

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 343 346

EC 301 030

AUTHOR Goldbach, Robert L.  
 TITLE Five Years of Follow-Up of Mentally Retarded School Completers.  
 INSTITUTION Community Research Associates, Pittsburgh, PA.; Health and Welfare PLANNING Association, Pittsburgh, PA.  
 SPONS AGENCY Edit: L. Trees Charitable Trust.  
 PUB DATE Nov 91  
 NOTE 121p.; For a previous report, see ED 334 748.  
 PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.  
 DESCRIPTORS \*Education Work Relationship; Employment; Followup Studies; Graduate Surveys; High School Graduates; High Schools; Housing; \*Job Placement; \*Mental Retardation; Multiple Disabilities; \*Outcomes of Education; Parent Role; Place of Residence; Postsecondary Education; Quality of Life; Special Education; Transitional Programs; Unemployment; \*Vocational Adjustment

ABSTRACT

This report documents the fifth year of follow-up of mentally retarded school completers in the Pittsburgh (Pennsylvania) area, begun with parents/ guardians of students who completed their special education programs in 1985-86 (N=73) and in 1986-87 (N=60), 1990 (N=102), and in 1991 continued with completers (N=95), when a preliminary follow-up study was done. Findings for the first two groups are reported in terms of living arrangements, work situations, competitive employment, physical and emotional disabilities, expectations and outcomes (a retrospective), and the hard core idle. The 1990 cohort is discussed in terms of living arrangements, work situations, competitive employment, training and placement, transition planning and outcomes, and comparison of work and living arrangements of three cohorts 1 year after completion. Initial follow-up data for the 1991 school completers are presented for living arrangements, work situations, job placements, post-school training placements, transition planning, and comparison with the 1990 cohort. Conclusions on the oldest group include more movement into a variety of competitive and sheltered work situations, entrenched patterns of idleness by 14 percent of the group, and no progress for those with multiple disabilities. Conclusions for the 1990 cohort include substantial similarities with experiences of the older group at the same stage. Findings for the 1991 cohort included a higher proportion with no work placement. (DB)

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
 \* from the original document. \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it  
 Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

\* Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

ED343346

**FIVE YEARS OF FOLLOW-UP OF  
MENTALLY RETARDED SCHOOL COMPLETERS**

by

Robert L. Goldbach

COMMUNITY RESEARCH ASSOCIATES

consultants to

HEALTH AND WELFARE PLANNING ASSOCIATION  
200 Ross Street  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

November, 1991

**BEST COPY AVAILABLE**

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert L.  
Goldbach

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

EC 301030

**This research was funded by a grant from the Edith L. Trees Charitable Trust. The views in this paper are not necessarily the views of the trust.**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### INTRODUCTION

### FIVE YEARS OF FOLLOW-UP OF MENTALLY RETARDED SCHOOL COMPLETERS

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	1
IMPLICATIONS FOR TRANSITION . . . . .	3
STUDY SECTION: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS . . . . .	5
STUDY SECTION: FIVE YEARS OF FOLLOW-UP OF MENTALLY RETARDED SCHOOL COMPLETERS. . . . .	7
Living Arrangements. . . . .	.14
Work Situations. . . . .	.19
Competitive Employment . . . . .	.28
Physical and Emotional Disabilities. . . . .	.30
Expectations and Outcomes: A Five-Year Retrospective . . . . .	.34
Hard-Core Idle . . . . .	.38

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

**FOLLOW-UP OF 1990 COHORT ONE YEARS AFTER COMPLETION**

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
STUDY SECTION: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS . . . . .	.40
STUDY SECTION: FOLLOW-UP 1990 COHORT ONE YEAR AFTER COMPLETION. . . . .	.44
Living Arrangements. . . . .	.47
Work Situations. . . . .	.50
Competitive Employment . . . . .	.53
Training and Placement . . . . .	.55
Transition Planning and Outcomes . . . . .	.57
Comparison of Work and Living Arrangements of Three Cohorts One Year after Completion. . . . .	.60

**FOLLOW-UP OF MENTALLY RETARDED YOUTH:  
1991 SCHOOL COMPLETERS**

<u>Topic</u>	<u>Page</u>
STUDY SECTION: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS . . . . .	.65
STUDY SECTION: FOLLOW-UP OF MENTALLY RETARDED YOUTH: 1991 SCHOOL COMPLETERS . . . . .	.62
Living Arrangements. . . . .	.75
Work Situations. . . . .	.76
Job Placements . . . . .	.78
Post-school Training Placements . . . . .	.79
Transition Planning. . . . .	.80
Comparison of Two Cohorts. . . . .	.84

