

# Griffin-Hammis Associates 2024 Iowa Blueprint for Change Implementation Insights

*Submitted to:*  
Brandy McOmber  
Project Director  
March 8, 2024

This evaluation was conducted under the auspices of a contract between Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation Services and the University of Iowa Center for Evaluation and Assessment. The contents of this report were developed under grant H421D220018 from the Department of Education. However, those contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Education, and grantees should not assume endorsement by the Federal Government. (Authority: 20 U.S.C. 1221e-3 and 3474).

# IOWA

## University of Iowa Center for Evaluation and Assessment

210 Lindquist Center  
Iowa City, Iowa 52242  
[coe-cea@uiowa.edu](mailto:coe-cea@uiowa.edu)  
[www.education.uiowa.edu/cea](http://www.education.uiowa.edu/cea)

Kayla Jackson, *Research Specialist*  
Cecilia Botwe, *Graduate Assistant*  
Elias Ejeh, *Graduate Assistant*  
Liz Hollingworth Ph.D., *CEA Director*

Copyright: Center for Evaluation and Assessment, March 2024

**IOWA**

College of Education  
Center for Evaluation and Assessment

**Table of Contents**

Acronyms Used in this Report..... 3

Executive Summary ..... 4

    Program Purpose ..... 4

    Background ..... 4

    Findings..... 4

Overview..... 5

Methods..... 5

Findings..... 6

    Resources and Support ..... 6

    Impact..... 7

    Challenges ..... 7

    Communication and Collaboration ..... 8

Discussion..... 9

    1. Collaboration for Collective Impact ..... 9

    2. Fidelity ..... 9

    3. Effective Services ..... 10

References..... 11

Appendix..... 12

    2024 GHA Survey..... 12

<b>Acronyms Used in this Report</b>	
<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Definition</b>
CE	Customized Employment
CRP	Community Rehabilitation Programs
DIF	Disability Innovation Fund
DSP	Direct Support
GHA	Griffin-Hammis Associates
IBC	Iowa Blueprint for Change
IVRS	Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation Services
PA	Pre-Apprenticeship
RA	Registered Apprenticeship
SWE	Subminimum Wage Employment
SWTCIE	Subminimum Wage to Competitive Integrated Employment
VR	Vocational Rehabilitation

## Executive Summary

### Program Purpose

The Disability Innovation Fund (DIF) grant from the United States Department of Education supports IVRS in enhancing the Subminimum Wage to Competitive Integrated Employment (SWTCIE) program through the Iowa Blueprint for Change (IBC) project. IBC, in collaboration with Griffin-Hammis Associates (GHA), incorporates Customized Employment (CE) training, a revamped Individualized Placement and Support (IPS) reimbursement system, and a sustainability model supported by Registered Apprenticeship (RA) and Pre-Apprenticeship (PA) programs. These components aim to achieve collective impact through structured collaboration involving a contract group, steering committee, backbone support group, and stakeholder workgroups. The six main objectives focus on engaging stakeholders, utilizing RA and PA programs as models, supporting CIE for youth, increasing CIE attainment for Iowans with disabilities, fostering expectations and demand for CIE, and establishing CIE supports as the preferred outcome for people with disabilities.

### Background

The University of Iowa Center for Evaluation and Assessment (CEA) leads the formative local evaluation of the IBC project, collaborating with IVRS on annual surveys for progress monitoring. GHA trainers, integral to the project, provide crucial IBC CE fidelity training and mentoring. To ensure project sustainability, trainers received the 2024 IBC Implementation Survey in February, with this report outlining updates on role clarity, project impact assessments, perceptions of the Collective, ongoing challenges, and required support since the project's launch.

