH¹⁵, a one-year internship programme for people with an intellectual disability or ASD (Wehman et al. 2013) in their last year in education presents the results of a randomized clinical trial on the employment outcomes for youth with ASD between the ages of 18–21 years of age. 87.5 % of treatment group participants acquired employment and an opportunity to learn new skills on the job, while only 6.25% of control group participants gained employment.

Given the potential for enhanced benefits for the person and taxpayers a greater focus is required on delivering what actually works at school or college to provide inclusive paid employment for young people after graduation. The provision of more Supported Employment seems to be the best way to deliver these requirements for effective transition from education to employment.

¹⁵ Project SEARCH website: <https://www.projectsearch.us>

Self-employment/Micro-enterprise

Neufeldt and Albright (1998, p. 6) define self-directed employment as:

“Income-generating work where disabled people, to a significant degree, have a prime decision-making role in the kind of work that is done, how time is allocated, what kinds of investment in time and money should be made, and how to allocate revenue generated.”

Parmenter (2011) has highlighted that, in the context of people with intellectual disabilities, the small amount of research conducted on this model has addressed the best practice processes involved, rather than outcomes (Momin 2004; Metts and Oleson 1995). In their review, Beyer and Robinson (2009, p. 65-66; Hogg 2005) have reported the main strengths of the model for people with an intellectual disability to be broad, higher level organisation, and not specific on individual profit or social outcomes by:

- respecting the capacity and the assets of people with intellectual disabilities, by focusing on people’s interests and strengths, and can be more flexible than mainstream employment and working conditions;
- pursuing equality by opening up the self-employment sector of the labour market, where people with intellectual disabilities are not represented;
- reflecting aspects of governmental thinking on increasing employment for disadvantaged groups, and on developing services to meet individual needs;
- allowing some people a way of gaining income from a hobby or an interest, with support and funding through person-centred planning, direct payments and individualized budgets;
- providing another way for a person with intellectual disability to move from being a client to being a citizen.

The model in the west seems to rely heavily on family resources and devolved social care funding to make it viable and profits appear to be low, with people topping up welfare benefit income.

International studies have highlighted success factors in income generation strategies. WHO (2011) studied 81 self-directed employment projects and found these to be necessary for success of micro-enterprises:

- a self-directed identity (self-confidence, energy, an ability to risk-take);
- relevant knowledge (literacy and numeracy, technical skills, business skills);
- availability of resources (advice, capital, marketing assistance);
- an enabling social and policy environment (political support, community development, disability rights).

Clearly, where the economy is conducive, self-employment can be a significant provider of employment. In China, self-employment grew as a natural consequence of the shift to a market

economy. This was supported by the government exempting people with a disability from business registration and market management fees, increasing earnings by an estimated 3.2%. Small start-up grants and free or low-interest loans to stimulate new business start-ups. The result was that around 2 million people with disabilities were self-employed by 2005, more than the combined capacity of the quota system and welfare enterprises together, underlying the power of this route for people with a disability in the right economy (Huang et al. 2009).

Micro-finance programmes are core to success in some countries and they are in principle open to all, including disabled people. However, what evidence exists is largely anecdotal and suggests that few people with a disability are benefitting from these schemes. More evidence is needed on their effectiveness. A review of the literature found obstacles in mainstream micro-finance, and so provisional schemes run by NGOs and disabled people's organizations were helping, and are giving rise to social inclusion, participation, and empowerment. Both approaches are needed to achieve wider coverage and sustainability, given that micro-finance has potential for social and economic impacts for people with a disability (Cramm et al. 2008). Targeted micro-finance has had positive impacts of people with a disability in Ethiopia; has been beneficial and sustainable in almost two thirds of case; other interventions have had an effect on paid employment for entrepreneurs in India, Zimbabwe, the Philippines and Bangladesh (Nuri, Hoque, Akand and Waldron 2012; Lagerkvist 1992; Biggeri 2012); and increased income in India (Gershon & Srinivasan, 1992). Disability organisations face difficulties in developing and administering microfinance programmes and can reach only a small number of people with disabilities (Dyer et al. 2004).

Another contribution to organising one-person micro-entrepreneurships particularly for people with higher support needs is the use of a "micro-board" to develop the business,

manage grant funding and take care of professional service functions of the business that people cannot do themselves. "Vela Microboards" are a version of this approach (Vela Microboard Association, 2009). The development of micro-enterprise model within the UK has been limited (Hogg 2005).

3.3. Opportunities and barriers for accessing each model

Sheltered Workshops

While Sheltered Workshops of many kinds exist across the EU, the European Parliament (2015) note that in 2012, across 19 EU Member States that a majority can be characterised as "Intermediary focus 'traditional' programme" (8 countries- AT, BE, DK, HU, IE, IT, PT and UK) or "Intermediary focus 'new attempts'" (8 countries- SE, ES, SK, LU, EL, DE, FI and CZ). Only 3 were classified as having a transition "Strong focus, but largely permanently employed" (FR, NL and PL). No countries were classified as "Strong focus, with significant transition rates" in relation to transition to open

employment, suggesting that Sheltered Workshops were not currently a viable route into open labour market jobs for new recruits or for existing Workshop clients, representing a barrier to access.

Supported Employment

Parmenter (2011) has queried the impact of extending Supported Employment to wider groups than the most disabled people it was designed for (namely people with an intellectual disability or autism). Parmenter notes that a policy shift made in Australia to extend Supported Employment to people with a mental health problem has led to discrimination against people with intellectual disabilities who have higher support needs. The sustained skilled input required from job coaches to find jobs, train and maintain people with significant intellectual disabilities is sometimes at odds with the skill set required to place and support people with a mental health problem.

The basic availability of Supported Employment agencies within and across countries is still a major barrier to people getting jobs. A noticeable trend in Supported Employment has been a move towards a mainstream approach where people with disabilities are supported by generic employment services. In New Zealand, the UK and the US, the support for open employment is based on outcome-based payments. Here providers take on the cost of job-seeking and are reimbursed by the taxpayer when employment is obtained. This attracts large providers who can afford these funding arrangements. These approaches appear to be successful in supporting people without a disability and people with mild levels of disability into employment. However, these policies can also be seen to incentivise providers to work with people who have lower levels of need and who experience fewer challenges in securing employment. This can be a barrier to people with more severe conditions accessing a government funded employment service. It is important that commissioners of such Supported Employment services should incentivise providers to support people with a range of abilities and support the development of staff with the appropriate skills to deliver jobs for these groups. Allocating resources based on people's individual needs should help improve outcomes.

Social Firms

Spear and Bidet (2005) conclude from their research that the Social Firms sector is not fully capitalised. They argue that the sector is under-resourced with fragmented support structures such as federations and development agencies, making it difficult for them to flourish and achieve their full potential. As a business model these enterprises will increase and flourish through the power of their business ideas, as a significant proportion of income must come from trading. However, their social function can still be dependent on other forms of public funding and the availability of finance can be a barrier to their success. The spread of social co-operatives and other effective models alongside some new social enterprise structures provides grounds for optimism, however.

Self-employment

A review by Neufeldt and Albright (1998) of over 120 self-employment projects across low-, middle- and high-income countries found considerably more experience in the low- to middle-income countries in supporting entrepreneurship for people with disabilities than in high-income countries. In the more affluent West, there are barriers to entering self-employment, particular people with an intellectual disability. Self-employment start-ups are heavily dependent on family finance and family support. There is a lack of suitable grants, of job coach support for entrepreneurs with a disability, accessible business planning assistance, and business expertise. While the notion of micro-boards to assist people in managing their business there remain few examples with evaluations of worker wage and other outcomes. This represents a barrier to access to Social Firms.

3.4. People with different levels of disability

Supported employment has been able to serve a wide range of people with a learning disability in the US, including people with mild, moderate and severe intellectual disabilities (Brickley et al. 1985; Wehman et al. 1985; Kregel et al. 1989). However, outcomes of Supported Employment are lower depending on the severity of people's condition in areas such as wages and work integration (Mank et al. 1997a, b; 1998; 1999). Also, severity of intellectual disability has been a factor in whether people can access Supported Employment services in some areas (Fabian et al. 2000). These factors can limit the success of expansion of Supported Employment if access is not guaranteed.

Supported Employment can provide employment for people with the “most significant” intellectual disabilities and be cost-beneficial. In a comparative study of study of Supported Employees and Sheltered Workers with these characteristics, Cimera (2007) found the cumulative costs of workers in Supported Employment were 33.7% cheaper than those of sheltered workers over the period 2002-2005. The cumulative average cost over this period was \$8,212 for Supported Employment and \$12,387 for Sheltered Employment. Reasons for this reduced cost were the shorter time it took to place and fade support in Supported Employment, compared to ongoing static costs for sheltered employment. Further cost arguments that Supported Employment serves people with substantial disabilities comes from Cimera (1998) who looked at the cost-efficiency of Supported Employment compared to sheltered workshops by people's IQ, level of learning disability, presence of multiple disabilities and other characteristics. The three perspectives of person, taxpayer and society were adopted. He found that regardless of the severity or number of disabilities all individuals were cost-efficient from each perspective. Cimera and Rusch, (1999) found that for the individual worker, wages increased irrespective of the level of learning disability within Supported Employment. Wehman et al. (2003) explored the cost-efficiency of Supported Employment for people with traumatic brain injury. In a study involving 59 people employed in open labour market jobs over the period 1989 to 1999, 71.4% found employment. The mean cost of Supported Employment input was \$8614 (compared to all employment service mean costs of \$10,350). The authors concluded that *“The results of our investigation provide additional support for the conclusion that Supported Employment is cost effective for individuals with disabilities, including individuals with TBI, and that the costs of Supported Employment decrease over time”* (Wehman et al. 2003).

Moore et al. (2002a) found that people were more likely to be employed if they had received a job placement as part of their support. Moore (2002b) also found that receipt of job placement services lead to people with severe or profound intellectual disabilities maintaining their jobs over time.

These findings are important as they suggest that Supported Employment is easier to develop further in cost terms than Sheltered Workshop provision, and that it is suitable for expansion across the full range of people with a disability, all other conditions being equal.

Our review of intervention with people with multiple disabilities or disabilities other than intellectual disabilities or psychosocial disabilities appears to support that a wide range of disabilities can be catered for in Supported Employment. Studies across a range of disabilities suggest that there is net taxpayer benefit from people going into employment in inclusive settings that is greater than Sheltered Workshops when comparisons are available. One of the key factors driving cost-beneficial outcomes related to the transitional nature of the support people receive from job coaches to get into work. Personalised approaches, such as Supported Employment, reduce the intensity of their input to workers over time, leading to reduced costs per person over time. For some people with a disability, a more general “return to work” Vocational Rehabilitation and Training strategy is powerful enough to get people back to their ordinary workplaces after injury or illness, and savings in reduced welfare benefit are enough to make these interventions viable for this group.

3.5. Changing employment model and the consequences of that change

Sheltered Employment

The current trend in the EU towards Sheltered Workshops is an increasing movement towards a transitional model, with workshops being refocussed to train and support people with disabilities to enter the open labour market. This is not universal with a number of variations between States in their view of the future of this model. The future of Sheltered Workshops in some cases bound up with State rules over who can access Sheltered Workshops or their equivalent. In some cases, people need to have a reduced work capacity of 50% or more while other States may also provide sheltered employment for people with specific disabilities or particular forms of social welfare support. The most effective investment solution for better employment outcome may be dependent on a State’s client base. For example, workshops with an open employment transition focus might benefit from increasingly investment in Vocational Education and Training but will only be effective if their clients can benefit from this approach. The most common rehabilitation measures involve technical programmes designed for certain people with a disability to become qualified and to be employed in professions. This may suit some people, but certainly those with a long-term mental health condition, autism or an intellectual disability appear to benefit from more direct “place and train” methods and achieve better outcomes going directly into open labour market employment than in Sheltered Employment options. Programmes that directly target open labour market jobs have been

found to be more cost-beneficial at present and appear to be more effective options for this outcome than transitional sheltered workshops.

The structure of Sheltered Workshops can be heavily tailored to their local culture and State legislation and so it can be difficult to be prescriptive about what might be usefully expanded in all situations. Public funding is central to most Sheltered Workshops and how this is delivered can heavily structure the aims of the Workshop and its success in employment of people with a disability. Some are more aligned to general support schemes without the same rules and regulations that Sheltered Workshops may have. These models may be seen as an alternative to being in care or receiving government benefits, rather than other types of economic employment. Here the goal is unlikely to be open labour market employment. Aligned with this, some sheltered workshops are not, therefore, party to the obligations and rights of a labour legislation and sheltered employees do not have full 'employee status'. In other countries, sheltered employees have full labour rights. For some, wage levels are controlled and maintained, whereas in other countries people can legally be paid less than the national minimum wage.

We have discussed data about the less tangible benefits that go along with engagement in a Sheltered Workshop. These benefits may be significant in a local cultural and economic context of some States and could lead some forms of sheltered occupation being regarded as beneficial for some people with a disability. A financial cost-benefit analysis on a sheltered workshop in Hungary has shown the return for each EUR 1 spent to be low, with returns of only EUR 0.20. Benefits come from lower welfare benefits paid and higher tax revenue. On an annual basis the cost to the Hungarian government was around HUF 43 million for a return of HUF 9 million. However, this analysis did not put a value on intangibles outcomes, such as any quality-of-life benefit or impact on people's life chances, status, established friendships and stable income as well as wider benefits to others such as family members relieved from supervision of relatives with a disability during the day. These high cost sheltered employment options may continue to be supported to avoid negative impacts on workers and families.

The role of organisations delivering Sheltered Workshops is also a factor here. Some larger NGOs may run a number of services that include Social Enterprises with a strong emphasis on paid employment, open labour market Supported Employment and Sheltered Workshops. The clients for the various services may be different, as will be the goals, but there may also be cross-subsidy of funding between the elements. This can make expansion of one part more complex.

There have undoubtedly been improvements in the quality of outcomes from sheltered workshops in some countries. Parmenter (2011, p14) highlights changes in the Australian system, where sheltered workshops changed to more proactive and good practice business orientated enterprises, with increases in wages and working conditions resulting. Similar increases in minimum wages standards have also been established in New Zealand. However, the data presented earlier does show that in general sheltered workshops do not earn as much as people with a disability working in the open

labour market, and do not generally receive the same standards of social protection workers in the open labour market enjoy.

Further, there is strong evidence that consumers in some States, including Northern Ireland, Spain and the US, aspire to open labour market employment (McConkey and Mezza, 2001; Migliore et al., 2007; Verdugo et al., 2009). In the US, “Employment First” States have adopted service delivery strategies that embrace the principle of integrated competitive employment as the default option for people across the span of disability and severity, underpinned by self-advocate pressure (Kiernan et al., 2011; Walker, 2011).

Migliore et al. (2007) in a study of 210 people with an intellectual disability and their families working in 19 US sheltered workshops showed that the majority of respondents would have liked employment outside of the sheltered workshop or would consider it an option. The majority of respondents also believed that adults with intellectual disabilities can perform outside workshops with support. The authors note that their results support the need for system change and the further promotion of the employment of adults with intellectual disabilities in the open labor market rather than further investment in segregated work.

It is clear that, in general, Sheltered Employment delivers lower wages and some other outcomes than alternative models and are less costly to run. Sheltered Workshops do provide security, engagement and wages in some countries and alternative models are poorly developed. There will be in some cases resistance to transition from what are perceived to be stable work in Sheltered Workshops. Legal frameworks may also be weak, and welfare benefit systems unsupportive, in relation to open labour market employment. Wages in open employment may not create the circumstances for people to be better off moving from Sheltered Work or welfare benefits to open paid employment. Even in these circumstances there remain ethical issues in pursuing greater investment in Sheltered Employment rather than to pursue solutions that can give people with a disability a pathway to equal work and income, to other open labour market employment, without recourse to UN CRPD principles and aspirations.

Supported Employment

Cimera (2011) has shown that people in sheltered workshops are able to be employed in the open labour market. In a study of two matched cohorts of employees from sheltered workshops no prior involvement in sheltered workshops the groups were equally likely to be employed in the open labour market. Rates of pay for those people with no prior sheltered workshop experience worked more hours, earned significantly more, and cost less to support than those from the sheltered workshops. Cimera (2008) also compared costs over time of support for all people with disabilities in US Sheltered Workshops and Supported Employment. Cumulative costs in Sheltered Workshops were \$19,388 compared to \$6,618 for Supported Employment. Cimera (2008) also reported that the cost-trend was downward for Supported Employment and slightly upward for Sheltered Workshops.

These data are confirmed in other countries. Beyer (2008), in a study of a Scottish Supported Employment agency, found a net cost of the service per person to be £7,216 pp pa compared to a Locality Day Support Services of £14,998 pp pa. In a UK study, Beyer et al. (2002) found better cost: benefit outcomes for community jobs (£4625 per person pa) than for sheltered factories (between £9,390 and £12,164 per person pa depending on sector of ownership). These findings suggest that Supported Employment should be easier to develop more widely in cost terms than alternatives, because of its lower cost, all other conditions for success being equal.

Evidence on barriers to expanding Supported Employment provision comes from Sijl et al. (2002) who note the failure of Supported Employment in the Netherlands to help people to transition from Sheltered Workshops to the open labour market. 1998 legislation led to a mandated 25% of new WSW scheme placements being directed to Supported Employment rather than Sheltered Workshops. However, only 200 of an expected 1,250 new Supported Employment placements were delivered by the end of 1999, with only 10% of workshop leavers entering open employment. Sijl (2002) notes the reason for failure to be that a large number of people in Sheltered Workshops were not thought to be capable of work in Supported Employment and a significant number did not want to work in the open labour market. Further, the funding from WSW did not incentivise municipalities to help people with a disability move into regular jobs. Nor did clients have an incentive to leave the WSW for a job in the open labour market. The difference between people's income while in the Sheltered Workshop and in the open market was not significant enough, and potential loss of personal status within the Workshop, to move from a perceived stable job.