**APPENDIX: KEY TO REPORT ABBREVIATIONS**

**LIST OF TABLES** \*

**FIVE YEARS OF FOLLOW-UP OF  
MENTALLY RETARDED SCHOOL COMPLETERS**

<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Response Summary - Survey of the 1986 and 1987 Cohorts . . . . .	9
Comparison of Respondents and Non-Respondents. . . . .	10
The Study Sample for the Continued Follow-up . . . . .	12
SPMR Living Arrangements . . . . .	14
Living Arrangements of Non-SPMRs . . . . .	14
Marital Status of Those Living Independently . . . . .	15
Number of Children by Marital Status of Those Living Independently. . . . .	15
TMR Living Arrangements. . . . .	16
Comparison of TMR Living Arrangements, 1990 and 1991 . . . . .	16
Living Arrangements of EMRs. . . . .	17
Comparison of Living Arrangements of EMRs, 1990 and 1991 . . . . .	18
1991 Work Activity of Non-SPMR Completers, 1986 and 1987 Cohorts . . . . .	20
1991 Work Situation of TMRs, 1986 and 1987 Cohorts . . . . .	21
Comparison of TMR Work Situations, 1990 and 1991 . . . . .	22
Summary of Changes in TMR Work Situations. . . . .	23
1991 Work Situations of Center and Mainstream EMRs . . . . .	23
Comparison of Work Situations of EMRs, 1990 and 1991 . . . . .	25
Net Changes in Work Situations, 1986 and 1987 EMRs . . . . .	26

**LIST OF TABLES**  
(continued)

<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Net Changes in Living Arrangements, 1986 and 1987 Non-SPMR Sample . . . . .	.26
Net Changes in Work Situations, 1986 and 1987 Non-SPMR Sample . . . . .	.27
Exceptionality of Workers in 1991. . . . .	.28
Types of Jobs Held by Those with Competitive Employment. . .	.29
Secondary Exceptionalities of EMRs and TMRs. . . . .	.30
Secondary Exceptionalities of PHs and SED/LAPs . . . . .	.31
Living Arrangement of TMRs by Presence of Additional Disability . . . . .	.31
Work Situation of TMRs by Presence of Additional Disability . . . . .	.32
Living Arrangement of EMRs by Presence of Additional Disability . . . . .	.32
Work Situation of EMRs by Presence of Additional Disability . . . . .	.33
Employment Status of EMRs by Presence of Additional Disability . . . . .	.33
Comparison of Non-SPMR Living Arrangements and Parent Preferences, 1986 and 1987 Cohorts . . . . .	.34
Comparison of Living Arrangements and Youngster Preferences . . . . .	.35
Comparison of Non-SPMR Work Situations Parent Preferences, 1986 and 1987 Cohorts . . . . .	.36
Comparison of Non-SPMR Work Situations and Youngster Preferences, 1986 and 1987 Cohorts. . . . .	.37
Obstacles/Disincentives to Work Placement Cited by Parents. . . . .	.39

**LIST OF TABLES**

**FOLLOW-UP OF 1990 COHORT ONE YEAR AFTER COMPLETION**

<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
Response Summary for 1990 Cohort . . . . .	.44
Comparison of Respondents and Non-Respondents. . . . .	.45
Non-SPMR Living Arrangements . . . . .	.47
Comparison of 1990 and 1991 Non-SPMR Living Arrangements. . . . .	.48
Summary of Changes in Living Arrangements, Non-SPMR Sample . . . . .	.49
Non-SPMR Work Situations . . . . .	.50
Comparison of 1990 and 1991 Non-SPMR Work Situations. . . . .	.51
Summary of Changes in Work Situations, Non-SPMR Sample . . . . .	.52
Exceptionality of those with Competitive Employment . . . . .	.53
Types of Jobs Held by Those with Competitive Employment. . . . .	.54
Training Experience of 1990 Completers, by Exceptionality. . . . .	.55
Training Involvement, by Subject and Provider Agency . . . . .	.56
Non-SPMR Work Situations by Involvement of Parent/Guardian in Transition Planning. . . . .	.57
Non-SPMRs with No Work Placement, Parent Involved in Planning . . . . .	.58
Sources of Placement Information and Referral for Youngsters whose Parents/Guardians Were Not Involved in Transition Planning . . . . .	.59
1986, 1987 and 1990 Center Completers, by Primary Exceptionality . . . . .	.60
First-Year Living Arrangements of TMRs, 1986, 1987 and 1990 . . . . .	.61
First-Year Living Arrangements of Center EMRs, 1986, 1987 and 1990 . . . . .	.62
First-Year Work Situations of TMRs, 1986, 1987 and 1990 Cohorts . . . . .	.63
First-Year Work Situations of EMRs, 1986, 1987 and 1990 Cohorts . . . . .	.64
First-Year Work Situations of Mainstream EMRs, 1987 and 1990 . . . . .	.64