### Findings

Regardless of their project tenure, all GHA Trainers understand their roles in the IBC project and find project expectations to be completely or mostly manageable. To date, trainers observe that CE IBC fidelity standards and corresponding training and mentoring have had a positive impact on the supported employment services that employment specialists provide. Likewise, trainers reported that most employment specialists grasp IBC CE implementation to fidelity standards, with most meeting most fidelity standards while falling below expectations on others. Team coordination can be improved with clearer communication, patience, and understanding, effectively supporting GHA IBC efforts. Additional suggestions include more counselor training, regular meetings, and applying a greater focus on the alignment of CE funding, training, and fidelity monitoring with Health and Human Services. Finally, all trainers have been involved in the Collective to some extent and understand the purpose of the Collective generally. However, trainers are less sure about the purpose of the Apprenticeships and Education/Transition workgroups and feel the Collective could more effectively engage key agencies. Engagement in the Collective and workgroups can be further supported by posting scheduled workgroup meetings to the IVRS website alongside Collective meetings. Regularly notifying key stakeholders about these postings can help them feel more informed. Collectively, these findings can inform program decisions to guide program implementation and inform the development of a playbook for replication in the final years of DIF funding.

## GHA 2024 IBC Implementation Insights

### Overview

IBC utilizes a guided approach in partnership with GHA for customized employment (CE) training. GHA, an international company specializing in employment services, developed and refined a CE proficiency scale and three CE fidelity scales to accompany their ACRE-approved basic employment training for providing effective CE opportunities. Paired with these scales, GHA provides mentoring throughout the training process guided by formative feedback on training progression, as measured by the fidelity and proficiency scales.

There are three questions guiding the local evaluation of the IBC project: 1) How are the multiple agencies working together to have a collective impact? 2) Are the providers implementing the program with fidelity? 3) What services are effective for SWTCIE program participants to transition from subminimum wage employment (SWE) to competitive integrated employment (CIE)? The 2024 IBC Implementation Survey for GHA (see Appendix) was developed around these questions and assesses four early aspects of project implementation, including role clarity changes, assessments of project impact, perceptions of the Collective, ongoing challenges, and needed support.

### Methods

A utilization-focused approach emphasizes conducting an evaluation that produces the most useful information to guide program decisions (Patton, 2008). This formative approach is applied to the IBC evaluation. The initial development of pre-implementation stakeholder surveys was designed to illicit barriers, facilitators, and implementation anticipations for project implementation. The design and administration of annual surveys thereafter will build upon pre-implementation data to foster progress monitoring toward project outcomes and barrier resolutions. Similarly, these surveys facilitate the identification of emergent challenges throughout the project for timely responses from the implementation team, fostering objective attainment and potential for collective impact (Preskill et al., 2014). A preliminary document analysis and meetings with the IBC program director, GHA executive director, counselor specialists, and IVRS resource manager revealed key roles and expectations for program success on behalf of GHA that helped inform survey item development.

The GHA annual survey for IVRS underwent a collaborative review process initiated by the CEA. The draft, prepared on 1/8/2024, received feedback from three IVRS stakeholders (project director, counselor specialist, and resource manager) via email on 1/10/2024 and 1/11/2024. After integrating this feedback, the revised survey draft was submitted to the GHA executive director for further review on 1/11/2024. A Zoom meeting between the lead local evaluator and the executive director on 1/16/2024 facilitated discussions on survey revisions. These revisions were deliberated during the local evaluator meeting on 1/29/2024, leading to seven survey modifications. The final iteration, incorporating these changes, was completed on 1/29/2024. On 2/1/2024, the GHA executive director verified the accuracy of all GHA trainer contacts, and the survey links were administered on 2/2/2024. A maximum of three survey reminders was sent to each survey recipient, and the survey was closed on 2/16/2024.

Completed analyses included exploratory thematic coding of open-ended survey questions and crosstabulation and descriptive frequencies for closed-ended questions. This report details these findings.

### Findings

Four GHA staff members received the survey; however, one reported an inactive role in the IBC project and declined participation. Two of the three involved trainers have been engaged in the project since its inception and contributed responses to the initial pre-implementation survey. Their baseline feedback was used in the development of their personalized survey links to understand the evolution of their role clarity in the project. One trainer is newly involved in the project; their personalized link included the same clarity questions that were administered in the Y1 pre-implementation survey. The findings in this report are based on the experiences of three trainers. Due to the small sample size and to protect anonymity, responses to open-ended items are summarized, and exhaustive quoted responses are excluded.