There are a number of other factors need to be considered to establish if expansion of Supported Employment is feasible in any particular country. A study by Smits (2004) provides an overview of some of the factors that need to be put in place for expansion of Supported Employment to be a success. Smits (2004) researched cumulative good practice in gaining employment for people with a disability in the US. At a Federal level, better outcomes come from close working between Departments of Labour, Disability Employment Policy and Education. This is needed to model the collaboration needed at regional and local levels. At local level, it is helpful to appoint agency heads who share a belief in moving various groups of people with a disability into meaningful employment, and then developing objectives shared by the necessary collaborating agencies and consumers, and a shared understanding of each other's capacities and restrictions in law and resources. At service delivery level, best practice and better employment outcomes are achieved by: co-locating of staff from relevant agencies to aid communication, teamwork, and resource sharing; joint training to build understanding and trust in others services; delivering multi-agency expertise to fully serve people with the full range of disabilities who want employment in the open labour market; making services fully accessible to the full range of people with a disability; and access to assistive technology. Unless this level of joint working can be achieved, it is likely that there will be limitations in the rates of open labour market employment that can be achieved, and in the severity of disability of those who might be supported into work, via Supported Employment.

There is further evidence to suggest that attention must be given to wage levels and the State context for costs of living when considering if a model can be expanded (Kondratová and Winkler 2017). In countries such as Norway and Sweden there are high wage levels and strong economic support for the unemployed. The wages on offer in the open labour market must normally be high enough to exceed welfare benefit income and Sheltered employment income. Norway has prioritised voluntary “More Inclusive Working Life Agreements” (IA) that strengthen employer responsibilities to reduce sickness absenteeism, increase employment of people with reduced functional abilities and to retain ageing workers. The government has only recently intensified non-discrimination obligations. Sweden, however, has largely focused on implementing anti-discrimination legislation, Supported Employment, and wage subsidies for employers.

Research with employers in these two States show the implementation of strong Disability Rights legislation, that companies may conform to this legislation, but may still avoid cases that can ‘incur costs or negative claims’ (Kuznetsova and Winkler 2017, p 247). In Norway, managers of selected large companies seemed to promote IA activities which benefited their own employees, rather than being more proactive about including people with disabilities from outside their workforce. In Sweden, companies were more aware and had experience of including people with intellectual disabilities through working with special support programmes. The 2015 employment rates for Sweden and Norway were higher in Sweden for people with moderate (70.7% vs 62.5%) and severe (50.8% vs 35.4%) disabilities, suggesting that in the context of high wage economies, it is likely that promotion of direct Supported Employment approaches and attention to wage subsidies are most effective in recruitment of new employees with a disability.

If more employment in open labour market jobs is to be a goal of employment policies, the manner by which support is delivered is also important (O’Brien and Dempsey 2004). In a comparison of Finland, Austria and Sweden, Supported Employment was relatively under-developed, but its delivery across the countries differed. In Finland in 2004 few independent agencies and sheltered workshops were delivering most Supported Employment projects. Here conflicts of interest can occur and retaining high competency workers in the sheltered workshop to maintain productivity means there are fewer incentives to make community-based employment successful (O’Brien and Dempsey 2004). In Sweden, Supported Employment was more independent from sheltered workshops than in Norway or Finland. Independent funding and status for Supported Employment is needed if open labour market jobs are to increase, and transition from sheltered employment to the open labour market is to be achieved.

Sweden had been relatively successful in employing people but high standards of living and income set a different context from States with lower per capita income. To deal with this, the Swedish system is underpinned by widespread use of long-term subsidies. While these can be valuable to meet any additional costs incurred by employers, they may also reinforce negative perceptions held by employers that people with disability are less valuable than other workers. More consistent progress towards open labour market jobs might be gained through changing attitudes through

improved job matching, competent work, and the promotion of workers with disabilities as productive and valuable employees.

In high wage economies, open employment without government wage subsidy can lead to insecurity and reluctance among people with a disability to choose employment instead of maintenance on welfare benefit or remaining in sheltered work where wages might be regarded as more secure. This can lead to slower progress in developing the open labour market through Supported Employment in these countries unless progressive policies are used to overcome public fear of people being moved into entry-level, low-skilled jobs with wages at the minimum level. Wage subsidies may need to be considered to level the wage playing field with welfare benefits or subsidised sheltered work incomes (O'Brien and Dempsey 2004).

A comparative study of employment approaches in Austria, Finland and Sweden raises another issue that needs to be considered in determining the ease of expanding particular services (O'Brien and Dempsey 2004). The authors raised the issue of the increasing loss of low skilled jobs, which traditionally have been the basis of much employment of people with intellectual disabilities. They recommend that future efforts to employ this group may well need to be underpinned by improving the level of education and training available for people with intellectual disabilities across Europe. This will itself suggest greater investment in Vocational Rehabilitation and Training, but in tandem with a move to "Intermediate" Sheltered Workshops with a focus on transition or linked to Supported Employment.

Rose and Harris (2005) identified barriers to shifting to IPS for people with a mental health condition coming from the attitudes of mental health service providers in Australia, despite the weight of quantitative evidence for its effectiveness in getting people into paid employment. The authors found that: mental health services lacked a structure to support vocational rehabilitation and access to employment opportunities; consumers were placed in prevocational training programmes even though Supported Employment programmes were available in the local area; and both consumers and case managers believed that open employment was dangerous and could promote mental health relapse. The authors note that there is no evidence of any negative effects on symptoms of entering IPS/SE (Drake et al. 1999). Changes in awareness and understanding among mental health professionals may be needed in some countries if a shift to open labour market jobs is to be successful.

Nicholas et al. (2015), suggests that there has been dissatisfaction with existing ASD vocational supports, supported by other authors (Nicholas and Roberts, 2012; Richards, 2012; Van Wieren et al., 2008, 2012). The pervasiveness and multiplicity of barriers mean that, at that point, greater understanding about key issues and methods of vocational rehabilitation were still required for persons with ASD. Provision of direct employment support is low. Richards notes that, in 2012, there were estimates of the shortfall in specialist employment support for this group of 10% for interview and 20% for in-work support. A further barrier was that support is often not fit for purpose because: the needs of people with ASD are different from others, particularly in on-the-job training; treating

people with ASD as an homogenous group; and that support tends to overlook the high intellectual capacity of people. A particular set of barriers stem from employment being in open employment settings. Here, a number of unresolved employer related problems can restrict the employment prospects of people with ASD (and other disabilities): the provision of poor job previews; managerial intolerance for individual idiosyncrasies; a failure to build on previous examples of the employment of people with Asperger syndrome; employers' inconsistent management of prospective employees disclosing details of their condition; and employers not making 'reasonable adjustments' under equalities legislation; and a failure of some vocational rehabilitation frameworks to respond to these (Richards 2012, p 9).

While people with ASD can enter paid employment through Supported Employment and some wider vocational rehabilitation services, research suggests that males with ASD and co-occurring anxiety and/or depression experience a 50% reduction in the odds of finding employment (Sung et al., 2015). The results of Supported Employment and Vocational Rehabilitation in terms of higher community-based employment rates in the US are influenced by race (White higher), gender (male), education (more educated higher), mental health status (no diagnosis), higher levels of financial input.

Kukla et al. (2016) identified barriers to successful Supported Employment for military veterans with mental health conditions in rural areas. Responses from rural staff engaged in Supported Employment found more barriers to employment success compared with urban personnel, particularly in the areas of access to mental health services and a range of job-related factors, including: the limited range of jobs in rural areas making it difficult to successfully match between job to people's abilities and needs; and the impact of poor transport in rural areas to help people access jobs. This implies open employment through Supported Employment cannot be Universally successful in producing high rates of employment among people with a disability.

Knaeps et al. (2012) in a study of IPS within 17 wider service models in Flanders found barriers to wider IPS implementation in that State, they found similar barriers for Supported Employment Services, Sheltered Employment and Pre-Vocational Counselling Training Centres. Agencies responding reported the following barriers to further development of IPS:

- Employers being reluctant to offer internships and jobs
- A lack of financial stability due to short-time financing of agencies hinders the implementation of high-quality rehabilitation programmes
- Difficulties with collaboration between governmental agencies for unemployment services and other services, stigma and benefit traps
- Some agencies perceive the numerous legal regulations for unemployed persons with Severe Mental Illness as no longer adapted to the current labor market. Organizational barriers and opportunities were least often reported
- Agencies find the caseload and administrative workloads too high which inhibits a trusting and continuous relationship with clients

- High workloads of both vocational rehabilitation services and mental health agencies impedes successful collaboration
- There are significant differences in the values of employment agencies and mental health organisations, with vocational rehabilitation counselors favouring quick integration into work, and mental health teams offering a relatively slower recovery process.

Job retention has been a problem in the early days of Supported Employment. High turnover within two-years has been reported ranging from 20% to 89% (Goldberg et al. 1990; Lagomarcino, 2002; Wehman et al. 1986; Beyer et al. 1996; Keel et al. 1997) The issue is complex however, with people leaving for “no fault” and positive reasons such as other jobs, being made redundant, but still with estimates of people leaving because of poor behaviour or inadequate skills being 38% as high as (Lagomarcino, 2002; Lemaire and Mallik 2008). Understandably, improving job retention in jobs has therefore been a focus of development in Supported Employment for many years.

Saloviita and Pirttimas (2007) in a study of Supported Employment in Finland identified 22 organisations, the majority of whom employed only one or two persons in supported work. Comparison of data over a 6-year period showed a decline in the number of agencies providing intensive employment supports. Along with this change, Supported Employment agencies in Finland were found to have progressively barred people with significant disabilities from being their customers. The authors argue that this reflects a change in European public policy on employment supports, moving from serving people with significant disabilities to people with limited support needs.

Wistow and Schneider (2007) in a survey of the views of UK Supported Employment managers, identified barriers to their delivering employment opportunities to disabled people. Managers stated that the negative and protective attitudes of employers, ‘care services’ and of society at large restricted disabled people’s access to employment opportunities. The authors argue that lack of societal integration from an early age was driving these restrictions, required, to make employment of disabled people be the norm for employers, society and disabled people themselves. Managers also identified the operation and perception of the UK welfare benefits system as a barrier to increasing employment opportunities for people with disabilities. Further, Supported Employment agency managers highlighted the need for change in how their agencies were funded. They argue for a shift from insecure and piecemeal funding to longer-term core funding to enable long-term planning and stability in support service provision. There appears to be no consistent approach to defining quality or improving performance. Managers also report that few funders understand Supported Employment, and therefore, the outcomes set by funders are often inappropriate. Poor target setting can also bias recruitment towards people who are perceived as easier to place in jobs, favour investment in getting new jobs rather than jobs with secure futures or helping people to develop their careers when in a job.

In the UK, Melling, Beyer and Kilsby (2011) also highlight the problem of employment policy and funding not reflecting the needs of disabled people with complex needs and the lack of consistency

in how education and skills, employment and social care departments, work together to fund Supported Employment. A clear policy and funding framework for Supported Employment and job coaching had not emerged up until 2011. They argue that the Prime Provider model for flagship disability employment programmes in the UK makes it less likely the more intensive, longer-term and more costly clients are provided with Supported Employment and making funding less available for small specialist SE agencies.

There is also evidence that the Prime model of poor performance” In 2011, the UK Committee of Public Accounts reported that “The Department for Work and Pensions deserves credit for attempting to tackle the intractable problem of moving people from incapacity benefits into work. But its key programme for doing so, Pathways to Work, was not well implemented and has had limited effect.” They found that private providers’ performance was universally poor in helping claimants required to go on the programme. They tended to “cherry pick” their clients and still achieved only one third of the targets for mandatory participants.¹⁶

COWI (2012) mapped Supported Employment in 30 countries and revealed that the term was not used consistently across the different countries. From this data the authors note that the understanding, position and status of Supported Employment becomes unclear and funding unstable and unpredictable. Six countries were selected for the in-depth study- Austria, the Czech Republic, Norway, Spain, Sweden and UK. In Austria, Norway and Sweden, a formal framework for funding, guidelines and standards was in place. In the other three countries, Supported Employment was not the result of national policy design (Czech Republic, Spain and UK) and a more informal approach was taken in the absence of a national Supported Employment programme. Funding from local, national and EU sources still provided scope for a range of Supported Employment projects to be in place. However, this approach seems to result in isolated projects with “no thorough institutional anchoring and ad-hoc character... which may divert focus from employment in the open labour market.” Without a national framework projects lack continuity and predictability and Supported Employment is regarded as an “experimental or pilot project,” or simply as individual projects. Lack of institutionalised or mainstreamed of Supported Employment also has the following consequences:

- Unclear position of Supported Employment
- Unclear understanding of what Supported Employment is (employment or subsistence)
- Unclear status of Supported Employment
- Unstable and unpredictable funding

¹⁶ Prime Providers are large, often private sector eservice providers who take on large government employment support contracts and are able to provide initial funding for staffing that can ultimately refunded to them from welfare benefit and other savings, See this reference for discussion of issues in this model: www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/public-accounts-committee/news/committee-of-public-accounts-support-to-incapacity-benefits-claimants-through-pathways-to-work/

- Lack of awareness and knowledge about Supported Employment on national policy level and in Public Employment Service
- Lack of monitoring and statistics
- Lack of financial and professional incentives for service providers. (COWI (2012, p7-8))

COWI (2012) also highlight that many people with disabilities are concerned with how to regain their welfare benefits if a job ends. This influences clients' motivation to enter employment and acts as a further barrier to taking-up of paid employment in general, and Supported Employment in particular.

Supported Employment has higher levels of staff input at the beginning of placement, reducing after a person has been placed and trained in a target job. This leads to higher costs at the beginning, but reduced costs later, in the process with an ability to take on further clients potentially reducing the average cost per worker over time. The fact that an employment model is cost-effective should make it attractive to politicians and policy-makers to invest in it and provide the opportunity to expand access to it.

In terms of an opportunity, the relative costs of IPS/Supported Employment (SE) suggest that there is a net financial benefit to taxpayers and that savings from shifting from alternatives to IPS/SE more than covers the cost of transfer. Salkeve (2013) in a Review of 27 studies in the US found that in two studies of day service treatment programmes in New Hampshire where, before conversion, the annual cost per client were \$8739 and \$6597 and after conversion to IPS/SE it was \$1920 and \$1878. Authors concluded that the costs of conversion to IPS-SE services were at least fully offset. An RCT of IPS/SE versus skills training vocational rehabilitation found an annual cost of \$5230 and \$5134 respectively. This suggests that potential savings from moving from more segregated to mainstream services are highly dependent on the nature of the alternative serve. Most of the savings in the day services example were from stopping high cost partial hospitalisation delivered through these services on conversion. This data suggests that there may be more savings than costs in moving to IPS/SE.

A study by Mavranzouli et al. (2014) compared the cost-effectiveness of the NAS Prospects programme with standard care. The study found Supported Employment to be more expensive but resulting in an increased number of weeks employed, and increased quality-of-life years, when compared to standard care. Supported Employment for adults with autism was reported to be cost-effective for both individuals and for communities. Building on these results, and those from Howlin (2005), the UK's National Audit Office (NAO) (2009) looked at the impact of specialised support for people with ASD in England. They estimated that if services identified and supported 4% or more adults with high functioning autism into inclusive employment, they could become cost-neutral in time. By identifying 6%, they estimated a savings of £38 million per year, and if 8% of this group were identified and employed then annual savings could reach as much as £67 million. This highlights that Supported Employment can have a major impact on government budgets and investment could be cost efficient.

Cimera and Cowan (2009) studied of US Vocational Rehabilitation funded Supported Employment for people with Autism from 2002 to 2006, 569 people were diagnosed as having autism or ASD. The cost of these clients to VR averaged \$3213 per year and they were the most costly people to serve apart from people with sensory disabilities. When costs were considered in the context of wages earned and hours worked per week, people with Autism were one of the most costly groups examined. Jacob et al. (2015) noted that, while ASD was one of the most expensive groups served by US VR services, it was more efficient for adults with ASD to be provided with VR services and become employed, than compounding an already significant cost of care services. Investment in these supports is a worthwhile investment potential for taxpayer funded vocational rehabilitation services and represents an opportunity to develop mere Supported Employment.

Vocational Rehabilitation

Assessing the effect of Vocational Rehabilitation on employment outcomes for people with a disability is complex, as in some States Vocational Rehabilitation services include access to Supported Employment and other models. Sheltered Workshops with a strong focus on transition to the open labour market often incorporate Vocational Rehabilitation and Training into their programmes to enhance people's prospects of an open labour market job. These combinations sometimes make it difficult to separate into component effects the impact of expenditure on Vocational Rehabilitation services.

Hanrahan (2006) assessed the influence of service systems integration in the US on employment outcomes for persons with mental illness. A survey of key programme staff that worked for community mental health treatment agencies or vocational rehabilitation agencies found that referral and employment rates were low. Characteristics of interagency systems integration do relate to outcomes. Of 448 individuals referred by community mental health staff referred for employment services, vocational rehabilitation agencies accepted only 26% and found employment for 11%, with only 7% being employed six months later. Thirty-nine percent of respondents reported that linkage agreements between their agencies for this work was not established. This study suggests the more effective strategies for integrating mental health treatment and vocational rehabilitation systems are needed if Vocational Rehabilitation and Training services are to be effective in delivering greater employment outcomes (Hanrahan 2006).

This may act as a barrier to more effective use of Vocational Rehabilitation for people with mental health problems if systems are fragmented in organisation and in legislative terms in States pursuing greater employment outcomes in this respect. This integration is necessary whether we are pursuing Vocational Rehabilitation for people who are recovering from acute mental health problems, or who have more severe and enduring mental health conditions requiring an IPS approach to getting a job, or who are being helped to be successful in Sheltered Employment.

3.6. Section Conclusions

Sheltered Employment

- We found significant diversity of sheltered work in Europe. Even in the same State workshops can have different goals (employment, social, training), different client groups, and different organisational methods.
- Quality of work and work conditions and wage outcomes vary significantly across workshops types and countries.
- Workshops are costly compared to other models
- There are examples of transitional Sheltered Workshop models but generally numbers moving on to open employment remain still low.
- A majority seem not to have a focus on transition to open labour market jobs, but many see themselves playing a different role in the employment system.
- Where Sheltered Workshops have taken on a transitional role, Vocational Rehabilitation has been a key approach.
- Sheltered Employment has different status and value depending on the country it operates in and the range of services on offer. Some deliver a more social care role than other with a more focused employment rationale:
 - Jobs in Sheltered Workshops are valued by many workers and families and can be stable incomes offering friendship, status and being responsive to people's individual needs in task type and productivity demands.
 - There can be resistance to transition in some areas where the economy offers more unstable employment with less reliable wages
 - Employer resistance and a lack of investment in Supported Employment to help overcome barriers to open employment can also reduce transition
 - People need to be better off in employment and attention to the real local economy is needed and mechanism to ensure people are better off in work if transition is to be an option
- The role of Sheltered Employment and its future generally within the EU is still unclear but planning and investment are needed to ensure they are of high quality, and deliver a good standard of employment, even if they become part of a transitional agenda.