## LIST OF TABLES

### **FOLLOW-UP OF MENTALLY RETARDED YOUTH: 1991 SCHOOL COMPLETERS**

<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
Response Summary - Survey of the 1991 Cohort . . . . .	.70
Comparison of Respondents and Non-Respondents. . . . .	.71
Characteristics of the 1991 Sample . . . . .	.73
Non-SPMR Living Arrangements, 1991 Cohort . . . . .	.75
Non-SPMR Work Situations by Primary Exceptionality . . . . .	.77
Exceptionality of Workers in 1991. . . . .	.78
Types of Summer and Permanent Jobs . . . . .	.79
Parent/Guardian Involvement in Transition Planning . . . . .	.81
Placement by Parental Involvement in Transition Planning . . . . .	.82
Post-School Placement, by Family Income. . . . .	.83
Parental Involvement in Transition Planning, 1990 and 1991 Non-SPMRs . . . . .	.84
Non-SPMR Post-School Placements 1990 and 1991 Non-SPMRs . . . . .	.85
Percent with Post-School Placement, by Exceptionality - 1990 and 1991 Non-SPMRs. . . . .	.86

# FIVE YEARS OF FOLLOW-UP OF MENTALLY RETARDED SCHOOL COMPLETERS

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report marks the fifth consecutive year of follow-up of mentally retarded (MR) school completers begun in 1987 by HWP/CRA and underwritten each year by the Edith L. Trees Charitable Trust. Parents and guardians of youngsters who completed their educations in the Allegheny Intermediate Unit's (AIU) special education programs in 1985-1986, and in 1986-1987, were contacted. The 1985-86 group was followed for the fifth year; the 1986-87 group for the fourth. As in previous years, information was gathered on youngster's present living and work situations, and training program involvement over the past year. The report presents a number of conclusions and implications for this period of transition, as well as study findings, both summarized and in detail.

## CONCLUSIONS

**Progress toward self-reliance:** More movement into competitive work situations is seen in this study than in any previous year.

**Increase in the number and variety of work placements:** Fewer persons are without work this year. New work situations include jobs, placements in activities centers and sheltered workshops, and volunteer positions. Persons holding two jobs are seen for the first time. More persons hold supported work positions.

**Entrenched patterns of idleness:** There remains a minority (14%) of study subjects who have had little or no work activity since completing school. Impediments to work placements include lack of transportation, long waiting lists for non-competitive placements, and parental dissatisfaction with available placements. Marriage, cohabitation, and child-rearing responsibilities are disincentives to work involvement for some.

**Continuing obstacles for those with additional disabilities:** Barriers to competitive employment and independent living include chronic health problems, physical handicaps, and emotional and behavioral difficulties. We see no evidence of progress for persons with these conditions. Setbacks in work involvements and living arrangements are evident.

**Gaps between expectations and realities:** The preferences of parents and guardians who had lower initial expectations for their youngsters' eventual living arrangements have largely been realized. Greater disparities between expectations and outcomes exist for those with preferences for more independent living arrangements.

## IMPLICATIONS FOR TRANSITION

Study findings for different groups within the sample have implications for their transition needs. These implications are based on the recognition, supported by the findings of the longitudinal study, that a 4- to 5-year "settling in" period is typical as youngsters move from public school toward eventual work and more independent living arrangements. The range of needs, by group, during this transition period include the following:

**TMRs:** Additional WAC and sheltered workshop opportunities are needed to avoid the four-to-five year waiting periods experienced by some in our sample. Alternatively, beneficial non-work activities to fill the hiatus caused by long waiting lists are called for. Ultimately, there must be a reconsideration of what constitutes appropriate placements, working towards those that are community-, rather than facility- or agency-based.

**EMRs:** This group requires on-going, long-term transition supports for 5 - 8 years after leaving school that would encourage post-school training, monitor work placements, suggest and arrange additional ones. Also needed are effective approaches for preparing these youngsters for independent living.

**Individuals with additional handicaps:** This group would benefit from more supported employment opportunities and alternative work activities, such as volunteer placements.

**Mainstreamed youngsters:** Members of this group experience difficulties locating resources that recognize and understand their unique transition requirements. Therefore, innovative, community-based programs that would reach youngsters in their homes and prepare them for eventual independent living are needed.