### Resources and Support

No trainers indicated a need for further clarity around their roles in the IBC project, and all trainers indicated that the expectations surrounding these roles are mostly (1/3) or completely (2/3) manageable. All trainers identified communication and/or commitment as the most impactful factor for providing effective CE services. Respondents emphasized the positive impact of the entire CRP team's support, not just in 1:1 meetings with Employment Specialists. They value working with organizations committed to best practices and stress the significance of consistent communication. Valued strategies in this collaborative work include regularly scheduled virtual and in-person mentoring sessions with employment specialists, managers, team leads, and IVRS. Trainers emphasized the importance of sharing insights with broader teams, a process enhanced by various resources, including tools for tracking progress in Discovery, fidelity scoring sheets, and keeping organized notes or lists.

*"Everything is better when the support of the entire CRP team is present and made known outside of 1:1 meetings with employment specialists."*

Recognizing the value and impact of communication, trainers would feel more supported in the IBC project with increased training, meetings, and updates between the teams involved in the IBC work. These efforts can best support GHA project goals by including project updates and fostering discussions on potential improvements while minimizing overly critical conversations focused on performance errors. Meeting topics can include updates about what is happening across the IBC project, especially with regard to CE, GHA mentoring, and systems change efforts. Efforts during these meetings can also focus on collaborative efforts to align CE funding, training, credentialing, and fidelity monitoring with Health and Human Services. Increasing and modifying collaboration in these ways can foster greater feelings of partnership between GHA and IVRS and can reduce miscommunication between key project roles, including CRPs, employment specialists, and GHA trainers.

*"We want to walk side by side with IVRS in order to provide the best quality work, and being involved with updates and communications about new information is vital to doing great work."*

### **Impact**

All trainers recognized a positive effect of IBC CE efforts on employment specialists' supported employment services. Specifically, all trainers reported that as a result of GHA's CE fidelity standards and GHA CE mentoring, employment specialists' supported employment services have "improved a lot". When asked about the quality of observed performance, all trainers observed that most employment specialists are meeting most fidelity standards, while falling below expectations on others.

### **Challenges**

Minor challenges were consistently reported by all trainers for IBC mentoring and data management processes. When asked about challenges experienced in the IBC CE mentoring process, trainers reported examples pertaining to employment specialists, including workloads, hiring processes, turnover rates, and learning curves. In working with employment specialists, collaboration with employment specialists who balance a workload outside of their IBC CE commitment can be challenging. Recognizing this challenge, trainers questioned whether a selection process should be established to guide CRPs in identifying employment specialists who would be dedicated IBC CE team members. As part of the selection and onboarding process, employment specialists should be fully aware of the IBC CE commitment, including the CE mentoring process, what IBC CE fully entails, and how this will impact their workload. This process can be particularly beneficial because the current employment specialist turnover rate for some teams creates challenges in providing effective mentoring and efficient service delivery. Finally, IBC CE has been difficult for some employment specialists who have prior customized discovery experience to grasp. Trainers reported that the different approach from what these employment specialists are used to and the higher standards of practice to meet fidelity standards have been particularly challenging for these individuals.

*"In my experience as a CE mentor, I've found it hard to encourage and support employment specialists in providing timely CE services due to their workloads they are balancing on top of CE."*

Detailing challenges pertaining to IBC data tracking, trainers reported inconsistent communication about DIF tracking expectations. Trainers communicated that CRP teams could benefit from monthly updates or paperwork walk-throughs to facilitate accurate and effective data collection efforts. Selection criteria for assigning a staff member to this role should include patience, kindness, and comprehensive knowledge of the CE process.