Supported Employment

- Supported Employment can produce good outcomes for people with a disability and taxpayers, but its availability and scale still vary considerably across countries and EU Member States.
- Research does show that delivery of Supported Employment at a large scale is possible.
- Consistent delivery of high-quality outcomes at scale requires attention to a wide range of issues which can include:
 - Integrated working across relevant federal ministerial and local organisations
 - Promotion of joint values and understanding
 - Increased co-location with health and other relevant professional

- Supportive definitions of disability linked to supportive welfare benefit regulations and rules for access to Supported Employment and other relevant support service
- Attention to the local wage economy and creativity around ensuring people are “better off” in the open labour market than receiving welfare benefits or subsidised pay in segregated workplaces facilities.
- Pursuit of an equality agenda with employers alongside support
- Costs are favourable compared to other models
- Supported Employment works across a range of client groups and condition severities
- Lots of things have to come together and work well for Supported Employment to be effective:
 - Legislation
 - Definition of disability
 - Employer awareness and a worker rights agenda progressed
 - Joint working and value base
 - Welfare benefit reform to ensure people are financially better off in open labour market employment
 - Attention to local economy, wage rates and incentive mechanisms to ensure that people are financially “better off” and incentive mechanisms
 - Using commissioning models that avoid employment support services “cherry picking” the easiest people to place and leaving people behind
 - Stronger links to transition of sheltered workers
 - Independent delivery of Supported Employment to avoid conflicts of interest
 - Bridging investment to grow new Supported Employment before disinvesting in less effective services
- We need providers to believe in and welcome Supported Employment
- Staff need skill to deliver this

Social Firms/Inclusive Enterprises

- Social Firms provide normal jobs with regular contracts and wages for disabled people in economic enterprises where non-disabled people are also employed.
- In some countries the sector is poorly supported and poorly resourced.
- We need more relevant and comparative data to monitor the health of the sector.
- Social Firms are not necessarily a staging post for open employment and throughput to the open labour market is generally low. Participant can be attracted to the Social Firm supportive ethos and positive select this sector as a result.
- It is not an easy option to convert from sheltered work to a Social Firm and cost-benefits are not always delivered until a business is fully mature.
- Positive fostering of the sector through encouragement of positive goods and services contract commissioning would assist the sectors development
- Social Firm flexibility and ethos should help them to work with people who have a range of disabilities.

- Inclusive Enterprises are a significant option in a number of States offering active support for employment, adaptable employment, legal required wages, and training.
- We need more data to better understand who Social Firms are employing and the outcomes that Social Firms and Inclusive Enterprises are achieving for their workers.

Self-employment

- This is an important sector of the economy and a major force in some countries due to the nature of their economy. Micro-financing has worked well based in Asian and other countries but not in more affluent countries where self-employment for all people with a disability is less common.
- Development often seems to be dependent on family finance but with the added need for job coach type supports for the business operator that is not required for other entrepreneurs.
- This model is again a flexible, person-centred model with the capacity to provide employment to even people with complex needs if the business development process allows.
- For this sector to expand we need more supportive business start-up grants, and mechanisms for obtaining the additional personal support many people with a disability will need.

Vocational Rehabilitation

- There are a wide range of interventions included under the Vocational Rehabilitation heading.
- Vocational Rehabilitation is helpful for many people with a disability but not for all, particularly those people with more complex needs, with job outcomes being low for some of these groups.
- Vocational Rehabilitation is powerful in combination with other models if it is to serve all that can benefit from it to gain employment.
- Vocational Rehabilitation is a source of professional training for some people with a disability in some countries where mainstream education is not picking up this need in the mainstream.
- We will need to bring in more Vocational Rehabilitation to help those people who can benefit from it as the nature of work changes.

Transition

- Access to support to try out various forms of employment while in education is still important.
- What is done at school, especially for those who have complex needs, has demonstrable impact on employment outcomes in adulthood.
- Practical support, including job coaching in the workplace, is needed to support young people with a disability age appropriate, work experience is needed to help with this transition from education to employment.
- Supported internships and paid Apprenticeships are good models for the transition between education and employment for some people, and barriers to their uptake by people with a disability should be removed.

- Apprenticeships and internship models are individually focussed and they use Supported Employment technology. Supported Employment services needs to be available to young people while they are still in transition from education to employment.

The direction of travel should be towards the open labour market if people are to benefit from the better personal outcomes they deliver. However, we recognise that the scale and speed of the journey in that direction may differ between countries depending on the work, resources and changes needed to deliver equality in employment. A dashboard of desirable local actions will be needed to help States make even the first steps to an open labour market pathway. We need to continue to learn from other on the practical measures needed to deliver this.

4. Case studies of opportunities and barriers from different models

4.1. Models of employment identified among case studies

We were pleased to have received six responses for five countries in our surveys: Germany; Spain; Greece; Austria; and the United Kingdom. Together they identified 29 examples of models of employment for people with a disability. The schemes described covered a wide range of the models we set out in the introduction to this report, including various forms of Sheltered Employment, Supported Employment, Social Firms/Inclusive Enterprises, various forms of Vocational Rehabilitation/Guidance, and Alternative Vocational Services. These are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of employment models described in case study survey responses

| Germany | Spain | Greece | Austria | UK |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| Werkstätten für behinderte Menschen (Sheltered Workshops) | Occupational/ Therapy Centres | Sheltered Work | Arbeitsassistentz /Jobcoaching (Supported Employment) | Work and Health Programme |
| Andere Leistungsanbieter (Alternative Service Providers) | Inclusive Enterprise (Special Employment Centre) | Vocational guidance and signposting services | Jugendcoaching (Vocational guidance and signposting services) | Individual Placement with Support |
| Budget für Arbeit (Budget for Work) | Supported Employment | Social Firms/Enterprises | Social Firms/Enterprises | Specialist Employability Support (SES) |
| Unterstützte Beschäftigung (Supported Employment) | Ordinary Labour Market | Supported Employment | Supported Employment | Intensive Personalised Employment Support programme |
| Berufsbildungswerke (Vocational Training Centres) | Supported employment/ customized employment | | | Fair Start Scotland |
| Berufliche Trainingszentren (Vocational Training) | | | | Local Supported Employment |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|----------------------|
| Centres for people with psychological illnesses) | | | | |
| Berufsförderungswerke (Vocational Rehabilitation Centres) | | | | Access to Work |
| Inklusionsbetriebe (inclusive enterprises) | | | | Supported Businesses |
| Integrationsfachdienste (integration offices) | | | | |

4.2. Sheltered Workshops and Occupational Centres

Our case studies provide some insight into the range of Sheltered Workshop models operating in European, along with their relative strengths and weaknesses. It also reveals something of the complexity of goals and outcomes that underpin sheltered employment options. We found examples of Sheltered Workshops with production and vocational training goals, Sheltered Workshops with social goals and other Workshops with profit goals. These also have different organisational structures, with social goal orientated workshops being largely delivered by the 3rd Sector and for-profit workshops delivered by the private sector.

Germany

The German situation provided a wealth of examples. In Germany, Sheltered Work served around 310,000 people in 2018 with an expectation of a further 15.000 in 2019. One version of the Sheltered Workshop is the *Werkstätten für behinderte Menschen* which provides a service for people with any type of disability but has a focus of serving people who, due to their disability, are not able to perform more than three hours a day in the open labour market. These people are considered fully incapacitated for the purposes of work. Generally, therefore, these sheltered workshops address the needs of people with severe and long-lasting disabilities. People with an intellectual disability make up around 75% of the people served by these workshops, people with psychological disabilities around 21%, and people with physical disabilities around 3%.

This form of provision is funded by the State. Depending on the type and severity of the disability of the people served, the body responsible for funding can be the health, pension or accident insurance authorities, but also the Federal employment agency (unemployment insurance). While in principle people with a disability are a State responsibility, provision can be contracted out to 3rd Sector organisations (e.g. Caritas, Diakonia, Antroposophical Organisations, Arbeiterwohlfahrt [Workers' Welfare Association], Lebenshilfe, etc.). In some cases, Municipalities also run sheltered workshops for historically reasons.

There is some commonality in what preparation activities are offered through Sheltered Workshops in Germany. The services offered by Sheltered Workshops are very precisely regulated and always include vocational education; ongoing development of professional and life skills; and rehabilitation for working life through access to a broad range of working opportunities. This phase of vocational education generally lasts two years. The skills acquired are not officially recognized but can show a future employer what skills people have acquired.

Our Rapporteurs highlighted the fact that Sheltered Workshops in Germany are not-for-profit-organizations and that their main goal is to enable participation in working life and not to maximise profit. However, they must generate a minimum amount of profit because they are obliged by law to remunerate their workshop users according to their performance. It is also a unique feature to German Sheltered Workshops, that they are obliged by law to support every person who is entitled to their services. There are, therefore, no waiting lists and the Sheltered Workshop cannot choose the people they work with as long as the person's disabilities are "severe" enough.

A second form of provision, called Andere Leistungsanbieter (Alternative Service Providers). As with the Sheltered Workshops, this model served people with any disability who are not able to perform more than three hours a day under the conditions of the open labour market. These people are considered fully incapacitated for work. Generally, this model serves people who have severe and long-term disabilities. The model is funded by the State and is delivered through 14 service providers. This model has been in operation for two years and data is not yet available on its performance. Alternative service providers are non-for-profit-organisations who have as their main goal enabling participation in working life and not to generate a profit. However, they must generate a minimum profit as they are obliged by law to pay workshop users according to their performance. People with disabilities who have their own assets can also pay for the services of the alternative service.¹⁷ Alternative service providers have been explicitly created in order to offer alternatives to sheltered workshops. In principle they offer the same services, but they can be smaller. They can also offer only a part of the Sheltered Workshops' services, especially for people with mental health conditions who need support but, in the past, refused to receive the services of Sheltered Workshops because they feared stigmatisation. So far, most of the existing Alternative Service providers offer vocational education.

In principle, any person with a disability who has access to the services of a sheltered workshops also has access to Alternative Service providers. That means that, if their disabilities are severe enough to meet the service criteria, so that he or she is considered fully incapacitated for work.

¹⁷ <https://www.rehadat.de/presse-service/lexikon/Lex-Andere-Leistungsanbieter/>

Greece

Sheltered workshops in Greece provide services to people with Intellectual disability, Autism or Autistic Spectrum Conditions. The Model also provides services for people with Developmental Disabilities such as ADHD or Dyspraxia. Figures were available for one organisation (VTC Margarita) which served 60 people in 2018 and expected its service to grow to 70 in 2019 suggesting that Sheltered Workshops are still growing in Greece. Sheltered Workshops are delivered primarily by not-for-profit organisations. Funding is provided by the State's National Strategic Reference Framework (NSRF), the EU (Erasmus and other programmes) and through Charitable Foundations and other sources.¹⁸

Austria

Sheltered Workshops in Austria provided jobs for 23,500 in 2016. There are few updated figures beyond this, and Rapporteurs indicate that there are likely to be many more people served now. Sheltered Workshops cater for people with sight loss, intellectual disabilities, physical disabilities, mental health issues and brain injury. Here people have to have a working capacity assessed at less than 50%. People with this characteristic cannot be employed elsewhere in Austria because there are legal barriers. Sheltered Workshops are funded by the State through 9 Austrian Municipalities and mainly provided by not-for-profit organisations.

The service Sozialökonomischer Betriebe und Gemeinnützige Beschäftigungsprojekt (Social-economic enterprises and non-profit employment projects) represents another form of Sheltered Workshop in Austria. These enterprises can cater for people with any disability as long as they are long-term unemployed. They provide short-term employment of 3 to 6 months for people who are long-term unemployed and people with disabilities in enterprises. In 2016 these enterprises catered for 26,000 people.¹⁹ The service is funded by the State with national unemployment insurance funds. The model is delivered largely by 3rd Sector organisations but also private organisations.

Spain

Sheltered Workshops often provide an alternative for people with severe disabilities who have little or no chance of being employed in the ordinary labour market. Employees with disabilities do not have worker status and receive a minimum remuneration that does not meet the ordinary working conditions set out in the law. Sheltered Workshops of this type do not exist in Spain. Occupational or Therapy Centres are the nearest to Sheltered Workshops in Spain and they provide occupational

¹⁸ <https://bit.ly/2OVqP7W>

https://www.synigoros.gr/resources/ohe_el-2.pdf

¹⁹ <https://arbeitplus.at/blog/2017/06/26/neuestudie-ausgaben-der-arbeitsmarktfoerderung-finanzieren-sich-selbst/>

therapy and personal and social adjustment services. The person does not receive a wage is not considered a “worker” with full labour rights.

Occupational Centres deliver occupational therapy and personal and social adjustment services, to prepare the person with a disability for the demands of daily life and work. For the users who have greater abilities, occupational activities can will enable them to achieve labour integration and personal and social fulfilment. Occupational activity are tasks or duties carried out by persons with intellectual disabilities to deliver objects, products or services under the guidance of professionals from the centre. While these activities do not meet the level of properly participating in the dynamics of the economic market, these activities are designed to assist the future incorporation of persons with intellectual disabilities into paid work. Most of the Spanish Occupational Centres take people with intellectual disabilities with a full range of severity, aged over 16 and having finished education. They refer them to workshops according to their capacity. The predominant workshops in the different communities are: industrial handling, carpentry, ceramics, handicrafts, dressmaking, graphic arts, computer science, basketwork, wickerwork and bookbinding. A system of rewards is put in place that recognises the occupational activity carried out by the person in order to promote their integration in the centre's activities. The maximum bonus should not exceed 30% of the minimum interprofessional salary in order not to hinder the transition to more inclusive situations.

For the most disabled users, however, the Occupational Centre will be a stable and permanent place that facilitates their personal and social development. their autonomy, and work skills, according to their characteristics and needs.

United Kingdom

Investment in Sheltered Workshop has reduced significantly over time in the UK. Reformed as “Social Businesses”, a number were supported under the Work Choice programme which ended in March 2019.²⁰ A Supported Business employs disabled people as over 50% of its workforce. Disabled employees working for supported businesses can currently benefit from a mix of holistic support, including: adapted working practices; additional Human Resources support; job coaches; workplace aides and adaptations; and extra supervision.

After the closure of Work Choice funding, Supported Employment are reliant on a wider range of funding to provide places in their competitive businesses. EU Article 19 regulations form a part of European legislation that allows organisations to reserve public contracts for supported businesses. Procurement of any goods and/or services can be reserved, and Supported Businesses have sought funding from a range of public sector organisations using this route. They also seek funding for individual places from employment related State services. Ongoing support is now offered to individuals working in Supported Businesses through specially designed new elements of the government’s Access to Work scheme. For 2 years from April 2019, Supported Businesses will receive increased funding of £5,000 a year from Access to Work for each individual that had been funded

²⁰ <http://ersa.returnonideas.co.uk/documents/ersa-policy-briefing-work-choice>

under Work Choice as a “Protected Place.”²¹ The increased payment will not only be available for existing employees but also for businesses to employ more disabled people, enabling a total of over 2,000 disabled people across England, Scotland and Wales to access support.²² The British Association for Supported Employment hold a Directory of 38 Supported Businesses in the UK.

Assessment of model efficacy

We have provided Rapporteur feedback for the various forms of Sheltered Workshop in our case studies in Table 2. The ratings of quality from our Rapporteurs were generally positive. Responses were mixed on the performance of sheltered Workshops on employment rate, wages, and the match of work to people’s aspirations. There was a greater positive consensus on the ability of Sheltered Workshops to deliver sustained jobs and jobs that have some quality about them.

Table 2: Ratings of the quality of outcomes from various models of Sheltered Workshops and Occupational Centres

| | Very ineffective | Ineffective | Not sure | Effective | Very effective | Don't know |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Percentage employment rate achieved | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| Sustainment of jobs | 1 | | 1 | 3 | 2 | |
| Wages achieved | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | |
| Quality of jobs delivered | | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| Match to people’s aspirations | | 3 | 3 | 1 | | |

Positive assessments of Sheltered Workshops

Our Rapporteurs provided assessments of the strengths and weaknesses of the Sheltered Workshop model. The goal of the services of Sheltered Workshops in Germany is to rehabilitate people with disabilities through work. Their task and speciality is to adapt work processes to enable people with a broad range of type and severity of disabilities to give them the opportunity to take part in the work

²¹ <https://www.base-uk.org/supported-business/qanda>

²² <https://www.base-uk.org/news/base-welcomes-supported-business-funding-announcement>

process and to participate in working life. There is a level of inclusion of people with significant disabilities in working life.

While the work offered in Germany is not considered employment, workshop participants do have an employee-like status. The jobs offered by the Sheltered Workshop are sustainable over time. This point is supported also in the Greek situation, where Sheltered Workshops were regarded as providing a stable and safe work environment where people with significant disabilities can work. Workshop participants do have the opportunity to develop their skills and interests and, if they wish, to change the departments that they work in.

German Sheltered Workshops are obliged by law to pay participants a remuneration according to their performance. These remunerations are not very high because the workshop users' performance is not comparable to the performance of people without disabilities. Rapporteurs tell us that jobs offered by the Sheltered Workshops are of high quality because they are obliged by law to provide highly specialised staff to adapt working processes in a person-centred way.

Even if the rate of transition from German Sheltered Workshop to open employment is very low, those who take the step into the open labour market, and also those who do not, have the opportunity to develop their skills in an individual way through working in the workshop. Although numbers are small, most of the people who do move into the open labour market do so after a period of paid internship or placement in an integrated work place. Both of these options are supported by the Sheltered Workshops which have a remit to establish positive relationships between open labour market companies and workshop users and to support the workshop users during their internship or integrated work placement.

Rapporteurs in Austria felt it important that participants in Social-economic Enterprises and non-profit employment projects have access to social workers who can be involved in supporting people to cope with basic challenges such as housing and dealing with financial debt.

In the UK, Supported Businesses have a number of distinctive features that can provide an effective source of support for disabled people. They provide a supportive 'real work' environment rather than an institutional environment. A real work environment offers demands and challenges, the need for effective teamwork and communication, adaptation for regular change in the market, and requires reliability and work quality. People with disabilities are employees and not patients. The Supported Businesses offer a mixed workforce of non-disabled and disabled staff who can work together and provide mutual support around practical tasks. The model provides opportunity that can attract significant commercial income to offset the costs of providing supported work opportunities and to reducing the overall cost of the service.