**Hard-core idle:** Intensive, personalized efforts to reach and assist those who have limited or no work involvement once they finish school.

## IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The work and living arrangements of the 1987 cohort showed the greatest degree of change this year; those of the 1986 cohort remained notably stable. Continued follow-up of the 1987 cohort will:

- \* determine whether the pattern of stability in work and living arrangements portrayed by the 1986 cohort is typical 5 years after completion;

- \* consolidate a body of information on a larger sample (projected n=142) of 5-year completers in order to generate more significant correlations;
- \* provide a foundation for the comparison of the consolidated 5-year sample with subsequent cohorts.

### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

**Living Arrangements:** As we have found consistently, the majority of our sample lives with parents or guardians: 75% of the non-SPMRs remain in this arrangement, 11% live independently, 8% in a CLA or group home, and 7% in an institution. Almost all of those living independently are EMRs. There were few changes in living arrangement over the past year, although those that did occur show a movement toward more independent living.

**Work Situations:** In a marked improvement from last year, we find the total non-SPMR sample in a number of work-related situations. 36% are in competitive work, 26% are in activities centers, 13% are in sheltered workshops, 20% have no work-related activity, 1% are in training, and 3% are volunteers. 59% of EMRs are in competitive work. TMRs are most frequently found in activities centers (54%), while 15% are in sheltered workshops.

**Competitive Employment:** 91% of the competitively employed are EMRs. Food service continues to be the most important employment sector, engaging 29% of the study's workers. 19% work in health care institutions, 12% work in supermarkets.

**Physical and Emotional Disabilities:** We again explored the situation of those individuals who have a physical and/or emotional disability in addition to their mental retardation. We found that TMRs with additional disabilities are somewhat more likely to be found in institutions (30%) and CLAs and group homes (20%) than those without additional handicaps. They are somewhat less likely to live with parents or guardians (50%) than the remainder of the TMR group (82%). EMRs with additional disabilities tend to be less likely to live independently, and somewhat more likely to live in institutions than the general group of EMRs. The differences in living situation are not significant.

The work situations of the TMRs with additional disabilities do not differ significantly from those of other TMRs. However, the differences in work situation of EMRs with additional disabilities appear more marked from EMRs without compounding handicaps. Fewer are in competitive employment (25% vs. 69%) and more in activities centers (25% vs. 6%). The difference in percent competitively employed between EMRs with and without additional disabilities is statistically significant.

**Hard-Core Idle:** 14% of the non-SPMR group consists of individuals who have had little or no work activity since completing school. Obstacles to work placement include: transportation problems (25%); health problems or physical disabilities (19%); behavioral or emotional problems (19%); parent dissatisfaction with available programs (13%). For some, disincentives to work arise from living arrangements: 19% are females who have a spouse or roommate who works to support them; one is a single mother living independently with sole responsibility for her child's care.

**Expectations and Outcomes:** The longitudinal study presented an opportunity to compare the current work and living arrangements of the sample with the preferences of parents and youngsters expressed in the initial survey four and five years ago.

**Living Arrangements:** Concurrence between preferences and outcomes occurred in 94% of the cases in which parents and guardians preferred that their youngster live at home; 29% of those who preferred a group setting; and 39% of those who preferred an independent living arrangement. For youngsters, concurrence between preferences and outcomes was found for 90% of those whose choice was to live at home; 40% for those who preferred a group setting; and 33% for those who preferred to live independently.

**Work Situations:** Concurrence between preferences and outcomes occurred in 62% of the cases in which parents and guardians preferred competitive employment for their youngsters; 56% of those who preferred sheltered workshops; 64% of those who preferred activities centers, and 100% of those who preferred that their youngster not work. For youngsters, concurrence between preferences and outcomes was found for 58% of those who preferred competitive employment; 30% of those who preferred sheltered workshop placements; 42% of those who preferred activities centers; and 80% of those who preferred not to work.

**FIVE YEARS OF FOLLOW-UP OF  
OF MENTALLY RETARDED SCHOOL COMPLETERS**



## CONCLUSIONS

This, the fifth year of the follow-up project, marks a turning point for the youngsters in our study. The term "youngsters" is perhaps a misnomer, since most of the study subjects in this cohort are now between 25 and 27 years old. As they have made the transition from school to adult life, we have chronicled the progress made by some, the lack of progress experienced by others. We have documented their struggles, achievements and setbacks. In past reports, we noted that the expectations for independence and productivity of these young people -- expressed by experts and innovators in the field -- seemed far removed from the realities of our findings. This year, however, we see evidence of progress in the form of increased self-reliance, greater variety of work placements, and fewer persons who are chronically classified as having little or no work activity. At the same time, the findings reaffirm some of the seemingly intractable obstacles to independent living and work placement faced by a now smaller minority of the study subjects: compounding physical and emotional disabilities, entrenched patterns of idleness, and the lack of resources to meet the special transition needs of certain subgroups and individuals.