*“In my involvement with the IBC project, I feel like the referral process is so individualized between each VRC.”*

Trainers consistently reported barriers to receiving referrals, although the severity of this challenge varied. Some providers have struggled to receive referrals from IVRS, which creates a major implementation challenge. Referral receipt may be explained by inconsistencies in the referral processes that are followed by individual vocational rehabilitation counselors; throughout the mentoring process, there has been a disconnect about how and whom to refer to CE based on these individualized referral processes. Additionally, some referral inconsistencies may reflect hesitations grounded in limited IBC experience. Additional one-on-one guidance is suggested to improve the referral process. Support should include talking through live caseloads as an exercise for identifying which individuals in those caseloads would be appropriate CE referrals. While this support process may be particularly beneficial for some counselors, early, individualized check-ins with counselors could more directly remedy this challenge by empowering the identification of unique, region-specific challenges or needed supports.

### **Communication and Collaboration**

The IBC project relies on communication and collaboration between key agencies and stakeholders to support collective impact. Communication and collaboration are facilitated by regularly scheduled meetings, correspondences, or visits with relevant project roles as well as the maintenance of the Collective. The Collective consists of the Contract Group, Steering Committee, Backbone, and four workgroups: Apprenticeships, 14C, IPS, CE, and Community of Practice, Education/Transition, and Employment First/Technology First. Each of these entities strive to involve key players to guide, influence, and implement systems change work, including agencies serving people living with disabilities, persons with lived experience, and other project partners.

As part of the IBC project, GHA trainers maintain regular communication with CRPs, Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) counselors, and employment specialists. Reported frequencies for regular correspondences between these project stakeholders were most consistent for employment specialists; trainers reported that they meet with trainers either daily (1/3) or 2–3 times per week (2/3). Schedules varied greatly for CRPs and VR counselors, indicating possible inconsistencies in service delivery based on individual trainers’ or stakeholders’ needs. Correspondences varied between 2–3 times per week, monthly, and quarterly for CRPs and VR counselors.

All GHA trainers are involved in the Collective, although two had more experience attending meetings and indicated a greater understanding of the purpose of the collective. At the time of survey administration, 2/3 trainers attended all four Collective meetings, and one had attended one meeting, although they could not stay for the breakout room sessions. The two trainers who were able to stay for the entire meeting reported most commonly attending the 14C, IPS, CE & Community of Practice workgroup. No pattern emerged between reported workgroup attendance and understanding of each workgroup, which could indicate a reliance on post-breakout room summaries concluding Collective meetings for understanding. The least understood workgroups (as indicated by 2/3 “slightly understand” response selections) were Apprenticeships and Education/Transition, while the most understood workgroups (as indicated by 2/3 “mostly



understand” response selections) were the 14C, IPS, CE, & Community of Practice group and the Employment First/Technology First group.

Regardless of meeting attendance, trainers had low ratings for the Collective’s effectiveness in engaging key agencies that play a role in employment services (for example, Medicaid, CRPs, the DOE, and other state-level agencies, regions, and businesses); 2/3 rated slightly effective and 1/3 rated somewhat effective. When asked whether any agencies are not engaged with the Collective that should be, however, all trainers responded, “Not sure”.

One challenge observed from an inability to attend a Collective meeting is the acquisition of an invitation to future consecutive meetings—for example, workgroup meetings. Because workgroup meetings are scheduled outside of Collective meetings based on workgroup attendance during the Collective meetings, individuals who are interested in participating but could not attend the workgroup meetings during the Collective may be excluded, as was experienced by one of the GHA trainers. To remedy this barrier, workgroup meetings outside of the Collective can be advertised alongside Collective meetings on the IVRS website with frequent announcements to key stakeholders about where upcoming meetings are posted.