Negative assessments of Sheltered Workshops

There remain a number of negative aspects of Sheltered Workshops. From a German perspective, the rate of transition from the Sheltered Workshop into employment in the open labour market is very low. It is difficult to establish, if the experiences offered by Sheltered Workshops match their participant's aspirations. Our Rapporteurs tell us that polls of participants reveal that the majority of workshop users are happy and content. However, many of the workshop participants want to earn more money because workshop wages are low.

In Germany, Rapporteurs tell us that there is still a resistance in the open labour market to hiring people with disabilities. Sheltered Workshops do try to respond to this by delivering their services increasingly in central locations in the community to make people more visible. There is a lack of continuity for workshop participants after they move to be employed in an open labour market company. Other services can be involved but people can lose touch with their familiar support system. In the past, many workshop users have refused to take the step into the open labour market, primarily because it was hard to get back into the Sheltered Workshop if the open market job was not successful. In the German case, this situation has been improved and this barrier partially lifted by the introduction of the new 'Budget for Work' scheme.

For the Alternative Service Provider model, most people with physical disabilities are not entitled to access the model, because they can work for more than three hours per day under the conditions of the open labour market and they have access to other means of support. If they are not a sheltered workshop, an Alternative Service can choose who can receive its service. Thus, they are more specialised but also it is feared that they will tend to choose people with higher work performance.²³

Our Greek Rapporteurs tell us that the Sheltered Workshops are high cost and offer relatively limited work choices to people. They can also offer rather institutional, non-inclusive work environments which lack a legal framework for their operation and as a result they may marginalise people. Innovative legislation is needed in order to connect sheltered workshops with the open labour market.

In Austria, Rapporteurs were critical of Sheltered Workshop effectiveness, particularly due to people's lack of wage. The model is described as largely 'protective' rather than employment. Further, in relation to the Austrian Social-economic Enterprises, the period of employment was reduced during the last ten years from 1 year to 3 to 6 month and the effectiveness of the programme for delivering sustainable employment was reduced. Also 'creaming' off the most able people can happen and people's aspirations are often not well matched. Further, the biggest weakness in this Social-economic Enterprises model is the short period that the person can attend. People with more complex needs would require a longer time period to be successfully integrated into the open labour market. Higher employment rates have been achieved in the past before the time periods for attendance were reduced.

²³ <https://www.rehadat-adressen.de/de/arbeit-beschaeftigung/anderer-leistungsanbieter-nach-dem-bthg/index.html>

There are some negative assessments of the Supported Business model. It is sometime difficult to ensure that there is a close fit between a clients’ skills, their experience and their abilities and the jobs which contribute to the business tasks. Unless this is done well there is a risk of creating ‘non-jobs’ which can reduce productivity, efficiency and the viability of the business and not provide a positive experience for the employee. It is sometimes difficult for Supported Businesses to deliver on client progression to open employment. It is also sometimes very difficult for Supported Businesses to see their employability role as an income stream in its own right and ensuring a business-like approach to this. There can be a wide range of cost in businesses, leading to a significant dependence for some on grant support.²⁴

Implications of trying to increase access to this Model

Our Rapporteurs told us that there was potential to expand this model as they felt it was relatively easy to deliver, the cost of delivering the model was affordable, there was political support for expanding delivery to more people, and there was some support for it matching people’s aspirations better than other models (Table 3). There was some resistance to actually doing so from some Rapporteurs. In Greece, greater funding and better legislation would be needed. In Austria it was felt that this model could hinder people gaining jobs in the open labour market as it is and it would need further development to deliver better outcomes.

Table 3: Opportunity to provide more access to the various models of Sheltered Employment and Occupational Centres

| | Agree Fully | Agree somewhat | Unsure | Agree somewhat | Agree fully | |
|---|-------------|----------------|--------|----------------|-------------|---|
| EASY to deliver Model to more people | 5 | 1 | | | | HARD to deliver Model to more people to more people |
| The cost of delivering Model to more people is AFFORDABLE | 3 | 3 | | | | The cost of delivering Model to more people is UNAFFORDABLE |
| There is POLITICAL | 5 | 1 | | | | There is NO POLITICAL |

²⁴https://www.base-uk.org/sites/default/files/knowledge/Scottish%20Government%20review%20of%20Supported%20Business/scottish_government_review_of_supported_businesses_report_june_2013.pdf

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| SUPPORT for delivering Model to more people | | | | | | SUPPORT for delivering Model to more people |
| The wages achieved by Model are BETTER than other models | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | The wages achieved by Model are WORSE than other models |
| The quality of jobs delivered by Model are BETTER than other models | | 3 | 3 | | | The quality of jobs delivered by Model are WORSE than other models |
| The match of jobs to people's aspirations in Model is BETTER than other models | 1 | 4 | 1 | | | The match of jobs to people's aspirations in Model is WORSE than other models |

4.3. Supported Employment

Germany

In Germany, Supported Employment is a legal term and not the same as the concept of Supported Employment defined by the European Union of Supported Employment. "Unterstützte Beschäftigung (Supported employment)" is applicable for people with any form of disability and is targeted at people with disabilities who have a special need for support but who do not need the special services of workshops for people with disabilities. The target group includes in particular school leavers with disabilities and adults who have acquired a disability in the course of their working life. This programme provided for 3287 people in 2018 and a further 2440 expected in 2019.²⁵ In terms of funding, the German State contracts with 3rd Sector service providers to deliver the service to the

²⁵

https://statistik.arbeitsagentur.de/nn_31922/SiteGlobals/Forms/Rubrikensuche/Rubrikensuche_Suchergebnis_Form.html?view=processForm&resourceId=210358&input_=&pageLocale=de&topicId=939264®ion=&year_month=201812&year_month.GROUP=1&search=Suchen

person with a disability. Responsibility for funding on the type and severity of the disability, and funding can come from health, pension departments or through accident insurance authorities depending on the person's situation. However, it is mainly the Federal employment agency that provides funding for this service through unemployment insurance.

The German "Budget für Arbeit (budget for work)" scheme offers elements of a Supported Employment programme. This model has been especially developed to be an alternative to sheltered workshops for people who want this. In principle, this model is person-centered. The model is flexible and sheltered workshop users can make use of a number of support mechanisms to get an open job, such as obtaining individual support on the job and re-entry to a sheltered workshop if open employment is not successful. People using this model get a normal salary of at least minimum wage or a collectively agreed wage. The Budget für Arbeit model pays for staff support on the job, for adaption to the physical work environment if necessary, and up to 75% of the salary paid to the employer as compensation for lower work performance.²⁶

Greece

In Greece Supported Employment is reported to work with Intellectual Disability, Autism or Autistic Spectrum Conditions, other Disabilities, such as ADHD, Dyspraxia and Mental health issues. The reported priorities are people with more complex disabilities such as ID, Autism and ASC. We received case study data from three organisations in Attica Region²⁷ who were serving 350 people in 2019. In this Region, Supported Employment is provided by Non-profit Organisations. Funding is provided through the EU funding (Erasmus and Horizon) and through Charitable Funding from Lotteries, gambling sources, employment waiver schemes or from other specific taxes. There appears to be little or no State funding for the model.

Austria

In Austria, Supported Employment is reported to work with all disabilities. According to the Austrian Disability Employment Act people undergo an assessment which leads to a certain degree of disability (measured in percentages). Only persons with at least 30% disability get access to the service. Another assessment measures the person's "ability to work". If a person's ability to work is less than 50% of the average, the person is considered unfit to work and does not have access to the service. This assessment framework provides a fairly rigid structure within which to provide Supported Employment. The service also works with young people below the age of 24 can get access to the service if they have a "social and emotional impairment", or if they received special

²⁶ <https://www.rehadat.de/presse-service/lexikon/Lex-Budget-fuer-Arbeit/>

²⁷ Attica Region of Greece encompasses Athens and the cities of Eleusis, Megara, Laurium, and Marathon, as well as a small part of the Peloponnese peninsula and the islands of Salamis, Aegina, Angistri, Poros, Hydra, Spetses, Kythira, and Antikythera. About 3,750,000 people live in the region. More than 95% are inhabitants of the Athens metropolitan area.

education at school or if they attended a "vocational school". We understand that 17,029 people went through this system in 2018.²⁸

Spain

In Spain in 2017 there were 1,860,600 people with disabilities of working age (from 16 to 64 years old), which represented 6.2% of the total population of that age. Of this figure, 651,700 (35%) were active. This activity rate was 42.7% lower than that for the population without disabilities. The unemployment rate for the group was 26.2%, a rate 9.1% higher than that for the population without disabilities. The employment rate for people with disabilities was 25.9% compared with 64.4% for people without disabilities. 89.1% of those employed were salaried and, of these, 74.4% had an indefinite contract, the highest quality of contract.

Spain has developed a quota system to access public employment for people with disabilities. 7% of all jobs in the public employment are reserved for people with a disability, and of those, 2% are reserved for people with intellectual disabilities specifically. In 2018, 4,000 people from all over Spain participated in a State level examination, and an evaluation of their previous work experience and training, to be eligible for these ring-fenced jobs. The process to access public employment is an exam. There are other calls delivered at local or regional government level but data is not available.

In relation to Supported Employment, in Spain it serves people with Intellectual Disabilities, Autism or ASD, physical disabilities, mental health conditions and traumatic brain injury. The model also serves people with physical and sensory disabilities with an assessed level of disability over 65%. There is no central estimate of how many people receive Supported Employment.

There is a split between the State, Region or Municipality who are in charge of commissioning and the support is provided by non-profit contracted organizations. Each region in Spain can finance and regulate Supported Employment. Services are also provided through EU funding sources including the European Social Fund. The Basque Employment Service funds an aid scheme to finance Supported Employment. The funding programme finances finding jobs in the labour market based on the number of visits staff make to employers (with a minimum and maximum number of visits per year); and for support and training in the workplace. The amount of funding depends on the type and degree of the person's disability, with a minimum hiring period and working hours required.

The Basque Country

At the Basque level, the Public Employment Service funds Supported Employment. Supported employment provides a service to a wide range of people. Within this system, people with greater support needs are prioritised over others. Reports show that the majority of people with disabilities who work under the Supported Employment methodology in the Basque Country are people with

²⁸ <https://www.bundeskost.at/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/NEBA-Jahresbericht-2018.pdf>
Professional Assistance Network (NEBA) 2018 annual report

intellectual disabilities (35%), people with mental illness (28%), people with hearing loss (13%) and people with physical disabilities (12%). Groups represented to a lesser extent are people with ASD (5.5%), people with visual loss (3.7%) and people with multiple disabilities (1.4%).²⁹

Customized Employment has also been offered as a pilot project. Customized employment is targeted at people with intellectual disabilities who have a “certificated” level of disability of at least 65%. This is expected to deliver 25 paid jobs from the 136 people participating in customized employment in 2019. In Spain, 299 people were employed from the public employment call and around 150 are in the Basque Country. Funding for customized employment comes from the State and it is a small amount that pays for the training of professionals delivering the Supported Employment methodology.

The United Kingdom

The UK provides a number of national and local schemes to provide Supported Employment type programmes. A number of these programmes provide elements of what we define as Supported Employment, and a number of organisations will use a Supported Employment methodology within that programme. However, only the *Individual Placement with Support (IPS)* and some Local Authority funded programmes offer a pure model of Supported Employment. We mention here a new programme, *Local Supported Employment*, which is only at a pilot stage at present, but it has the aim at delivering the Job Coach Supported Employment through a mix of State (DWP) and Local Authority funding.

Individual Placement with Support (IPS) supports people with severe mental health difficulties into employment. It involves intensive, individual support, a rapid job search followed by placement in paid employment, and time-unlimited in-work support for both the employee and the employer. IPS has been shown to be more effective the more closely it follows a number of principles. IPS should aim to get people into competitive employment. It is open to all those who want to work. It tries to find jobs consistent with people's preferences and works quickly to place people in work. It brings employment specialists into clinical teams to maximise communication and integration of clinical treatment and work. Employment specialists develop relationships with employers based upon a person's work preferences. It provides time unlimited, individualised support for the person and their employer. Welfare Benefits counselling is included.³⁰

Under a scheme to “Test and Learn” in May 2018, with the government, Sheffield City Region and the West Midlands Combined Authority, the National Health Service (NHS) launched the world's largest trial of IPS services. This trial is evaluating whether IPS can be equally as valuable and cost effective for people who have any health condition and are using primary and community care services.

²⁹ http://www.ehlabe.org//upload/memorias/MEMORIA%20FORO%20ECA_V3.pdf

<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/specialist-employability-support-statistics#latest-release>

³⁰ <https://www.centreformentalhealth.org.uk/what-ips>

Through increasing access to IPS, the NHS aims to support an additional 35,000 people with severe mental illnesses where this is a personal goal to find and retain employment by 2023/24. This investment will support people to get back into or gain access to employment. By 2028/29, the aim to extend this to 50% of the eligible population to benefit up to 115,000 people.³¹

The *Work and Health Programme* is funded at the national level through the Department of Work and Pensions and provides its service to people with a disability as well as others who are out of work and have claimed unemployment benefits for 24 months. This can include carers, former member of the armed forces, care leavers, refugees, victims of domestic violence, people who are dependent on drugs or alcohol, or ex-offender. The scheme provides personal support to help the person to: identify their employment needs; match their skills to jobs; find employers and long-term employment; get training to help find work; manage any health problems to reduce impact on work. It can include direct workplace support but is not fully designed as a Supported Employment methodology. Since 2017 the programme has worked with 51,490 people started on the programme and 3,140 had found paid jobs. 78% of the participants in the programme were people with a disability.³²

The *Specialised Employability Support Programme* is funding at the national level through the Department of Work and Pensions and is designed to support people with disabilities and health conditions into the workplace. This is a voluntary support programme delivered across the whole of the UK. It has been designed to support people with higher support needs into work. Specialist Employability Support provides people with access to a dedicated key worker who works with them to overcome complex barriers which may be preventing them from entering work, ensuring they have a personal support network, longer-term support and training for an agreed length of time. Help can be provided with: job search and doing the job; identifying appropriate networks, charities, advocates etc. to help meet specific employment needs; work-related independence skills e.g. mobility training and assistive technology; appropriate medical support including counselling and mentoring; work solutions and providing advice on managing a disability in the workplace; in-depth personal development programmes tailored to the needs of disabled people; links to local employers to arrange work experience, work placements or job shadowing; acquiring funding if required from social services, healthcare providers and LAs; liaison with Jobcentre Plus to assist individuals in gaining any support through Access to Work.

Applicants receive support for up to 21 months, including 6 months of in-work support for those who get a job. SES is delivered through a small number of national contracts. Three of these are for people with all disabilities, one for people with a visual impairment and one is for people with a hearing impairment. The programme started in September 2015 and up until 2019 it had served 6,740 people and 860 had achieved a paid job.

³¹ <https://www.longtermplan.nhs.uk/online-version/>

³² <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/work-and-health-programme-statistics-to-august-2019>

The Scottish Government's *Fair Start Scotland* provides people with support to enter the open labour market. The focus for the service is providing tailored and personalised support for all those who participate. Key elements of the service are:

- Voluntary participation
- In-depth action planning to ensure the support people receive is tailored for them and suits their individual needs and circumstances
- The service offers pre-work support for 12-18 months
- The service offers in-work support for 12 months
- Those who require specialist support to help them find work can expect to receive it
- There are national standards to ensure everyone is supported consistently across the 9 geographic contract areas across Scotland
- For disabled customers who require intensive support, Supported Employment and Individual Placement and Support are available as a part of the system

The *Intensive Personalised Employment Support* programme again provides highly personalised packages of employment support for people who are at least a year away from moving into work. People on the scheme get a dedicated key worker who works with them to overcome complex barriers which may be preventing them from entering work, ensuring they have a personal support network in place.

This scheme was rolled out across England and Wales in 2019, and applicants can receive support for up to 21 months, including 6 months of in-work support for those who get a job. Not enough progress has been made to assess progress so far. However, the following providers have been selected to deliver the programme across the country:

- Southern England: Fedcap
- Home Counties: Shaw Trust
- Central England: Shaw Trust
- North West England: The Growth Company
- North East England: Reed in Partnership
- Wales: Remploy

The *Access to Work* scheme is a government-funded scheme funds workplace support (rather than pre-placement and follow-on support) and workplace adjustments. It caters for large numbers of people with physical disabilities, hearing loss, sight loss, mental health conditions, intellectual disabilities and other developmental disabilities, progressive illness and other forms of medical condition. People with long-term disabilities made up the largest proportions of participants in the scheme in 2018/19 (over 70%). The funding is allocated on an individual by individual basis but can pay for a job coach to support people in the workplace (as well as other forms of personal support).

It can also fund support for people with any disability to work less than 16 hours (for a year) or longer if they work over 16 hours per week. Access to Work is used to provide job coach assistance for with a disability in Supported Internship, Apprenticeship or Traineeship programmes.³³ As well as providing a support worker or job coach to help in the workplace, the programme can also be used to fund a wide range of aids, adaptations and forms of support, including: equipment; transport to work if the person cannot use public transport; a support service for people with a mental health condition; and elements of staff training around the person. Access to Work provided support for 32,010 people in 2018/19. 10,170 people received a payment for a Support Worker to help them into employment in 2018/19, more than any other service provided under the scheme.³⁴

Local Supported Employment Pilot is an experimental programme in England, Wales and Scotland to provide Job Coach Supported Employment for people with an intellectual disability. An 18-month long ‘Proof of Concept’ pilot in 9 English Local Authority areas has been completed which developed in a funding partnership between the national government Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) and Local Authorities (Municipalities) to specifically deliver job coach Supported Employment for people with intellectual disabilities. After evaluation this was considered to be successful and a further, larger pilot is being developed for launch in 2020. While the model will remain a Supported Employment model, the funding, its scale, and other details have yet to be established.

Assessment of model efficacy

We had reports on Supported Employment on 5 of our State case studies. The ratings of quality from our Rapporteurs were generally positive where people had an opinion (Table 4). Rapporteurs were largely positive about Supported Employment’s ability to deliver sustained, and jobs that matched people aspirations. There remained uncertainty over the level of employment and the level of wages achieved, which may relate to lower levels of provision and of examples of outcome of this type of service.