This section will present conclusions derived from the findings of the 1991 follow-up. Following the presentation of conclusions will be a discussion of the implications of the study results for the transition process, addressing the needs of each exceptionality group, as well as those of the "hard-core" idle.

**Progress toward self-reliance:** The results of this year's follow-up indicate more movement into competitive work situations than we have documented in any previous year. In last year's study, we showed how job gains within the non-SPMR<sup>1</sup> sample were negated by job losses, so that the net effect on the degree of competitive employment for the group as a whole was nil. The findings of the 1991 follow-up, however, show a net increase in job placements. Thus, the "revolving door" pattern that characterized the work histories of many of the completers is not so strongly in evidence this year. Moreover, a few individuals who attained jobs did so while moving out of placements that in the past have seemed to be dead ends: activities centers and sheltered workshops. Providers of vocational training and supported work programs were instrumental in this upward mobility and helped to secure more challenging placements for youngsters.

---

<sup>1</sup> A Key to Report Abbreviations is provided in the Appendix.

### Increase in the number and variety of work placements:

Fewer persons are without work placements this year. All but one of the SPMRs, an institutionalized individual, were enrolled in structured day programming. Thus, persons from the SPMR group who live at home are now all placed for the first time in the five-year study. For the non-SPMR group, the proportion of "no-work" situations was reduced from 26% of the sample last year to 20% this year -- not acceptable, but still a sign of progress.

New work situations this year include not only jobs, but also placements in activities centers, sheltered workshops, and volunteer positions. Persons holding two jobs are seen for the first time. More persons now hold supported work positions.

There is also more variety in the types of jobs held by our study subjects. Restaurants and fast food outlets still provide a large share of the jobs, as do nursing homes and hospitals. However, half of the center completers and 75% of the mainstream completers hold jobs in other milieux.

Entrenched patterns of idleness: There remains a minority (14%) of study subjects who have had little or no work activity since completing school. These individuals, the "hard-core" idle, face obstacles to successful work placement that are not easily overcome. Among the most obdurate impediments are those which reflect inadequate resources in the community, such as lack of transportation and long waiting lists for activities centers and sheltered workshops. On the other hand, some of those counted among the hard-core idle had been placed in TACs soon after school completion, but were removed from them by parents who expressed dissatisfaction with the programs. Thus, the quality -- as well as the availability and accessibility -- of placements is an important factor in successful school-to-work transition.

Even work placements which are available and accessible may not be appropriate for or preferred by some individuals. For example, within the hard-core idle group are young women who are married to, or living with, someone who works to support the household. In addition, some women have child-rearing responsibilities that take precedence over work placement at present. These cases serve as a reminder that certain individuals face other types of transitions in their lives which may conflict with, or provide a disincentive to, work placement.

Continuing obstacles for those with additional disabilities: A subgroup of the sample is comprised of persons who must contend with compounding disabilities, such as chronic health problems, physical handicaps, and emotional and behavioral difficulties. Last year's study demonstrated, and this year's study confirms, that these additional disabilities constitute formidable barriers to competitive employment and independent living. We see no evidence of progress for persons with these conditions. Indeed,



setbacks in work involvements and living arrangements are evident. Within the center EMR group, in particular, we find significant differences in outcomes between those with additional disabilities and those without. EMRs with additional disabilities are more likely to be placed in activities centers or sheltered workshops than their counterparts who do not have additional disabilities. Thus, they tend to compete with other exceptionality groups for placements that are in short supply and have long waiting lists. Most have no options presented to them except work situations lacking in opportunities to increase self-reliance or earning power.

Gaps between expectations and realities: At the point in the longitudinal study when youngsters had been out of school for one year, the parents and guardians who responded to the initial contact survey were asked to indicate what types of work and living arrangements they preferred for their youngsters 3-5 years into the future. They were also asked to indicate their youngsters' preferences for the same. The continued follow-up afforded an opportunity to review these expectations and preferences and compare them with the present realities of the youngsters' situations. For example, the vast majority of parents expressed a preference for having their youngster live at home, rather than independently or in community living arrangements (CLAs). Our study finds that these expectations for the youngsters' eventual living arrangements have largely been realized. Greater disparities between initial expectations and eventual outcomes exist for the relatively smaller group of respondents who preferred more independent living arrangements for their young people.