## Discussion

There are three evaluation questions guiding the IBC local evaluation: 1) How are the multiple agencies working together to have a collective impact? 2) Are the providers implementing the program with fidelity? 3) What services are effective for SWTCIE program participants to transition from SWE to CIE? The 2024 GHA trainer survey provided data to assess behaviors that can facilitate progress toward these objectives and emergent barriers over the life of the grant. Reflecting on progress since the pre-implementation survey that was administered in February 2023, trainers provided insights about their current collaboration with key stakeholders, their assessment of the effectiveness of the Collective for engaging key agencies in the IBC project, their assessment of the impact of the fidelity scale and CE monitoring on supported employment services, and the barriers and supports that can support the effectiveness of IBC CE services. These findings provide data for formative project decisions over the life of the grant and provide annual data to inform the development of a Playbook that guides project replication at the end of the DIF grant.

### 1. Collaboration for Collective Impact

Trainers reported positive collaboration with key stakeholders involved in the Iowa Blueprint for Change (IBC) project. No trainers indicated a need for further clarity around their roles, and all trainers found the expectations manageable. Despite the challenges reported, trainers highlighted the positive impact of the entire CRP team's support, emphasizing consistent communication and commitment as crucial factors for effective Customized Employment (CE) services. The trainers expressed the value of working with organizations committed to best practices and the significance of regular mentoring sessions. Efforts to enhance collaboration include sharing insights with broader teams, utilizing various resources, and fostering discussions on potential improvements.

### 2. Fidelity

Trainers unanimously recognized positive impacts of IBC CE efforts on employment specialists' supported employment services. The implementation of GHA’s CE fidelity standards and mentoring led to improvements across the board, with all trainers reporting that employment

specialists' services have "improved a lot." While most employment specialists met fidelity standards, there were observations of variations, emphasizing the need for ongoing monitoring. Challenges related to IBC mentoring and data management processes were consistently reported, highlighting the importance of refining systems to maintain fidelity.

### **3. Effective Services**

Trainers provided insights into barriers and supports influencing the effectiveness of IBC CE services. Challenges included working around employment specialists' workloads and employment specialist turnover rates and learning curves. Communication and collaboration emerged as key factors, with trainers emphasizing the need for increased training, meetings, and updates to enhance support. The importance of aligning CE funding, training, credentialing, and fidelity monitoring with Health and Human Services was highlighted. The findings underscore the importance of addressing challenges and maximizing supports to ensure the continued effectiveness of IBC CE services.

## References

Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization-Focused Evaluation* (4th ). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Preskill, H., Parkhurst, M., & Juster, J. S. (2014). *Guide to Evaluating Collective Impact*. Collective Impact Forum.

**Appendix**  
**2024 GHA Survey**

In October 2022, Iowa Vocational Rehabilitation Services (IVRS) was awarded the Disability Innovation Fund (DIF) grant for the Iowa Blueprint for Change (IBC) project to increase competitive integrated employment (CIE).

If you were part of the IBC project early last year, you completed a Pre-Implementation survey to identify early barriers, facilitators, and anticipations. This survey is a continuation of last year's survey; it is intended to track progress towards resolving key challenges and to assess emergent needs as project implementation continues. You do not need to have taken last year's survey to take this one, however.

Your feedback will help IVRS make informed project decisions to sustain effective implementation approaches and make improvements where needed, but your name will not be tied to your responses.

All acronyms in this survey are clickable. Clicking on acronyms will spell the acronym out for you.

*Display This Question:*  
 If 'ReturnRecipient' = 0

1. How clear is your role in the IBC project as part of the GHA team?
  - Completely clear
  - Mostly clear
  - Somewhat clear
  - Minimally clear
  - Not clear at all

*Display This Question:*  
 If 'ReturnRecipient' = 0  
 And 'How clear is your role in the IBC project as part of the GHA team?' = Completely clear

2. What about your role in the IBC project needs more clarity?

---



---



---



---



---

*Display This Question If*  
*'ReturnRecipient' = 1*

3. Last year, you indicated {[explanation from 2023 survey about what needs more clarity](#)}.

Since last year, how, if at all, has your clarity about your role in the [IBC](#) project changed?