Table 4: Ratings of the quality of outcomes from the Supported Employment Model

| | Very ineffective | Ineffective | Not sure | Effective | Very effective | Don't know |
|-----------------------|------------------|-------------|----------|-----------|----------------|------------|
| Percentage employment | | | 3 | 7 | 1 | |

³³ Supported Internships, Apprenticeships or Traineeships are not all offered in all countries within the UK.

³⁴https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/823693/access-to-work-statistics-april-2007-to-march-2019.pdf

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| rate achieved | | | | | | |
| Sustainment of jobs | | | 3 | 6 | 2 | |
| Wages achieved | | | 3 | 6 | 1 | 1 |
| Quality of jobs delivered | | | 4 | 6 | 1 | |
| Match to people's aspirations | | | 5 | 5 | 1 | |

Positive assessments of Supported Employment

Our Rapporteurs from Spain and Greece told us that the key elements that underpin the effectiveness of the Supported Employment Model are the Supported Employment methodology itself. These strengths included: Individual support for job maintenance; searching for suitable jobs for persons with disabilities with greater support needs; and an inclusive methodology in the open labour market. In Austria and the UK, the only jobs being considered are those fully paid in accordance with legal standards or collective bargaining agreements. In Germany, the strength of the Supported Employment model is seen that it does deliver a fully paid job in the open labour market. In Greece and Austria, the model corresponds to the needs of people with a disability and the needs of the employer. There is proper job matching and on-going support on and off the job. Most employees keep their jobs for a long-time.

In the Basque Country, if the person needs and asks for support in their workplace, it can be provided by the 3rd sector organizations and financed by the Basque Service of Employment, with no limitations. Customized employment as a methodology is also giving good results. Regarding access to public employment, it is very important that the State and Regional governments are collaborating with 3rd Sector organisations in order to make the funding and employment accessible for people with intellectual disabilities.

Negative assessments of Supported Employment

There were negatives to the Supported Employment model. Our Rapporteurs told us that the model was dependent on companies and on the open labour market. That labour market sometimes does not offer strong jobs. Jobs may not always be long-term jobs with good salaries. Funding can be

inflexibility for both Supported Employment agencies and for employing companies (e.g. the types of contracts, the number of contracts on offer).

Supported Employment can also be dependent on the detailed policies of each region in Spain and this can lead to inconsistent provision for people with a disability. In Spain, Supported Employment only last a maximum of 2 years and in Germany for 3 years. When Supported Employment funding ends, people can struggle without support because many people with intellectual disabilities or mental health issues need continuing support. Any deterioration in the working relationship with the employer can lead to the job being terminated. In Austria, society's negative perception of what a person with a disability might be able to accomplish in an ordinary workplace is also seen as a barrier to Supported Employment.

In Greece, the lack of a legal framework to define and fund Supported Employment acts as a major barrier to model availability. In Austria, the main weakness is exclusion of people with disabilities whose ability to work is below 50% and who are considered unable to work.

There was some support for it being possible to expand this model, except in Germany where people with disabilities who need ongoing support are reluctant to use this model because it is only available for up to three years. In other cases, we were told that there were factors that could assist in expansion include more funds from Public Administration and better underpinning legislation.^{35,36}

From German experiences with the Budget für Arbeit model made so far, a problem can be that in many regions sheltered workshops are not able or allowed to deliver support in an open workplace due to regulations. The result is that once a person leaves the sheltered workshop for the open labour market, any support that they had through familiar staff teams and other service users, ends. This can hamper access to the Budget für Arbeit scheme and also the effectiveness of any support they receive, especially people with psychological disabilities.

In the UK, primary problems are the availability of enough places on the schemes available. Access to Work is under-subscribed by people with cognitive disabilities and mental health conditions. The intensity of support that can be offered on Work and Health Programme is at time not enough to carry through a full Supported Employment process. This can lead to 'creaming' of clients who can enter into paid employment with lower levels of staff input. For some types of disability, the skills of

³⁵ <https://www.esamea.gr/navigation-shortcuts>

Human Rights and Persons with Disabilities: Alternative Report - Greece 2019 (Final Edition) and Answers to the List of Topics and Recommendations

³⁶

https://www.synigoros.gr/resources/ohe_el--2.pdf

Report of the Ombudsman (No. 72 Law 4488/2017) on the implementation of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

staff are not well enough developed to work with the full range of clients who could benefit from their input.

Factors that help or hinder Supported Employment effectiveness

In general, access to the model is poor and unsupportive welfare benefit regimes in some countries impacts on model effectiveness. In the German situation, welfare benefit regulations are positive and there are relatively few employers who are willing to employ people with a disability, which hinders this community focused suite of services.

Table 5: Opportunity to provide more access to the Supported Employment Model

| | Agree Fully | Agree somewhat | Unsure | Agree somewhat | Agree fully | |
|--|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|--------------------|---|
| EASY to deliver Model to more people | 8 | 1 | 2 | | | HARD to deliver Model to more people |
| The cost of delivering Model to more people is AFFORDABLE | 25 | 1 | 1 | | | The cost of delivering Model to more people is UNAFFORDABLE |
| There is POLITICAL SUPPORT for delivering Model to more people | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | | There is NO POLITICAL SUPPORT for delivering Model to more people |
| The wages achieved by Model are BETTER than other models | 5 | 3 | 3 | | | The wages achieved by Model are WORSE than other models |
| The quality of jobs delivered by Model are | 4 | 5 | 2 | | | The quality of jobs delivered by Model are |

| BETTER than other models | | | | | | WORSE than other models |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| The match of jobs to people's aspirations in Model is BETTER than other models | 2 | 5 | 4 | | | The match of jobs to people's aspirations in Model is WORSE than other models |

4.4. Social Firms/Inclusive Enterprises

Germany

In Germany the Inklusionsbetriebe (inclusive enterprises) model offers something close to our definition of a Social Firms/Inclusive Enterprise. This model again can cater for a range of people with a disability. Severity requirements are that Inclusive Enterprises generally employ people with a degree of disability of at least 50%. There is flexibility, however, and the degree of disability can also be 30% or lower if there is a particular disadvantaging effect of the disability on working life.

The legal criteria is that the service serves people with an intellectual or psychological disability or with a severe physical, sensory or multiple disability which is particularly detrimental to working life and which, alone or in combination with other employment disabling circumstances, hampers or prevents participation in the general labour market outside an inclusion enterprise. There is a focus on transition to the open labour market serving people with disabilities who, having undergone specific preparation in a sheltered workshop or in a psychiatric institution, are eligible for, and are to be prepared for, the transition to a company or service on the open labour market. The service also served people with disabilities who have completed school education and who only have prospects of being employed in the general labour market if they have previously taken part in pre-vocational training in an Inclusive Enterprise and are employed and further qualified here, and people with disabilities who have been long-term unemployed.

The Inclusive Enterprises operate in the open labour market and have to employ at least 30% and no more than 50% of its staff as people with a disability. In 2018 there were 919 Inclusive Enterprises, employing 29,313 employees, 13,038 of which were people with a disability. Funding for the Inclusive Enterprises was reported to be only from wage compensation for the lower work performance of the staff with disabilities. In addition, inclusive enterprises can apply for funding for the structural adaptation of a working environment tailored to the needs of their employees, which

is financed through the employment waiver scheme. Again, provision is largely contracted to 3rd Sector and private sector organisations.³⁷

Austria

In Austria, Integrative Betriebe (Integrated Enterprises) provides services for people with sight loss or impairment, physical disabilities, mental health conditions and other disabilities (such as disfigurement). As well as having a disability, people need to have an assessed working capacity of more than 50%. These Enterprises have non-disabled people working in them and these cannot represent more than 30% of the total staff group. In 2018 these Enterprises provided for 1969 people with a disability. The service is funded by the Ministry of Social Affairs, Employment, Health and Consumer Protection and delivery is through Municipalities.

The service is financed by the "Ausgleichstaxfonds" which is a fund, managed by the Federal Ministry for Social Affairs. Companies which do not meet their employment quota pay into the fund paid. If an employer has more than 25 employees then they must employ one disabled person for every 25 employees they have, otherwise a fine has to be paid. The budget for this service was Euro70 million, with Euro38 million the Ausgleichstaxfonds. Additional funding came from the Austrian Regions, the national labour market agency, and the Sozialministerium service responsible for the employment of persons with disabilities.

Spain

Our Rapporteurs provided information on Inclusive Enterprises operating in Spain. Inclusive Enterprises have as a main goal to provide jobs for disabled workers. They help achieve the labour inclusion of people with disabilities by offering opportunities to people that have more difficulty in accessing the labour market. Approximately 30.5% of jobs for people with disabilities are in ordinary companies, the remainder of jobs being delivered by the Spanish Inclusive Enterprises. These Inclusive Enterprises offer protected employment and are reported to operate in the open labour market. Inclusive enterprises are social economy companies that combine economic viability and participation in the market with their social commitment towards those groups that have fewer opportunities to become employed. Their structure and organisation is the same as in regular companies with a broad range of legal structures (e.g. Co-operatives).

³⁷ <https://www.rehadat-statistik.de/de/berufliche-teilhabe/Inklusionsbetriebe/index.html>

<https://www.bag-if.de/>

For the region Norththine-Westfalia:

<https://www.gib.nrw.de/service/downloaddatenbank/lvr-faktenblatt-inklusionsbetriebe>

These Inclusive Enterprises catered for a wide range of disabilities but have an emphasis on working with people with mental health problems, intellectual disability or physical or sensory disability where the level of disability is assessed with a minimum of 33% recognised degree of disability. As an Inclusive Enterprise the model is also staffed by workers without disability. A minimum of 70% of the employees in an Inclusive Enterprise need to be workers with a disability. As well as offering paid jobs, Inclusive Enterprises offer permanent training and support to these workers, both at a professional and personal level, favouring their integration into the open labour market.

Inclusive Enterprises for people with disabilities competes with all other regular companies in the labour market and has become a great source of employment for the disabled in Spain. In 2018 this model served 89,884 workers with disability in 2100 enterprises.³⁸ The Inclusive Enterprise model is delivered through the coordinated efforts of the Special Employment Centres that themselves work in the employment market and under the regulation of the Ministry of Employment as well as the Employment Councils of the Autonomous Communities of Spain. Inclusive Enterprises can be created by public and private institutions or by companies, but they become the same Inclusive Enterprise model for people with disabilities. At the Spanish level, around 50% of the Inclusive Enterprises are operated by the 3rd sector and the other half by private initiative. The first form of Social Enterprise is offered through social or public initiative organisations. It has the objective of improving the employability of people with disabilities using an employment model in which the person's outcomes are a higher priority than economic benefit. These organisations prioritise people who have greater support needs. Here, any benefits from the economic activity of Sheltered Employment are reinvested to improve the services offered to people with disabilities.

The main objective of Social Enterprises delivered by private companies is to generate economic benefit. These organisations usually hire people with disabilities with lower levels of support need, largely people with physical and sensory disabilities who have an assessed level of disability under 65%. Staff without a disability can work in these organisations, but they cannot represent more than 30% of the total staff group. Of these, 40,686 people received work through Sheltered Employment offered through social or public initiative organisations.³⁹ Our Rapporteurs tell us that, at the moment, current numbers of people served are being maintained in 2019 but few new jobs are being created in this sector due to the lack of public funding,

Both forms of Inclusive Enterprise are considered under the Spanish Social Economy configured by Law 5/2011 of 29 March on Social Economy and both have the same regulation and requirements (Royal Decree 2273/1985 and the Royal Decree 469/2006).

³⁸ <https://www.sepe.es/HomeSepe/quees-el-sepe/estadisticas.html>

³⁹ https://elpais.com/economia/2018/12/19/actualidad/1545249188_390115.html

<https://www.odismet.es/>

Funding is provided at State level by the Ministry of Labour, Migration and Social Security. Enterprises can also be funded by Charitable and other sources. Worker's salary costs are subsidised up to 50% of the Minimum Interprofessional Salary (SMI) for each employee with a disability. There is a 100% exemption of Social Security contributions, including those for work-related accidents and occupational diseases, as well as a deduction in corporate tax, for each new contract for a worker with a disability. Support Units at €1,300 per person with greater support needs to pay for support staff. Aid for infrastructure investment in organisations acts as a subsidy and has been provided in some regions of Spain since 2010. Some funding can also come from the European Social Fund but this depends on the actions of specific regional and local government departments.

Other tools that have proved to be highly efficient are Inclusive Enterprise Support Units. Their main goal is to remove the obstacles that disabled workers find at work.

These support units are composed of a team of professionals whose role is to develop training programmes, to offer direct assistance to the person at work, to provide support whenever there is a lack of progress and enhance the independence and autonomy of disabled workers. They implement promotion plans and establish links with the workers working environment. All these supports are aimed at workers with intellectual disabilities, mental illness or other special difficulties in employment.

In the Basque Country, 9,772 people were served in Inclusive Enterprise in 2017. Of these, 8,198 people were served in not-for-profit social initiative organisations and 1,574 people in for-profit Inclusive Enterprise organisations.⁴⁰ While at the Spanish level, around 50% of the Sheltered Workshops are operated by the 3rd sector, in the Basque Country, the percentage of the 3rd Sector is over 90%.

Assessment of model efficacy

The ratings given by Rapporteurs on Social Firms/Entrepreneurs were generally positive in all aspects of employment including, rates of employment, quality of jobs, and matching people's aspirations. Their highest ratings were in terms of wages achieved and jobs sustained.

⁴⁰ <https://www.ehlabe.org/es/infografia/>

Table 6: Ratings of the quality of outcomes from various Models of Social Firms/Inclusive Enterprises

| | Very ineffective | Ineffective | Not sure | Effective | Very effective | Don't know |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------|----------|-----------|----------------|------------|
| Percentage employment rate achieved | | | | 3 | 1 | |
| Sustainment of jobs | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | |
| Wages achieved | | | 1 | | 2 | |
| Quality of jobs delivered | | | | 2 | 1 | |
| Match to people's aspirations | | | 2 | 1 | 1 | |

Positive assessments of Social Firms/Inclusive Enterprises

Our Rapporteurs in Spain report a number of positive elements of this model. Inclusive Enterprises are active on the ordinary labour market. The Inclusive Enterprises provide significant employment to people with disabilities, with 70% of the employees in an Enterprise needing to be disabled workers. While the model provides salaries at legally specified levels, they are also able to adapt work to the disability of participants. Participants receive long term contracts of employment, providing stable and predictable employment. All this provides integration into working life for the person with a disability and disability-friendly employment, with impact on people's well-being. Rapporteurs also state that having a stable, well paid job with wages consistent with the law on remuneration, leads to their economic independence, enhances the social integration of persons with a disability and builds their self-esteem and confidence. Inclusive enterprises rely on highly qualified professionals and on the use of the new technologies. These assets are reported to be key in overcoming the difficulties arising from the disabilities people experience and to guaranteeing high competition levels in the business market.

Ultimately, this model provides a return on investment for the State by reducing welfare benefits expenditure.

In Germany, managers of Inclusive Enterprises often founded the company purposefully in order to employ people with disabilities. As a result, there is no reluctance to adapt their work environment and to people with disabilities according to their needs. Further, there is an understanding of the skills of people with disabilities because many inclusive enterprises are founded by organisations which are already in the field of services for people with disabilities and are better positioned to understand their needs.

In Austria, one of the biggest strengths of the Inclusive Enterprise is that they take people with disabilities of older age and with more limited working capacity. These people can work until they retire. These are people who would not easily find another job in the open labour market in the country, even if support was available. Another strength is that the service is quite cost effective, even if it is one of the most expensive models in Austria. Rapporteurs tell us that workers with disabilities report a high level of satisfaction with the jobs that they have.

Negative assessments of Social Firms/Inclusive Enterprises

In Spain, Inclusive Enterprises are heavily dependent on government financial aid. Rapporteurs suggest that attendance at these Inclusive Enterprises can stigmatise people with a disability, although the mechanism for this is unclear. Rapporteurs from Spain were also able to identify weaknesses in their Inclusive Enterprise models. They report that there is a need to improve the rate of transition to non-protected ordinary employment from this model. Turnover rates are low. In Spain in particular, the growth of for-profit organisations delivering this model is seen as problematic. The private sector receives the same subsidies from local authorities as the 3rd Sector, although their main objective is not to provide services to improve the employability of persons with disabilities. Private organisations usually hire people with lower levels of disability and high productivity rates. They are organisations with low production costs, and their representation is growing in Spain. This growth of private companies is reported, in some cases, to be driving cuts in subsidies that were originally aimed at maintaining and creating jobs for people with disabilities rather than subsidising profit.

In Germany, Inclusive Enterprises are based in the open labour market and as such have to operate in the competitive marketplace. They have to compete, even though they have workers regarded as performing at lower levels of productivity. In order to remain profitable, and despite the possible subsidies they are eligible for, they choose their employees to meet their commercial needs. This selective process can be the reason why not every person with disabilities can access this model. It is also why it is not always easy for these companies to remain profitable. However, our Rapporteurs note that the insolvency rate of inclusive Enterprises in Germany is lower than for conventional businesses.

In Austria, the working conditions in these Inclusive Enterprises is reported to be very good, and so there is no motivation for workers with disabilities to transition into jobs in the open labour market. Further, the model is limited by delivering to relatively low numbers of people. At the same time in

Austria has around 25,000 people with a disability who are still in day centres receiving token wage levels, are labelled as "not employable," and excluded from real work. The model of Integrated Enterprises could work alongside Supported Employment structures help to solve the problem of exclusion from the labour market. As the status of being "unable to work" is a legal barrier, the Austrian Government first has to remove this barrier in law before people can enter the labour market and become socially insured.

Table 7: Opportunity to provide more access to Social Firms/Inclusive Enterprises

| | Agree Fully | Agree somewhat | Unsure | Agree somewhat | Agree fully | |
|---|-------------|----------------|--------|----------------|-------------|--|
| EASY to deliver Model to more people | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | HARD to deliver Model to more people |
| The cost of delivering Model to more people is AFFORDABLE | 2 | 1 | | | | The cost of delivering Model to more people is UNAFFORDABLE |
| There is POLITICAL SUPPORT for delivering Model to more people | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | There is NO POLITICAL SUPPORT for delivering Model to more people |
| The wages achieved by Model are BETTER than other models | 3 | | | | | The wages achieved by Model are WORSE than other models |
| The quality of jobs delivered by Model are BETTER than other models | 2 | | 1 | | | The quality of jobs delivered by Model are WORSE than other models |
| The match of jobs to | | 2 | 1 | | | The match of jobs to people's |

| | | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| people's aspirations in Model is BETTER than other models | | | | | | aspirations in Model is WORSE than other models |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|---|

Implications of trying to increase access to this Model

Our Rapporteurs told us that there was potential to expand this model as they felt it was relatively easy to deliver, the cost of delivering the model was affordable, there was political support for expanding delivery to more people, and there was some support for it matching people's aspirations better than other models.