With regard to work placements, a less clear picture emerges from the data. Concurrences range from 22% for sheltered workshop preferences to 64% for activities centers, with competitive employment in between. Thus, parents were less able to reliably gauge the most suitable, or even the most likely, work placement for their youngster 3-5 years into the future.

### IMPLICATIONS FOR TRANSITION

The findings of this study suggest the need for an approach to transition planning that has more of a long-range emphasis than that suggested in the literature. Indeed, it appears that, at minimum, a 4- to 5-year "settling in" period may be required for youngsters to move from public school toward eventual work and more independent living arrangements, usually in that order. A question can be raised as to whether, during this transition period, more effort should be placed on determining a suitable work situation than in stressing independent living. Perhaps the emphasis on independent living would be more appropriate after the youngsters have had a chance to "find" themselves in the

spectrum of work opportunities. Indeed, the fairly active turnover of vocational placements among the EMRs and multiply-disabled that we have documented over the life of the study suggests that quests for appropriate placements for some may be occurring in an unstructured, unplanned fashion. As documented last year, more measured approaches, such as enrollment in post-school training, may bring about better outcomes by deferring immediate job placements for future placements that may be more lasting.

Training may not be appropriate for some individuals, however. Therefore, the long-range approach to transition planning must also consider alternative placements that provide a vocational experience with a suitable period of adjustment. Indeed, the increase in supported work and volunteer placements in our sample this year suggests that parents, youngsters and service providers may be looking for non-traditional vocational experiences as one promising interim solution.

Study findings for different groups within the sample have implications for their transition needs. The range of needs, by group, during this transition period include the following:

**TMRs:** Additional WAC and sheltered workshop opportunities are needed to avoid the four-to-five year waiting periods of idleness experienced by some in our sample. Alternatively, beneficial non-work activities to fill the hiatus caused by long waiting lists are called for. Ultimately, there must be a reconsideration of what constitutes appropriate placements, working towards those that are community-, rather than facility- or agency-based.

**EMRs:** This group requires on-going, long-term transition supports for 5 - 8 years after leaving school that would encourage post-school training, monitor work placements, suggest and arrange additional ones. Also needed are effective approaches for preparing these youngsters for eventual independent living.

**Individuals with additional handicaps:** This group would benefit from more supported employment opportunities and alternative work activities, such as volunteer placements.

**Mainstreamed youngsters:** Members of this group experience difficulties locating resources that recognize and understand their unique transition requirements. Therefore, innovative, community-based programs that would reach youngsters in their homes and prepare them for eventual independent living are needed.

**Hard-core idle:** Intensive, personalized efforts to reach and assist those who have limited or no work involvement once they finish school.

**STUDY SECTION:  
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

**Living Arrangements:** As we have found consistently, the majority of our sample lives with parents or guardians: 75% of the non-SPMRs remain in this arrangement, 11% live independently, 8% in a CLA or group home, and 7% in an institution. Almost all of those living independently are EMRs. There were few changes in living arrangement over the past year, although those that did occur show a movement toward more independent living.

**Work Situations:** In a marked improvement from last year, we find the total non-SPMR sample in a number of work-related situations. For this group, 36% are in competitive work, 26% are in activities centers, 13% are in sheltered workshops, 20% have no work-related activity, 1% are in training, and 3% are volunteers. 59% of EMRs are in competitive work. TMRs are most frequently found in activities centers (54%), while 15% are in sheltered workshops.

**Competitive Employment:** 91% of the competitively employed are EMRs. Food service continues to be the most important employment sector, engaging 29% of the study's workers. 19% work in health care institutions, 12% work in supermarkets.

**Physical and Emotional Disabilities:** We again explored the situation of those individuals who have a physical and/or emotional disability in addition to their mental retardation. We found that TMRs with additional disabilities are somewhat more likely to be found in institutions (30%) and CLAs and group homes (20%) than those without additional handicaps. They are somewhat less likely to live with parents or guardians (50%) than the remainder of the TMR group (82%). EMRs with additional disabilities tend to be less likely to live independently, and somewhat more likely to live in institutions than the general group of EMRs. The differences in living situation are not significant.

The work situations of the TMRs with additional disabilities do not differ significantly from those of other TMRs. However, the differences in work situation of EMRs with additional disabilities appear more marked from EMRs without compounding handicaps. Fewer are in competitive employment (25% vs. 69%) and more in activities centers (25% vs. 6%). The difference in percent competitively employed between EMRs with and without additional disabilities is statistically significant.