---

---

---

---

---

4. During project year 1, did you experience any challenges with the **referral process** for the IBC project?

- Major challenges
- Minor challenges
- No challenges

*Display This Question:*  
*If 'During project year 1, did you experience any challenges with the referral process for the IBC project...' = Major challenges*  
*Or 'During project year 1, did you experience any challenges with the referral process for the IBC project...' = Minor challenges*

5. During project year 1, what challenges did you experience with the referral process for the [IBC](#) project?

---

---

---

---

---

6. During project year 1, did you experience any challenges with the [GHA CE fidelity mentoring process](#) under the [IBC](#) project?

- Major challenges
- Minor challenges

*No challenges Display This Question:*

*If 'During project year 1, did you experience any challenges with the GHA CE fidelity mentoring process...?'= No challenges*

7. What challenges did you experience with the GHA CE fidelity mentoring process under the IBC project?

---



---



---



---



---

8. During project year 1, did you experience any challenges with **data tracking or reporting** as part of the [IBC](#) project?

- Major challenges  
 Minor challenges  
 No challenges

*Display This Question:*

*If 'During project year 1, did you experience any challenges with data tracking or reporting as part...?'= No challenges*

9. What challenges did you experience with data tracking or reporting as part of the [IBC](#) project?

---



---



---



---



---

10. Based on your experiences providing [CE](#) training as part of the [IBC](#) project so far, what effect has [GHA's CE fidelity standards](#) had on supported employment services provided by employment specialists?

Employment services...

- Improved a lot  
 Improved a little  
 Stayed the same  
 Regressed a little  
 Regressed a lot  
 Too soon to tell

11. Based on your experiences providing [CE](#) training as part of the [IBC](#) project so far, what effect has [GHA](#)'s **CE training/mentoring** had on supported employment services provided by employment specialists?

Employment services...

- Improved a lot
- Improved a little
- Stayed the same
- Regressed a little
- Regressed a lot
- Too soon to tell

12. At this point in [IBC](#) implementation, how manageable would you say your IBC job expectations are?

- Completely manageable; just right
- Mostly manageable
- Somewhat manageable
- Barely manageable
- Not manageable at all; too many expectations
- Not sure

13. How, if at all, can IVRS better support GHA 's role in the [IBC](#) project?

---

---

---

---

---

14. Are there any other [IBC](#) stakeholders from whom [GHA](#) could use additional project support?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

*Display This Question:*  
*If 'Are there any other IBC stakeholders from whom GHA could use additional project support?' = Yes*

15. From which stakeholder(s) could [GHA](#) receive additional project support?

---

---

---

---

---

*Display This Question:*  
*If 'Are there any other IBC stakeholders from whom GHA could use additional project support?' = Yes*

16. How can the stakeholder(s) you specified above further support [GHA's](#) role in the [IBC](#) project?

---

---

---

---

---

17. So far, to what extent are most employment specialists providing [CE](#) under the [IBC](#) project to fidelity?

Most employment specialists are...

- exceeding all fidelity standards
- exceeding most fidelity standards while meeting others
- meeting most fidelity standards, while exceeding others
- meeting all fidelity standards
- meeting most fidelity standards, while falling below expectations on others
- performing below expectations on many fidelity standards
- It's too soon to tell



18. Reflecting on project year 1, what has helped you the most to be able to provide effective [CE](#) fidelity training or mentoring as part of the [IBC](#) project?

---

---

---

---

---

19. During project year 1, how often did you communicate with each of the following [IBC](#) project roles, either in person, remotely, or via email?

20. Community Rehabilitation Program (CRP) leadership

- Daily
- 2–3 times per week
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Quarterly
- Semiannually
- Annually
- No regular correspondence

21. [IVRS](#) counselors

- Daily
- 2–3 times per week
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Quarterly
- Semiannually
- Annually
- No regular correspondence

22. Employment Specialists

- Daily
- 2–3 times per week
- Weekly
- Monthly
- Quarterly

- Semiannually
- Annually
- No regular correspondence

23. The Collective is a large group made up of four [IBC](#) workgroups that meets remotely on Zoom every other month. Meeting invites are sent by Judy Warth. So far, there have been four meetings held.