4.5. Vocational Rehabilitation/Training

Germany

In Germany, our Rapporteurs noted four Vocational Rehabilitation or Training models. The first are *Integrationsfachdienste (Integration Offices)*. These cater for people with any disability. The model served 68,500 in 2017.⁴¹ The model is funded through the Employment Waiver scheme⁴² and provided by 3rd Sector organisations. The Integration offices have a series of signposting and enabling tasks :

- to evaluate and develop the individual abilities, performance and interest profile of the severely disabled people
- to support the Federal Employment Agency, at its request, in providing vocational guidance and counselling in schools;
- to support in-company vocational training for severely disabled young people, especially mentally and learning disabled young people;
- to acquire and place suitable jobs on the open labour market;
- to prepare severely disabled people for the jobs envisaged;
- to assist severely disabled people in the workplace, where necessary;
- to inform superiors and colleagues in the workplace

Berufsbildungswerke (Vocational Training Centre) represent another element in the German system. This model serves people with any form of disability without any particular severity. They also serve

⁴¹ <https://www.rehadat-statistik.de/de/berufliche-teilhabe/integrationsfachdienste/index.html>

⁴² <https://integrationsaemeter.de/Fachlexikon/Ausgleichsabgabe/77c350i1p>

people with different forms of impairment, including those with social or learning problems, and who have problems getting a professional education. The model is funded by the State. The health, the pension or accident insurance authorities or the Federal Employment Agency via unemployment insurance (depending on the person's disability) can be in charge and the model is delivered by 3rd Sector organisations. Some 13,000⁴³ places are provided in Germany, but we have no data on how many are taken up.⁴⁴

The *Berufsförderungswerke (Vocational Rehabilitation Centre)* model again serves people with different impairments, mainly adults who already have professional qualification but cannot work in their profession anymore due to their experiencing health problems and/or disabilities or other applicable reasons. Funding and delivery organisations are the same for the *Berufsbildungswerke*. The Vocational Rehabilitation Centres assess with their client their personal and health conditions and determine their individual need for vocational rehabilitation as part of a rehabilitation assessment. If the person is threatened with the loss of his or her job due to disability or health impairment, the Vocational Rehabilitation Centres try to develop suitable preventive measures to maintain the person's employability. If a person can no longer work in his or her old job, Vocational Rehabilitation Centres help them to gain qualifications for work in another field and then try to place them directly into a new job. They also support the person after their qualification and return to working life. There are 12,000 places funded but we have no data on how many are taken up.

Berufliche Trainingszentren (BTZ) (Vocational Training Centres for people with mental health conditions) serve only people with these conditions.⁴⁵ The centres are vocational rehabilitation facilities supporting people to re-enter the workplace after they have had a psychological illness. To this end, professionals, psychologists, social workers and occupational therapists work with the participants as part of an interdisciplinary team until they are re-integrated into work. The working processes include the assessment of performance, individual training courses, internships, qualifications, training and further education based on these, and support in practical returning to work. Despite preventive efforts, mental illness remains one of the most common reasons why employees can no longer work. Vocational Training Centres primarily work with persons between the ages of 25 and 50 who are under affective and personality disorders, take advantage of the range of vocational training centres. Vocational training centres use a mix of individually tailored training in the BTZ and in companies in the general labour market. After a first phase in the BTZ's own training facilities, in which real work requirements are trained, a number of internships may follow where the participants can gain professional experience and try out what they have learned in training.⁴⁶

⁴³ <https://www.bagbbw.de/>

⁴⁴ <https://www.rehadat-bildung.de/de/lexikon/Lex-Berufsbildungswerk-BBW/>

https://statistik.arbeitsagentur.de/nn_31922/SiteGlobals/Forms/Rubrikensuche/Rubrikensuche_Suchergebnis_Form.html?view=processForm&resourceld=210358&input_=&pageLocale=de&topicId=939264®ion=&year_month=201812&year_month.GROUP=1&search=Suchen

⁴⁵ <https://www.bag-btz.de/home/index.html>

⁴⁶ https://www.bag-btz.de/cms/upload/pdf/BAG_BTZ_Fachtagung_Berlin_final.pdf

Austria

Austrian also offers the Jugendcoaching (Youth Coaching) which is a Vocational Guidance service. This model serves people with any disability aged between 15 and 24 who is at risk of becoming an early school leaver or social marginalisation. The model is funded by the Ausgleichstaxfonds fund managed by the Federal Ministry for Social Affairs (see earlier reference under Social Firms/Inclusive Enterprises).⁴⁷ The European Social Fund provides 50% co-funding alongside this. The services aim is to provide vocational guidance which does not necessarily have to lead to a paid job. In some cases, the aim will be for the person to continue in education. It is offered to all learners during their 9th year at school (last year of compulsory school education). Those eligible are learners at any school type at risk of dropping out, early school leavers, and those “Not in Education, Employment or Training” (NEETs) up to the age of 19. Learners with a special education needs, impairments, or disabilities up to the age of 24 are eligible, as are learners from disadvantaged backgrounds. The coaching process is divided into 4 steps: making contact with young people who are aged 18 have yet to complete compulsory education or training; an initial meeting for general counselling; in-depth counselling, including targeted vocational counselling, support to individual decision-making processes, and arranging access to other support measures; more intensive coaching is available for those who require it. Coaching is based on a case-management approach that allocates one coach as responsible for the entire process. Young adults participate on a voluntary basis and do not need the approval of their parents.

In 2018, the model served 49,512 people with disabilities with an expectation that the numbers will increase by 10% in 2019. The service is provided by 32 not-for-profit, and 3 for-profit, social service providers.

Assessment of model efficacy

We had information from Rapporteurs on Vocational Rehabilitation/Training in 4 of our case studies. Our Rapporteurs were unable to provide ratings of the effectiveness of these models directly as their knowledge of these models was incomplete. However, they were able to highlight some positive and negative features.

Positive assessments of Vocational Rehabilitation/Training

In Austria, a reported strength of the Jugendcoaching model is that it is open to the aspirations of young people and it tries to widen the horizons to encompass different options of young people. In Germany, the strength of the Berufsbildungswerke (Vocational Training Centre) is that young people with disabilities of several types have the opportunity to achieve a professional education with the support of trained staff where they might not have without it.

⁴⁷ <https://www.bundeskost.at/wp-content/uploads/2019/05/NEBA-jahresbericht-2018.pdf>

In Germany, Rapporteurs were able to highlight the unique contribution of Vocational Training and Rehabilitation Centres. The Berufsbildungswerke (Vocational Training Centres) provide a contribution to young people with disabilities who would not otherwise have been able to access professional training. The Berufsförderungswerke (*Vocational Rehabilitation Centre*) model serves people already in paid work who become ill or disabled to help them retain employment or to find new qualifications and careers. This is a significant niche service helping to maintain skilled workers in companies and skilled people from unemployment. In the Berufliche Trainingszentren (Vocational Training Centres for people with mental health conditions), we identified that the model offered work in small, appropriate steps on achievable goals and offered enough the time necessary for this to deliver successful re- integration after a mental illness.

Negative assessments of Vocational Rehabilitation/Training

There were negatives to the Supported Employment model. Our Rapporteurs in Austria told us that, due to the large number of participants each Coach has to manage, it is not always possible to devote the time necessary for each individual.

For the Berufliche Trainingszentren (Vocational Training Centres) there was a need for continual examination of the system to ensure it remains successful. While this model is already functioning well in Germany, all those stakeholders involved with vocational training centres need to respond to constantly changing requirements of the workplace and what is required to get people back into work.

4.6. Factors that help or hinder model effectiveness

There are consistent themes in the factors that help or hinder the effectiveness of many of the models we have seen in the Case Studies. Rapporteurs tell us that the level of accessibility of any of the models is key to their effectiveness. For many, accessibility meant catering for a wide range of disabilities and for people with significant levels of disability. Some countries operate assessment systems that rate people according to the level of their disability (%) or work capacity (%). The strength of the sheltered work models was their ability to cater for people with significant levels of disability (work for no more than three hours of 65% disability or 50% work capacity). There were niches within this- Vocational Training Centre for people with mental health conditions did focus on professionals requiring retention services or transition to other professions. However, considerations of other equality factors such as age, gender and religion did not seem to impact on the effectiveness of any of the models.

Our Rapporteurs generally felt that the models were sufficiently flexible to deal with their client group. There were some concerns expressed when services were required to create a profit as this

could lead to “creaming” of people to maintain competitive productivity. While people reported knowledge of disabilities, skill to cater for a wide range of needs, and a freedom to modify tasks, terms and conditions to meet needs also within the models. The effectiveness of helping people to transition to open employment from more sheltered options, or from Vocational Rehabilitation and Training models was criticised. This could undermine the model when the model had transition as a goal (which many had). Those models with a direct focus on getting people jobs in the open labour market seemed to do a little better in achieving that goal, along with delivering higher wage levels and a better match to aspirations that vocational rehabilitation or sheltered work models.

Rapporteurs noted that one of the major strengths of the Sheltered Workshops was their ability to deliver stable jobs, and jobs in significant numbers. Open employment focussed models, such as Supported Employment and IPS, tend still to be offered in smaller numbers than the other sheltered options. What we do not know clearly whether these Supported Employment and IPS models are serving people with the same levels of disability as sheltered models.

In Germany and Spain, current inflexibility in welfare benefit regulations hinders the effectiveness of Sheltered Workshops. Positive welfare benefit payments and preferential access to retirement benefits can provide disincentives to people leaving the Sheltered Workshop to enter the open labour market. In the UK, the shift to Universal Credit from several smaller benefits has offered the promise of simplification but has left many people with a disability in debt and with lower income and made them wary of entering employment that might be seen as unstable.

In Greece, Austria and Germany, legislation is seen to hinder the effectiveness of employment models for people with some disabilities. In the Greek case good law is available to pursue de-institutionalisation and independence for people but there is currently no decree to activate this law. In Austria, classifications of people as “unable to work” can bar people from what may be suitable employment models. Further, changes in categories of people requiring assistance are thought to hinder the Sheltered Workshop model’s effectiveness. A new process implemented in the national labour market agency divides people into 3 Groups of employment seekers: those not needing much support; those who with some support could easily find a job; and those who would need significant support to find a job. The final group will not receive support in the future. This new system may have a significant impact on overall model effectiveness.

4.7. Section Conclusions

- Funding for Sheltered Workshops comes largely from the State, and provision is largely provided by the 3rd Sector. In Spain the private sector is also active.
- Our case studies of sheltered workshops highlight a number of key factors
 - The dominance in terms of scale of provision of the model in some countries

- The differences in the goals between private profit orientated and 3rd Sector socially orientated Sheltered Workshops and the difference that this leads to in the people with disabilities they serve.
- That there are differences in the goals of Sheltered Workshops within and between countries
- Wages in Sheltered Workshops can be low compared to society generally and to some other forms of employment and rates of transition to open employment are also low
- Costs of Sheltered Workshops are reported to be high
- Where the focus of the Sheltered Workshop is on developing skills, the subsequent lacks of transition to other jobs is problematic, and can lead to ageing staff in the workshops
- In some countries, the addition of models that focus on the exit from sheltered work to open employment (such as the Budget to Work scheme in Germany) offers some hope of transition
- Jobs in Sheltered Workshops can be stable, be responsive to people's individual needs in terms of task type and productivity demands
- Differences in Sheltered Workshop remuneration and legislative rights would suggest that work is still required to raise standards in some counties to EU norms.
- Greater efforts are needed in some countries to provide realistic open labour market support mechanisms as alternatives to Sheltered Work. This can extend support those whose training had moved them nearer to the labour market and who need transitional support into open employment. It will also support people with more complex needs directly into community jobs where the rationale for pre-vocational training is poor.
- Funding for *Supported Employment* is also State funded, and in some cases, patchy or non-existent. The scale of provision is therefore significantly smaller than for sheltered alternatives.
- Supported Employment does show important strengths from our case studies:
 - The model is individually based and is flexible to cater for a wide range of clients
 - The availability of in-workplace training provides powerful support for the worker and employers
 - It delivers real paid job that are long-term
- There remain cultural and attitudinal barriers to the employment of people with disabilities in the open labour market in some countries and regions which hampers the number of jobs that are found and the size of the sector.
- Poor legislation and funding frameworks can lead to Supported Employment being a short-rather than a long-term support package, which can disadvantage workers with disabilities who need intermittent support over longer periods
- There appears to be poor continuity and linkage between people from Sheltered Work and Supported Employment which can disadvantage the person with a disability transitioning to the open labour market.
- The *Social Firms/Inclusive Enterprises* in our case studies are largely funded by the State and some Charitable sources and serve people with significant levels of disability. In our Germany

and Spanish case studies the model served large numbers of people. This model can serve people with higher levels of disability than some other models. Our Rapporteurs provided positive assessments of the effectiveness of the model, particularly in the wages achieved and jobs sustained.

- Inclusive Enterprises had often been developed to employ people with a disability and are therefore keen to adapt work to the person.
 - Our Rapporteurs told us that these enterprises can find it difficult to compete in the open market and that this can lead to people who are more able being employed.
 - The terms and conditions offered by some enterprises are favourable and offer little motivation for people to move on to jobs in the open labour market.
 - In Austria, legislative barriers to people who are labelled as not employable entering Inclusive Enterprises represents a limiting factor on the contribution of this models
-
- *Vocational Rehabilitation and Training models* provide a wide range on inputs to assist people to keep or get a job.
 - The models are necessarily more generic and some focus on guidance that can lead to education and other outcomes from employment.
 - These services can signpost people into other models if they are available in their State. They work with many people, but the paid employment outcomes are less clear than for direct sheltered or open labour market support mechanisms.
 - More information is needed to understand whether some services provided within Vocational Rehabilitation and Training are also to be found at the beginning of placements in direct job delivery of placement in the integrated labour market.
-
- Sheltered workshop or Social Firms/Inclusive Enterprises are often seen as more stable and more adaptable to the needs of people with more significant disabilities. In some cases, these options are seen as favourable as local employer's culture does not view integration as desirable or possible.
 - Our case studies suggest that outcomes may be better from more open labour market models and may be better able to reflect the full range of aspirations people may have. However, it is not clear whether the models deliver better outcomes within States, rather than across States and, while there may be real opportunities to expand the open labour market models, it is also unclear if they will be able to deliver jobs at a scale to replace jobs from the larger, more sheltered in Inclusive Enterprise related models.

5. Conclusions

It is clear that there is a difference in the outcomes that can be expected for people with a disability from different models of employment. At the macro-scale there has been shift in investment towards the inclusive labour market and away from more sheltered options. The transition remains modest however, and in many countries sheltered workshops remain the dominant pathway for people with a disability to enter paid employment. For some people with a disability, particularly people with ASD, an intellectual disability or a mental health condition, the shift towards individually selected jobs, with skilled in-work job coach support, has increased their options for paid employment and their outcomes from employment. Inclusive Enterprises have generally delivered jobs that deliver products and services valued in the marketplace, with longer-term contracts and rates of pay at usual legal limits, with training and development. However, many people are still served in sheltered, Occupational Centres and other congregate employment models with low or no pay and little prospect of transition to other forms of employment. Transition between group models and individual job placement models are also low. Those with less significant disabilities are served within the generalised vocational rehabilitation and training model, where outcomes for them are still relatively poor.

We must not under-estimate the significant contribution sheltered employment, Inclusive Enterprises and vocational rehabilitation approaches have had for many people with a disability over the years when few other alternatives were even being discussed. Sheltered workshops and Inclusive Enterprises have also contributed to maintaining incomes for some people with a disability where community wages and welfare benefit rates have been low. It is also true that group models have delivered significant engagement for persons with a disability where few other activities are available to them or their families. It is also clear that there is significant diversity in delivery within the sheltered employment and Inclusive Enterprise sectors (e.g. in procedures, ethos, goals, and in private and public sector delivery) as there is between employment models. They remain a dominant force and the most significant contribution to the employment and income of people with a disability in some European States, less so in others. We are also convinced that these local models are a reflection of local culture, history of employment delivery for people with a disability, and awareness of people's ability to contribute.

The evidence does suggest that the transition to more individualised and open labour market approaches must continue if we are to deliver the best financial, social inclusion and career progression outcomes for people with a disability. We must build more effective Supported Employment pathways for people to try open employment. These pathways must begin to serve those people in sheltered employment as well as those wanting to join the labour market for the first time, or to return to employment, if we are to support transition employment in the open labour market.

It is likely that the path pursued will necessarily need to be different across European States because of the scale of the transition from sheltered and other models required. There is a natural tension between economic stability (welfare benefit or sheltered employment) and inclusion (Supported

Employment and open labour market) for people with a disability and a transition to open market will require rebalancing between these two poles if people are not to be disadvantaged.

Vocational rehabilitation must be a part of the response for people who become long-term sick or disabled and need help to return to their jobs or to change career. However, effective transition to open employment for the full range of people with a disability will require investment in job coach Supported Employment and IPS methods. Adequate support of open labour market employers will also benefit from direct employment services such as Supported Employment and IPS. This transition will also require changes in legislation, definitions of disability and capacity, and welfare benefit rules in some States to accommodate a move to open market jobs. Outcomes from existing employment focused sheltered work may need to be improved, at the same time as pathways to open employment are established, where there are poor prospects for immediate transition to open employment. Rights based frameworks are now well advanced across the EU and this provides opportunity for policies that favour employer accommodating the needs of people with a disability, with State financial backing to support for this, rather than providing wage subsidies that reinforce ideas that people with a disability have poor employment productivity. Any use of additional employer-based subsidies will have to be creative and may be best targeted on employing people with very significant disabilities who may wish to enter employment and include subsidy for additional mentoring, supervision and partial participation.

In the EU context a continued move towards open employment is in line with goals of the European Pillar of Social Rights, Chapter 1: Equal opportunities and access to the labour market, *“the right to equal treatment and opportunities regarding employment”* and *“the right to timely and tailor-made assistance to improve employment or self-employment prospects.”* Any EU Implementation Plan for this Pillar will need to fully reflect the development of pathways to open employment across Member States.