**Hard-Core Idle:** 14% of the non-SPMR group consists of individuals who have had little or no work activity since completing school. Obstacles to work placement include: transportation problems (25%); health problems or physical disabilities (19%); behavioral or emotional problems (19%); parent dissatisfaction with available programs (13%). For some,

disincentives to work arise from living arrangements: 19% are females who have a spouse or roommate who works to support them; one is a single mother living independently with sole responsibility for her child's care.

**Expectations and Outcomes:** The longitudinal study presented an opportunity to compare the current work and living arrangements of the sample with the preferences of parents and youngsters expressed in the initial survey four and five years ago.

**Living Arrangements:** Concurrence between preferences and outcomes occurred in 94% of the cases in which parents and guardians preferred that their youngster live at home; 29% of those who preferred a group setting; and 39% of those who preferred an independent living arrangement. For youngsters, concurrence between preferences and outcomes was found for 90% of those whose choice was to live at home; 40% for those who preferred a group setting; and 33% for those who preferred to live independently.

**Work Situations:** Concurrence between preferences and outcomes occurred in 48% of the cases in which parents and guardians preferred competitive employment for their youngsters; 22% of those who preferred sheltered workshops; 64% of those who preferred activities centers, and 100% of those who preferred that their youngster not work. For youngsters, concurrence between preferences and outcomes was found for 55% of those who preferred competitive employment; 33% of those who preferred sheltered workshop placements; 50% of those who preferred activities centers; and 80% of those who preferred not to work.

**STUDY SECTION:**  
**FIVE YEARS OF FOLLOW-UP OF**  
**MENTALLY RETARDED SCHOOL COMPLETERS**



## **FIVE YEARS OF FOLLOW-UP OF MENTALLY RETARDED SCHOOL COMPLETERS**

This report marks the fifth consecutive year of the follow-up, begun in 1987, of mentally retarded (MR) school completers of the Allegheny Intermediate Unit's (AIU) special education programs. (Gordon, Goldbach and Katz, 1987; Gordon, 1988; Gordon and Goldbach, 1989; Gordon and Goldbach, 1990). Two cohorts of youngsters have been followed: those who completed school in the 1985-1986 and in the 1986-1987 school years. The former group, thus, was studied for the fifth year; the latter for the fourth. Youngsters with an MR involvement of any degree who had completed their educations at one of the AIU's special education centers in these school years were followed. Also included in the cohort of 1986-1987 completers were youngsters with an MR disability who had been in mainstreamed classes under AIU auspices in regular area high schools. These individuals were all classified educable mentally retarded (EMR). Since they were mainstreamed, these youngsters were considered to be less handicapped and better able to be integrated into normative learning settings than their peers in the special education centers.

### **The Study Subjects**

**Center completers:** Center completers finished their educations at the six special education centers of Allegheny Intermediate Unit during the 1985-1986 and 1986-1987 school years. These centers, located around the county, serve the handicapped children of the school districts of suburban Allegheny County which are under the auspices of the Allegheny Intermediate Unit. Less disabled youngsters, and those judged able to handle integration with nondisabled peers, are mainstreamed into district schools. The centers, then, serve the more severely disabled, those with multiple handicaps, those with emotional problems as well as developmental delays, and those otherwise unable to be integrated into a mainstreamed setting. The study population was comprised of all students who left school in the identified year who had any degree of mental retardation (MR), whether as a primary or secondary disability. While in school, the youngsters were classified into exceptionality groups using state standards. Although also based on functional ability and thus, having a 5% leeway, the major groups are determined by I.Q., as described below:

**Severely Profoundly Mentally Retarded (SPMR):** I.Q. 25 or less  
**Trainable Mentally Retarded (TMR):** I.Q. range roughly 25+ to 50  
**Educable Mentally Retarded (EMR):** I.Q. range roughly 50+ to 80

Additional groups are Physically Handicapped (PH), and Social or Emotional Disabled/Learning and Adjustment Problem (SED/LAP). Our study sample only included PH and SED/LAP

individuals who were also mentally retarded to some degree. Students who graduated, received a certificate or left school without official termination were all included in the follow-up.

**Mainstreamed students:** Mainstreamed students completed their educations in an EMR class under the auspices of the AIU, in one of 12 district high schools. Such classes are physically located within a regular high school. These students typically have their own programming within the high school building, but may interact with non-handicapped peers in some non-academic classes, at lunch, extra-curricular activities, and in the normal flow in hallways. Students who graduated, or who left school without official termination at any time during the school year, were included.

### **Data Collection: Surveying Parents and Guardians**

In accordance with the procedure used in the 1990 followup, the parents and guardians who responded last year were initially sent a mail questionnaire. The phone numbers and addresses of the parents and guardians, originally taken from school records and roster lists and updated each year, were again checked for accuracy against listings in telephone directories and Cole's Street Directory. Parents and guardians for whom address information was available were mailed a one-page, two-sided questionnaire, an explanatory letter and a postage-paid return envelope. When mailed surveys were returned due to address corrections, the changes were recorded in the computer file and the survey was retransmitted.