About how many Collective meetings, if any, have you attended?

- None
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4

*Display This Question:*

*If 'The Collective is a large group made up of four IBC workgroups that meets remotely on Zoom every...?' = 4*

24. Which of the following reasons, if any, have prevented you from attending a Collective meeting? Select all that apply.

- Not sure what the Collective is/does
- Not enough time
- The meeting times don't work with my schedule
- Did not receive a meeting invite
- Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

25. How would you rate your understanding of the purpose of the Collective?

- Completely understand
- Mostly understand
- Slightly understand
- Do not understand

*Display This Question:*

*If The Collective is a large group made up of four IBC workgroups that meets remotely on Zoom every... = 1*

*Or The Collective is a large group made up of four IBC workgroups that meets remotely on Zoom every... = 2*

*Or The Collective is a large group made up of four IBC workgroups that meets remotely on Zoom every... = 3*

*Or The Collective is a large group made up of four IBC workgroups that meets remotely on Zoom every... = 4*

26. Which workgroup(s) have you joined during the workgroup breakout rooms?

- Apprenticeships
- 14C, IPS, CE, & Community of Practice
- Education/ Transition
- Employment First/Technology First
- None
- Not sure

27. About how many workgroup meetings, if any, have you attended outside of the Collective meetings?

- None—I don't know what workgroups are
- None—I know what the workgroups are, but I haven't attended any meetings
- 1–2
- 3–4
- More than 4

*Skip To: Q36 If 'About how many workgroup meetings, if any, have you attended outside of the Collective meetings?' = None—I don't know what workgroups are*

*Display This Question:*

*If 'About how many workgroup meetings, if any, have you attended outside of the Collective meetings?' = 1–2  
Or 'About how many workgroup meetings, if any, have you attended outside of the Collective meetings?' = 3–4  
Or 'About how many workgroup meetings, if any, have you attended outside of the Collective meetings?' = More than 4*

28. For which workgroup have you attended meetings outside of the Collective? Select all that apply.

- Apprenticeships
- 14C, IPS, CE, & Community of Practice
- Education/ Transition
- Employment First/Technology First

29. How would you rate your understanding of the purpose of each of the following workgroups?

#### Apprenticeships

- Completely understand
- Mostly understand
- Slightly understand
- Do not understand

#### 14C, IPS, CE, & Community of Practice

- Completely understand
- Mostly understand
- Slightly understand
- Do not understand

#### Education/Transition

- Completely understand
- Mostly understand
- Slightly understand
- Do not understand

#### Employment First/Technology First

- Completely understand

- Mostly understand
- Slightly understand
- Do not understand

*Display This Question:*  
 If 'The Collective is a large group made up of four IBC workgroups that meets remotely on Zoom every...?'= None

30. Examples of key agencies that play a role in employment services include Medicaid, CRPs, the DOE, and other state level agencies, regions, and businesses.

How effective would you say the Collective has been for facilitating collaboration across key agencies

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Slightly effective
- Not effective
- Not sure

31. Are there any agencies that are not engaged with the Collective that should be?

- Yes, there are additional agencies that should be engaged in the Collective
- No, the Collective is engaging all key agencies
- Not sure

*Display This Question:*  
 If 'Are there any agencies that are not engaged with the Collective that should be?' = Yes, there are additional agencies that should be engaged in the Collective

32. With what other agencies can engagement with the Collective be improved?

---



---



---



---



---

*Display This Question:*

*If 'The Collective is a large group made up of four IBC workgroups that meet remotely on Zoom every...' = 1*  
*Or 'The Collective is a large group made up of four IBC workgroups that meet remotely on Zoom every...' = 2*  
*Or 'The Collective is a large group made up of four IBC workgroups that meet remotely on Zoom every...' = 3*  
*Or 'The Collective is a large group made up of four IBC workgroups that meet remotely on Zoom every...' = 4*

33. What recommendations, if any, do you have for improving the Collective?

---

---

---

---

---