Help for people to explore open employment would also help to promote UN Sustainable Development Goals 1 *“Ending poverty in all its forms,”* and 8 *“Decent Work and Economic Growth”* as well as Article 27 of the UN Convention on the Rights of Disabled Persons. The current European Disability Strategy seeks to significantly raise the share of persons with disabilities working in the open labour market and the re-negotiation of the Strategy will need to promote greater support for this goal.

Such a move is likely to require EU and State actions on the European Semester to include more social and economic goals related to greater employment of people with a disability in the open labour market. It is also likely to have significant implications for the future use of ESF funds if they are to assist in any development of pathways to the open labour market. Finally, the EU needs to Improve the coverage and consistency of its statistical information to assess progress to more inclusive employment for people with a disability.

References

Austin, B.S. and Lee, C.L. (2014). A structural equation model of vocational rehabilitation services: Predictors of employment outcomes for clients with intellectual and co-occurring psychiatric disabilities. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 80(3), 11–20.

Bailey, T., and Hughes, K. (1999). *Employer involvement in work-based learning programs*. Berkeley, CA: National Center for Research in Vocational Education.

Becker, D.R, Swanson, S.J., Reese, S.L., Bond, G.R. and McLeman, B.M. (2015). *FIDELITY REVIEW MANUAL: A companion guide to the evidence-based IPS Supported Employment Fidelity Scale, Third Edition*. Dartmouth: Dartmouth Psychiatric Research Center.

Benz, M. R., Lindstrom, L., and Yovanoff, P. (2000). Improving graduation and employment outcomes of students with disabilities: Predictive factors and student perspectives. *Exceptional Children*, 66, 509-529.

Beyer, S. (2008). *An evaluation of the outcomes of Supported Employment in North Lanarkshire (2007)*. Motherwell: North Lanarkshire Social Work Service.
<http://orca.cf.ac.uk/24732/>

Beyer, S., Goodere, L. and Kilsby, M. (1996). *Costs and Benefits of Supported Agencies. Findings From A National Survey*. Employment Service Research Series R37. Stationery Office: London.

Beyer, S., Jordan de Urries, E.B., Verdugo, M.A. (2010b). “A comparative study of the situation of Supported Employment in Europe”, in *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, 7, 130–136.

Beyer, S. and Robinson, C. (2009). *A review of the research literature on Supported Employment: a report for the cross-Government learning disability employment strategy team*. [Project Report]. London: Department of Health.

Beyer, S and Seebohm, P. (2003) *Employment Creation in Social Enterprises: A Public Authority Perspective 2001 – 2003- The financial net cost analysis*. Social Firms UK.

Beyer, S., Thomas, J. and Thornton, P. (2003). *The Net Costs and Individual Benefits of the Supported Employment Programme*. Report WAE 152. Sheffield: Department of Work and Pensions Research management.

Biggeri, M., Deepak, S., Mauro, V., Trani, J.F., Kumar, J., Rama-samy, P., and Giriappa, R. (2012). *Impact of CBR:Community based rehabilitation programme in Mandya district (Karnataka,India)*. Bologna, Italy: Italian Association Amicidi Raoul Foller-eau (AIFO).

Bond, G.R., Drake, R.E. and Becker, D.R. (2012). Generalizability of the Individual Placement and Support (IPS) model of Supported Employment outside the US. *World Psychiatry*, 11, 1, 32–39.

Brickey, M.P., Campbell, K.M., and Browning, L.J. (1985). A five-year follow-up of sheltered workshop employees placed in competitive jobs. *Mental Retardation*, 2, 67-73.

Burns, T., and Catty, J. (2008). IPS in Europe: The EQOLISE Trial. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, 31, 4, 313–317.

Burns,T., Catty,J., Becker, T. et al. (2007). The effectiveness of Supported Employment for people with severe mental illness: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*, 370, 1146–1152.

Burns, T., Catty, J., White, S., et al. (2009.) The impact of Supported Employment and working on clinical and social functioning: results of an international study of individual placement and support. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 35, 949–958.

Butterworth, J., Migliore, A., Nord, D. and Gelb, A. (2012). Improving the Employment Outcomes of Job Seekers with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities: A Training and Mentoring Intervention for Employment Consultants. *Journal of rehabilitation*, 78, 2, 815.

Centre for Social Research and Evaluation (2008). *Pathways to inclusion: strategy evaluation* [Final evaluation report]. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Social Development. (<https://www.msd.govt.nz/about-msd-and-our-work/publications-resources/evaluation/pathways-inclusion/pathways-to-inclusion-strategy-evaluation.html>, Accessed 24 Apr 2020).

Chadsey, J. and Beyer, R. (2001). Social Relationships In The Workplace. *Mental retardation and Developmental Disabilities Research Reviews*, 7, 128-133.

Cheng, C., Oakman, J., Bigby, C., Fossey, E., Cavanagh, J., Meacham, H. and Bartram, T. (2018). What constitutes effective support in obtaining and maintaining employment for individuals with intellectual disability? A scoping review. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability*, 43, 3, 317-327.

Cimera, R.E. (1998). Are Individuals with Severe Mental Retardation and Multiple Disabilities Cost-Efficient to Serve via Supported Employment Programs? *Mental Retardation*, 36, 4, 280-292.

Cimera, R. E., and Rusch, F. R. (1999). The Cost-Efficiency of Supported Employment Programs: A Review of the Literature. *International Review of Research in Mental Retardation*, 22, 175-225.

Cimera, R.E. (2001). Utilizing co-workers as “natural supports”: Evidence on cost efficiency, job retention, and other employment outcomes. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 11, 4, 194–201.

Cimera, R.E. (2007). The cumulative cost-effectiveness of supported and sheltered employees with mental retardation. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*, 32, 4, 247-252.

Cimera, R.E. (2007) The cost effectiveness of Supported Employment and sheltered workshops in Wisconsin (FY2002–FY2005). *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 26, 153–158.

Cimera, R.E. (2008). The cost-trends of Supported Employment versus sheltered employment. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 28, 1, 15-20.

Cimera, R.E. (2009). The national costs of Supported Employment to vocational rehabilitation: 2002 to 2006. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 30, 1-10.

Cimera, R.E. (2010b). The national cost-efficiency of supported employees with intellectual disabilities: The worker's perspective. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 33, 2, 123-131.

Cimera, R.E. (2010c). Can Community-Based High School Transition Programs Improve the Cost-Efficiency of Supported Employment? *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 33, 1, 4–12.

Cimera, R.E. (2011a). Supported versus sheltered employment: Cumulative costs, hours worked, and wages earned. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 35, 85-92.

Cimera, R.E. (2011b). Does being in sheltered workshops improve the employment outcomes of employees with intellectual disabilities? *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 35, 21-27.

Cimera, R.E. (2012). The outcomes achieved by previously placed supported employees with intellectual disabilities: Second verse same as the first? *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 36, 65–71.

Cimera, R.E. and Burgess, S. (2011). Do adults with autism benefit monetarily from working in their communities? *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 34, 173-180.

Cimera, R.E. and Cowan, R.J. (2009). The costs of services and employment outcomes achieved by adults with autism in the US. *Autism*, 13, 3, 285–302.

Cimera, R.E., Wehman, P., West, M. and Burgess, S. (2011). Do sheltered workshops enhance employment outcomes for adults with autism spectrum disorder? *Autism: The International Journal of Research and Practice*, 16, 1, 87-94.

Clement-Heist, K., Siegel, S. and Gaylord-Ross, R. (1992). Simulated and *in situ* Vocational Social Skills Training for Youths with Learning Disabilities, *Exceptional Children*, 58, pp. 336–345.

Cohen, A., Butterworth, J., Gilmore, D. and Metzel, D. (2003). High-performing states in integrated employment. *Research to Practice Series*, 9, 1.

Colley, D. and Jamison, D. (1998). Post school results for youth with disabilities: Key indicators and policy implications. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 21, 2, 145-160.

COWI (2012). *Supported Employment for people with Supported Employment for people good practices and recommendations in support of a flexicurity approach*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. doi:10.2838/72424

Cramm, J.M. and Finkelügel, H. (2008). Exclusion of disabled people from microcredit in Africa and Asia: a literature study. *Asia Pacific Disability Rehabilitation Journal*, 19, 15-33.

de Urries, B, Beyer, S. and Verdugo, M. (2010). A comparative study of the situation of Supported Employment in Europe. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, 7, 2, 130–136.

Dowler, D.L. and Walls, R.T, (2014). A Review of Supported Employment Services for People with Disabilities: Competitive Employment, Earnings and Service Costs. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 80, 1, 11-21.

Drake, R., McHugo, G., Bebout, R., et al. (1999). A randomized clinical trial of Supported Employment for inner-city patients with severe mental disorders. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*, 56, 627-33.

Dudley, J. R., and Schatz, M. S. (1985). The missing link in evaluating sheltered workshop programs: The clients' input. *Mental Retardation*, 23, 5, 235–240.

Durie, S. and Wilson, L. (2007). *Six Mary's place: social return on investment report*. Edinburgh, Forth Sector, (Series Report No. 1). (<http://www.socialvalueuk.org/report/six-marys-place-social-return-on-investment-report/>) Accessed April 2020

Dyer S. (2004). Credit is a need and a right: inclusive policy and practice in micro-finance. In Heinicke-Motsch K. and Sygall S., Eds. *Building an inclusive development community: a manual on including people with disabilities in international development programs*. Bloomfeld: Kumarian Press.

European Commission (2019). *Joint Employment Report*. Brussels: Directorate -General for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion. Brussels: European Commission.

European Parliament (2015). *Reasonable Accommodation and Sheltered Workshops for People with Disabilities: Costs and Returns of Investments*, Policy Department A: Economic and Scientific Policy. Brussels: European Parliament.

Farris, B. and Stancliffe, R.J. (2001). The co-worker training model: Outcomes of an open employment pilot project. *Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability*, 26(2), 143–159.

Faubion, C. W. and Andrew, J. (2000). A Systems Analysis of the Case Coordinator Model and an Outcomes Analysis in Supported Employment. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 43, 2, 75-83.

Forrester-Jones, R., McGill, P., and Gwillim, J. (2008). Does social enterprise help social inclusion? *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 52, 689-689.

Gascon, H. (2009). Self-Esteem and Loneliness in Adults with Mild Intellectual Disabilities Working in Sheltered Workshops Versus a regular work environment. *British Journal of Developmental Disabilities*, 55, 109, 145-155.

Geiger, B.B., van der Wel, K.A. and Tøge, A. (2017). Success and failure in narrowing the disability employment gap: comparing levels and trends across Europe 2002–2014. *BMC Public Health*, 17, Article number: 928.

Gershon, W., Srinivasan, G.R. (1992). Community-based rehabilitation: an evaluation study. *Lepr Rev*, 63, 51–59.

Gilmore, D. S., Schuster, J. L., Timmons, J. C. and Butterworth, J. (2000). An Analysis of Trends for People with ME Cerebral Palsy, and Epilepsy Receiving Services from State VR Agencies: Ten Years of Progress. *Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin*, 44, 1, 30-38.

Gold, P.B., Meisler, N., Santos, A.B. et al. (2006). Randomized trial of Supported Employment integrated with assertive community treatment for rural adults with severe mental illness. *Schizophr Bull*, 32:378–95.

Goldberg, R.T., McLean, M.M., La Vigne, R., Fratolillo, J. and Sullivan, F.T. (1990) 'Transition of persons with developmental disability from extended sheltered employment to competitive employment', *Mental Retardation*, 28, 5, 299-304.

Hall, A., Butterworth, J., Winsor, J., Gilmore, D., and Metzger, D. (2007). Pushing the employment agenda: Case study research of high performing states in integrated employment. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 45, 3, 182-19.

Hall, A.L., Freeze, S., Butterworth, J. and Hoff, D. (2011). Employment funding for intellectual/developmental disability systems. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 34, 1, 1-15.

Hanrahan, P., Heiser, W., Cooper, A.E, Oulvey, G. and Luchins, D.J. (2006). Limitations of System Integration in Providing Employment Services for Persons with Mental Illness. *Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research*, 33, 2, 244-252.

Hasazi, S., Gordan, L., and Roe, C. (1985). Factors associated with the employment status of handicapped youth exiting high school from 1979 to 1983. *Exceptional Children*, 51, 455-469.

Hedley, D., Uljarević, M., Cameron, L., Halder, S., Richdale, A. and Dissanayake, C. (2017). Employment programmes and interventions targeting adults with autism spectrum disorder: A systematic review of the literature. *Autism*, 21, 8, 929 –941.

Hillier, A., Campbell, H., Mastriani, K. et al. (2007). Two-year evaluation of a vocational support program for adults on the autism spectrum. *Career Dev Except Individ.*, 30, 1, :35–47.

Hoerner, J., and Wehrley, J. (1995). *Work-based learning: The key to school-to-work transition*. New York, NY: Glencoe/McGraw–Hill.

Hogg, J. (2005). Micro-Enterprises South West: A report on the viability of the US micro-enterprise model and possible implementation across the South West region for the Valuing People Team.

<https://www.centreforwelfarereform.org/uploads/attachment/366/microenterprise-and-people-with-learning-disabilities.pdf> Accessed April 2020.

Howarth, E., Mann, J.R., Zhou, H., McDermott, S. and Butkus, S. (2006). What predicts re-employment after job loss for individuals with mental retardation? *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 24, 183–189.

Howlin, P., Alcock, J., Burkin, C. (2005). An 8-year follow-up of a specialist Supported Employment service for high-ability adults with autism or Asperger Syndrome. *Autism*, 9, 5, 533–549.

Huang, W. and Cuvo, A. (1997). Social skills training for adults with mental retardation in job-related settings. *Behaviour Modification*, 21, 1, 3-44.

Huang, J., Guo, B. and Bricout, J.C. (2009). From Concentration to Dispersion: The Shift in Policy Approach to Disability Employment in China. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, Volume 20 Number 1, June 2009 46-54.

Huang W. and Cuvo, A. (1997). Social skills training for adults with mental retardation in job-related settings. *Behaviour Modification*, 21(1):3-44.

Hughes, C. and Carter, E. (2000). *The transition handbook: Strategies that high school teachers use that work*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Company.

Humes, C. and Brammer, G. (1985). LD Career Success after High School. *Academic Therapy*, 21, 2, 171-176.

Hyde, M. (1998) Sheltered and Supported Employment in the 1990s: The experiences of disabled workers in the UK. *Disability & Society*, 12, 2, 199-215.

Hyun-Sook, P. and Gaylord-Ross, R. (1989). A problem-solving approach to social skills training in employment settings with mentally retarded youth. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 22, 4.

International Labour Organization (ILO) (2006). *Doing business in Tigray: case studies of women entrepreneurs with disabilities in Ethiopia*. Geneva, International
(<http://www.ilo.org/public/english/region/afpro/addisababa/publ/tigraycasestudy.pdf>, Accessed April 2020).

Jacob, A., Scott, M., Falkmer, M., and Falkmer, T. (2015). The Costs and Benefits of Employing an Adult with Autism Spectrum Disorder: A Systematic Review. *PLoS ONE*, 10, 10).

Jordán de Urrías Vega, F. B. et al. (2014). Aproximación al análisis coste-beneficio entre empleo con apoyo y centros especiales de empleo mediante simulación comparativa con 24 trabajadores. *Revista Española de Discapacidad*, 2, 1, 33-50.

Kashner, T.M., Rosenheck, R., Campinell, A.B. et al. (2002). Impact of work therapy on health status among homeless, substance-dependent veterans: a randomized controlled trial. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*, 59(9), 938–44.

Keel, J.H., Mesibov, G.B. and Woods, A.V. (1997). TEACCH-Supported Employment Program. *J Autism Dev Disord*, 27, 3–9.

Kiernan, W. E., Hoff, D., Freeze, S. and Mank, D. M. (2011). Employment first: A beginning not an end. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 49, 300-304.

Knaeps, J., DeSmet, A. and Van Audenhove, C. (2012). An Application of the IPS Fidelity Scale in the Planning Process to Implement Supported Employment in Flanders. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 37, 13-23.

Knapp, M., Romeo, R. and Beecham, J. (2009). Economic cost of autism in the UK. *Autism*, 13, 3, 317–36.

Knapp, M., Patel, A., Curran, C., Latimer, E., Catty, J., Becker, T., Drake, R.E., Fioritti, A., Kilian, R., Lauber, C., Rössler, W., Tomov, T., Van Busschbach, J., Comas- Herrera, A., White, S., Wiersma, D. and Burns, T. (2013). Supported employment: cost-effectiveness across six European sites. *World psychiatry*, 12,1, 60-68.

Kober, R. and Eggleton, I. (2005). The effect of different types of employment on quality of life, *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 49, 10, 756-60.

Kondrátová L. and Winkler P. (2017). The Supported Employment of people with severe mental illness- The Czech and international experience: A narrative synthesis. *Čes a slov Psychiat*, 113(3): 132–139.

Kregel, J., Dean, D.H. (2002). “Sheltered vs. Supported Employment: A direct comparison of long-term earnings outcomes for individuals with cognitive disabilities”, in J. Kregel, D.H.

Dean and P. Wehman (eds): *Achievements and challenges in employment services for people with disabilities: The longitudinal impact of workplace supports monograph*.

<http://www.worksupport.com/resources/viewContent.cfm/151> Accessed Apr. 2020

Kregel, J., Weham, P. and Banks, P. (1989). The effects of consumer characteristics and type of employment model on individual outcomes in Supported Employment. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 22, 4, 407-15.

Kuznetsova, Y. and Yalcin, B. (2017). Inclusion of persons with disabilities in mainstream employment: is it really all about the money? A case study of four large companies in Norway and Sweden, *Disability & Society*, 32, 2, 233-253.

Lagerkvist, B. (1992). Community-based rehabilitation-outcome for the disabled in the Philippines and Zimbabwe. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 14, 44–50.

Lagomarcino, T. R. (1990). “Job separation issues in Supported Employment.” In F. R. Rusch (Ed.), *Supported employment: Models, methods, and issues*, p. 301–316. Sycamore Publishing Company.

Lee, M., Storey, K., Anderson, J. L., Goetz, L. and Zivolich, S. (1997). The Effect of Mentoring Versus Job Coach Instruction on Integration in Supported Employment Settings. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 22, 3, 151-158.

Lemaire, G.S. and Mallik, K. (2007). Barriers to Supported Employment for Persons With Developmental Disabilities. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 22, 3, 147-55.

Lewis, D.R., Johnson, D.R., Bruininks, R.H., Kallsen, L.A. and Guillery, R.P. (1992). Is Supported Employment Cost-Effective in Minnesota? *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 3, 67-92.

Luecking, R., and Fabian, E. (2000). Paid internships and employment success for youth in transition. *Career Development for Exceptional Children*, 23, 2, 205-221.

Mallender, J., Liger, Q., Tierney, R., Beresford, D., Eager, J., Speckesser, S. and Nafilyan, V. (2015). *Reasonable Accommodation and Sheltered Workshops for People with Disabilities: Costs and Returns of Investments—Study for the EMPL Committee*. Directorate General for Internal Policies of the European Parliament, Policy Department A. Economic and Scientific Policy, Employment and Social Affairs. Brussels: European Parliament.

Mank, D., Cioffi, A. and Yovanoff, P. (1997a). Analysis of the Typicalness of Supported Employment Jobs, Natural Supports, and Wage and Integration Outcomes. *Mental Retardation*, 35, 3, 185-197.

Mank, D., Cioffi, A. and Yovanoff, P. (1997b). Patterns of Support for Employees with Severe Disabilities. *Mental Retardation*, 35, 6, 433-447.

Mank, D., Cioffi, A. and Yovanoff, P. (1998). Employment Outcomes for People with Severe Disabilities: Opportunities for Improvement. *Mental Retardation*, 36, 3, 205-216.

Mank, D., Cioffi, A. and Yovanoff, P. (1999). Impact of Co-worker Involvement with Supported Employees on Wage and Integration Outcomes. *Mental Retardation*, 37, 5, 383-394.

Marina Kukla and Alan B. McGuire Richard L. Roudebush (2016). Rural and Urban Supported Employment Programs in the Veterans Health Administration: Comparison of Barriers and Facilitators to Vocational Achievement for Veterans Experiencing Mental Illnesses. *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, 39, 2, 129-136.

Mautz, D., Storey, K. and Certo, N. (2001). Increasing Integrated Workplace Social Interactions: The Effects of Job Modification, Natural Supports, Adaptive Communication Instruction, and Job Coach Training. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 26, 4, 257-269.

Mavranouzouli, I., Megnin-Viggars, O., Cheema, N., Howlin, P., Baron-Cohen, S., Pilling, S. (2014). The cost-effectiveness of Supported Employment for adults with autism in the United Kingdom. *Autism*, 18, 8, 975-84.

Mawhood, L. and Howlin, P. (1999). The Outcome of a Supported Employment Scheme for High-Functioning Adults with Autism or Asperger Syndrome. *Autism*, 3(3):229-254.

May-Simera, C. (2018). Reconsidering Sheltered Workshops in Light of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2006). *Laws*, 7, 6, 2-18.

McConkey, R.; Mezza, F. 2001. "Employment aspirations of people with learning disabilities attending day centres", in *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 5, 309-10.

Mcgaughey, M. J., Kiernan, W. E., McNally, L. C., Gilmore, D. S. (1995). A Peaceful Coexistence? State MR/DD Agency Trends in Integrated Employment and Facility-Based Services. *Mental Retardation*, 33, 3, 170-180.

McInnes, M.M., Ozturk, O.D., McDermott, S. and Mann, J.R. (2010). Does Supported Employment work? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 29, 3, 506–525.

McCuller W.J, Sussman S., Holiday K., Craig S. and Dent, C.W. (2002). Tracking Procedures for Locating High-Risk Youth. *Evaluation & the Health Professions*, 25, 3, 345-362.

McKeown, K., O'Brien, T.J. and Fitzgerald, G. (1992). *The European Project on Mental Health in Ireland 1989–1991: An Evaluation*. Dublin: Dublin Irish Social Firm Initiative.

Melling, K., Beyer, S. and Kilsby, M. (2011) Supported employment for people with learning disabilities in the UK: the last 15 years. *Tizard Learning Disability Review*, 16, 2, 23-32.

Metts, R.L. (2000). *Disability issues, trends, and recommendations for the World Bank*. Washington, World Bank,
<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DISABILITY/Resources/280658-1172606907476/DisabilityIssuesMetts.pdf> Accessed Apr 2020.

Migliore, A. , Mank, D., Grossiand, T. and Rogan, P. (2007). Integrated employment or sheltered workshops: Preferences of adults with intellectual disabilities, their families and staff. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*. 26, 5–19.

Migliore, A., Butterworth, J., Nord, D., Cox, M., and Gelb, A. (2012). Implementation of job development practices. *Intellect Dev Disabil*. 50, 3, 207-18.

Mills, L.A. (2006). *Revitalizing integrated employment: A study of nationwide best practices for increasing integrated employment outcomes among people with developmental disabilities*. Madison: Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services/Pathways to Independence.

Momin, A.K.M. (2004). Impact of services for people with spinal cord lesion on economic participation. *Asia Pacific Disability Rehabilitation Journal*, 15, 2, 64-78.

Moore, C.L., Feist-Price, S. and Alston, R.J. (2002a). Competitive employment and mental retardation: Interplay among gender, race, secondary psychiatric disability, and rehabilitation services. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 68, 1, 14–19.

Moore, C.L., Feist-Price, S. and Alston, R.J. (2002b). VR services for persons with severe/profound mental retardation: Does race matter? *Rehabilitation Counselling Bulletin*, 45, 3, 162–167.

Mueser, K. T. and McGurk, S. R. (2014). Supported employment for persons with serious mental illness: Current status and future directions. *l'Encéphale*, 40, S45-S56.

National Audit Office (NAO) (2009). *Supporting people with autism through adulthood*. Report by the Comptroller and Auditor General, HC 556 Session 2008-2009.
<https://www.nao.org.uk/report/supporting-people-with-autism-through-adulthood/>

Neufeldt, A. and Albright, A. (1998). *Disability and self-directed employment. Business development models*. Concord, Ontario: Captus Press.

New Zealand Department of Labour (2009). Pathways to inclusion: improving vocational services for people with disabilities. Wellington, New Zealand Department of Labour, 2001
<http://apskills.ilo.org/resources/pathways-to-inclusion-improving-vocational-services-for-people-with-disabilities> Accessed Apr 2020.

Nicholas, D.B., Attridge, M., Zwaigenbaum, L., Clarke, M. (2015). Vocational support approaches in autism spectrum disorder: a synthesis review of the literature. *Autism*, 19, 2, 235-45.

Noble, J.H., Conley, R.W., Banerjee, S. and Goodman, S. (1991). Supported Employment In New York State: A Comparison Of Benefits And Costs. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 2, 39-73.

Nord, D., Luecking, R., Mank, D., Kiernan, W., and Wray, C. (2013). The State of the Science of Employment and Economic Self-Sufficiency for People with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 51, 5, 376-38.

Nuri, R.P., Hoque, T., Akand, M.K. and Waldron, S.M. (2012). Impact assessment of a vocational training programme for persons with disabilities in Bangladesh. *Disability, CBR and Inclusive Development*, 23, 76–89.

O'Brien, J. and Dempsey, I. (2004). Comparative Analysis of Employment Services for People with Disabilities in Australia, Finland, and Sweden. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, 1, ¾, 126–135.

OECD (2003). *Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD). Transforming Disability into Ability: Policies to Promote Work and Income Security for Disabled People*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD/ILO (2018) Labour market inclusion of people with disabilities.
https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/how-the-ilo-works/multilateral-system/g20/reports/WCMS_646041/lang--en/index.htm

Open Society Institute (OSI) (2006). *Access to education and employment for people with intellectual disability: an overview of the situation in central and eastern Europe*. Budapest: Open Society Institute. <https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/publications/access-education-and-employment-people-intellectual-disabilities-overview-situation-central>
Accessed Apr 2020

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) (2010). *Sickness, Disability and Work: Breaking the Barriers*. Paris: OECD.
<https://www.oecd.org/publications/sickness-disability-and-work-breaking-the-barriers-9789264088856-en.htm> Accessed Apr 2020

Parent, W. S., Kregel, J., Metzler, H. M. D. and Twardzik, G. (1992). Social Integration in the Workplace - An Analysis of the Interaction Activities of Workers with Mental-Retardation and their Co-workers. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities*, 27, 1, 28-38.

Parmenter, T. (2011). Promoting training and employment opportunities for people with intellectual disabilities: International experience. Employment Sector Employment Working Paper No. 103. Geneva: ILO.
<https://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1560&context=gladnetcollect> Accessed April 2020.

Peraino, J.M. (1992). "Post-21 Follow-Up Studies: How do special education graduates fare?" In P. Wehman (Ed.). *Life beyond the classroom: Transition strategies for young people with disabilities*, p 21-37. Baltimore: Paul H. Brooks.

Phelps, A. and Hanley-Maxwell, C. (1997). School-to-Work Transitions for Youth with Disabilities: A Review of Outcomes and Practices. *Review of Educational Research*, 67, 2, 197-226.

Proft, J. (2012). *Die berufliche Teilhabe von hochfunktionaler erwachsenen Personen mit einer Autismus-Spektrum-Störung auf dem ersten Arbeitsmarkt und ihre Erwartungen an einen Arbeitsplatz*. Bachelor Thesis, University of Cologne.

Ricardo Pagán, R. (2009). Self-employment among people with disabilities: Evidence for Europe. *Disability and Society*, 24, 2, 217-229.

Richards, J. (2012). Examining the exclusion of employees with Asperger syndrome from the workplace. *Personnel Review*, 41, 5, 630-646

Rogers, C., Lavin, D., Tran, T., Gantenbein, T. and Sharpe, M. (2008). Customized employment: Changing what it means to be qualified in the workforce for transition-aged youth and young adults. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 28, 3, 191-207.

Rose, V.K. and Harris, E. (2005). What employment programs should health services invest in for people with a psychiatric disability? *Australian Health Review*, May, 2, 29, 185-188.

Rusch, F. R., Wilson, P. G., Hughes, C. and Heal, L. (1994). Matched-Pairs Analysis of Co-worker Interactions in Relation to Opportunity, Type of Job, and Placement Approach. *Mental Retardation*, 32, 2, 113-122.

Rusch, F. R., Wilson, P. G., Hughes, C., Heal, L. W. (1995). Interaction of Persons with Severe Mental-Retardation and their Non-disabled Co-workers in Integrated Work Settings. *Behavior Modification*, 19, 1, 59-77.

Saloviita, T. and Pirttimaa, R. (2007). Surveying Supported Employment in Finland: A follow-up. *Journal of Policy and Practice in Intellectual Disabilities*, 4, 229–234.

Scuccimarra, D. and Speece, D. (1990). Employment outcomes and social integration of students with mild handicaps: The quality of life two years after high school. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 23, 4, 213-219.

Shafer, M. S., Wehman, P., Kregel, J., West, M. (1990). National Supported Employment Initiative: A Preliminary Analysis. *American Journal of Mental Retardation*, 95, 3, 316-327.

Shima, I., Zólyomi, E. and Zaidi, A. (2008) *The Labour Market Situation of People with Disabilities in EU25*. European Centre for Social Welfare Policy and Research.

Shattuck, P.T., Roux, A.M., Hudson, L.E. et al. (2012). Services for adults with an autism spectrum disorder. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 57, 284–291.

Social Firms Scotland (2008). Welfare Reform Green Paper “No one written off: reforming welfare to reward responsibility”: Response from Social Firms Scotland. Glasgow: Social Firms Scotland

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/238741/7363.pdf Accessed April 2020.

Smits, S. (2004). Disability and employment in the USA: The quest for best practices. *Disability & Society*, 19, 6, 647-662.

Spear, R. and Bidet, E. (2005). Social Enterprise for Work Integration in 12 European Countries: a descriptive analysis. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 76(2):195-231.

Sung, C., Sanchez, J., Hung-Jen, H., Chia-Chiang, W. and Leahy, M. (2015). Gender Differences in Vocational Rehabilitation Service Predictors of Successful Competitive Employment for

Transition-Aged Individuals with Autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 45(10).

Surinak, T. (2008). *A Comparative Analysis of Self-determined Evaluations of Work Performance and Support Needs by Adults with Mental Retardation in Supported Work and in Sheltered Workshop Environments*. Doctor of Education. Florida International University.

Test, D., Mazzotti, V., Mustian, A., Fowler, C., Kortering, L. and Kohler, P. (2009). Evidence-based secondary transition predictors for improving postschool outcomes for students with disabilities. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*, 32, 3, 160–181.

Thoresen, S.H., Thomson, A., Jackson, R. and Cocks, E. (2018). Meaningful social and economic inclusion through small business enterprise models of employment for adults with intellectual disability. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 49, 161–172.

Thornton, P. and Lunt, N. (1997). *Employment policies for disabled people in eighteen countries: a review*. York: Social Policy Research Unit, University of York.

Tsang, H.W., Fung, K.M., Leung, A.Y. et al. (2010). Three year follow-up study of an integrated Supported Employment for individuals with severe mental illness. *Aust N Z Psychiatry*, 44, 49-58.

Van Rijn et al. (2016). Work as treatment? The effectiveness of re-employment programmes for unemployed persons with severe mental health problems on health and quality of life: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Occupational and environmental medicine* 73(4).

Van Wieren, T.A., Reid, C.A., and McMahon, B.T. (2008). *Workplace Discrimination and Autism Spectrum Disorders: The National EEOC Americans with Disabilities Act Research Project*. 1 Jan.: 299 – 308.

Van Wieren, T.A., Armstrong, A. J., and McMahon, B.T. (2012). *Autism Spectrum Disorders and Intellectual Disabilities: A Comparison of ADA Title I Workplace Discrimination Allegations*, 1 Jan.: 159 – 169.

Verdugo, M.A., Martín-Ingelmo, R., Jordán de Urríes, F.B., Vicent, C., et al. (2009). Impact on quality of life and self-determination of a national program for increasing Supported Employment in Europe. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 31, 55-64.

Vela Microboard Association (2008). *What is a Vela Microboard?* Vancouver. Canada: Vela Microboard Association. <https://www.velacanada.org> Accessed Apr 2020

Visier, L. (1998). Sheltered Employment for Persons with Disabilities. *International Labour Review*, 137, 348-365.

Walker, A. (2011). "CHECKMATE! A self-advocate's journey through the world of employment. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 49, 310-12.

Warner, R. and Mandiberg, J. (2006). An Update on Affirmative Businesses or Social Firms for People with Mental Illness. *Psychiatry Services*, 57, 1488-1492.

Wehman, P. (2001). *Life beyond the classroom: Transition strategies for young people with disabilities*. Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Wehman, P. and Kregel, J. (1985). A Supported Work Approach to Competitive Employment for Individuals with Moderate and Severe Handicaps. *The Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 10, 3-11.

Wehman, P., Kregel, J. and Keyser-Marcus, L. (2003). Supported employment for persons with traumatic brain injury: a preliminary investigation of long-term follow-up costs and program efficiency. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 84, 192-196.

Wehman, P., Schall, C., McDonough, J., Molinelli, M., Riehle, E., Ham, W. and Thiss W. (2013). Transition from High School Project SEARCH for Youth with Autism Spectrum Disorders: Increasing Competitive Employment On. *Behavior Interventions*, 15, 3, 144-155.

Weikle D.W. (2008). Achieving Community Membership Through CRPs: A Reaction to. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*: February 2008, 46, 1, 58-60.

West, M. Revell, W.G. and Wehman, P. (1992). Achievements and Challenges: A 5-Year Report on Consumer and System Outcomes from the Supported Employment Initiative. *Journal of The Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 17, 4, 227-235.

West, M.D., Wehman, P.B. and Wehman, P. (2005). Competitive employment outcomes for persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities: The national impact of the best buddies jobs programs. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 23,51–63.

White, J. and Weiner, J. S. (2004). Influence of least restrictive environment and community-based training on integrated employment outcomes for transitioning students with severe disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 21, 149-156.

Wistow, R. and Schneider, J. (2007). Employment support agencies in the UK: current operation and future development needs. *Health and Social Care in the Community*, 15, 2, 128–13.

World Health Organisation (WHO) (2011). *World report on disability*. Geneva: WHO.

Zijl, M., van der Meer, M., van Seters, J., Visser, J. and Keuzenkamp, H.A. (2002). *Dutch experiences with the European employment strategy*. Amsterdam: Research in commission of the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.

Appendix 1: Methodology for study literature search

Searches were made of the following databases to identify previous relevant research articles: NAHL Complete, EconLit, MEDLINE Complete, ERIC, Embase, PsycINFO. Further references have been generated from searches of bibliography and Google Scholar.

The following search scripts were developed to identify relevant papers or reports:

1. disab* OR handicap* OR impair* OR intell* dis* OR learning diff* OR mental* retard* OR developmental dis* OR autism OR autistic spectrum OR Asperger* OR sensory disab* OR deaf OR hearing loss OR hearing impair* OR blind OR visual* impair* OR phys* disab* OR mental* ill* OR psychiatric dis* OR mental health

2. employ* OR supported emp* OR customised employ* OR open employ* OR comm* employ* OR individual placement with support OR IPS OR sheltered work* OR social firm* OR social enterprise OR cooperative OR club house OR vocational rehabilitation service* OR transition* emp* OR work exper* OR work trial OR volunteer* OR self employ* OR micro enterprise OR supp* intern* OR project search

3. empl* inclus* OR lab* market particip* OR lab* market inclus* OR lab* market integ* OR integ* employ* OR integ* job* OR integ* work* OR active lab* market prog*

We undertook a seven-step process. STEP 1- We ran the search routines independently and then in these combinations:

1 AND 2 [e.g. disability and employment type)

1 AND 3 [disability and employment model discussions]

(1 AND 2) AND 3 [e.g. disability, employment type and employment model discussions]

Only literature from **1985** to current was selected.

EASPD is the European Association of Service providers for Persons with Disabilities. We are a European not-for-profit organisation representing over 17,000 social services and disability organisations across Europe. The main objective of EASPD is to promote equal opportunities for people with disabilities through effective and high-quality service systems.



This publication has been produced with the financial support of the European Union Programme for Employment and Social Innovation “EaSI” (2014-2020). The information contained in this publication does not necessarily reflect the official position of the European Commission.

Copyright © EASPD 2020 All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system without the prior permission of the copyright owners.