Phone interviews were conducted if any of the following situations occurred: 1) the mail survey was not returned; 2) current address information for the parent/guardian was not available; 3) the only known contact person was the supervisor of a Community Living Arrangement (CLA) or residential institution. Contacting parents and guardians was the first priority. If necessary, numerous callbacks, at different times of the day, and different days of the week, were made to the identified numbers. When requested, interviews were rescheduled at the interviewee's convenience. In the case of youngsters in group living situations or Community Living Arrangements (CLAs), sometimes an individual in charge was interviewed, sometimes a parent, and sometimes both were interviewed.

The same questionnaire was used to survey all respondents. It asked for basic information concerning the youngster's present living and work situations, and job and training program involvement over the past year. In addition, respondents were asked to indicate the subject's marital status and number of children, if any. Two questions from last year's survey, asking parents and guardians to cite and explain any significant areas of progress or achievement, as well as any problems or setbacks, experienced by the youngster during the past year, were



consolidated into one open-ended question.

The Study Sample

- \* Three of the 157 cases were lost due to mortality.
- \* For the remaining 154 cases, 142 respondents were contacted and successfully interviewed, for an overall response rate of 92%. (See table below for response summary).
- \* Of the 12 lost cases, 1 was a refusal, 5 had disconnected phones and expired mail forwarding, and 6 were either wrong numbers or could not be reached despite continuous attempts over a period of several weeks.
- \* Of the 12 lost cases, 9 were center completers and 3 were from the mainstreamed group.
- \* Half (6) of the 12 lost cases were from low-income neighborhoods. Families in these areas have proven to be difficult to locate in each year of the study. However, this year, respondents from middle- and upper-income areas were equally difficult to retain in the sample.
- \* Tables showing the characteristics of respondents and non-respondents are found on pages 10 through 13.

RESPONSE SUMMARY

Survey of the 1986 and 1987 Cohorts

Initial universe:	157
Deceased:	3
-----	
1991 universe:	154

Type of response	#	%
-----		
Parent/guardian completed mail questionnaire	64	(41.6)
Parent/guardian responded to follow-up call	54	(35.1)
CLA supervisor responded to follow-up call	24	(15.6)
Parent/guardian refused to participate	1	(0.6)
Phone disconnected/mail undeliverable	5	(3.2)
Unreachable by phone/did not respond by mail	6	(3.9)
-----		
	154	(100.0)

% responded by mail:	41.6
% reached by follow-up:	50.6
-----	
Total response rate:	92.2 %

**COMPARISON OF RESPONDENTS AND NON-RESPONDENTS**  
**Center Completers, 1986 and 1987 Cohorts**

	RESPONDED	DID NOT RESPOND	TOTAL	PERCENT RESPONDING
<b>SCHOOL</b>				
Mon Valley	19	1	20	(95)
Eastern Area	8	3	11	(73)
Sunrise	17	1	18	(94)
Middle Road	37		37	(100)
Western Hills	23	1	24	(96)
Pathfinder	17	3	20	(85)
<b>WEALTH RATING</b>				
Very High	23		23	(100)
High	29	3	32	(91)
Middle	18	1	19	(95)
Low	28	1	29	(97)
Very Low	11	3	14	(79)
Unknown	12	1	13	(92)
<b>PRIMARY EXCEPTIONALITY</b>				
EMR	43	4	47	(91)
TMR	46	2	48	(96)
SPMR	24	1	25	(96)
PH	3	1	4	(75)
SED/LAP	5	1	6	(83)
<b>SEX</b>				
Male	80	7	87	(92)
Female	41	2	43	(95)
<b>RACE</b>				
White	110	5	115	(96)
Black	11	2	13	(85)
Asian	0	2	2	0

**COMPARISON OF RESPONDENTS AND NON-RESPONDENTS**  
**Mainstream Completers, 1987 Cohort**

	RESPONDED	DID NOT RESPOND	TOTAL	PERCENT RESPONDING
<b>WEALTH RATING</b>				
Very High	3	0	3	(100)
High	7	0	7	(100)
Middle	2	0	2	(100)
Low	4	0	4	(100)
Very Low	4	2	6	(67)
Unknown	1	1	2	(50)
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>(88)</b>
<b>SEX</b>				
Male	14	1	15	(93)
Female	7	2	9	(78)
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>(88)</b>

**THE STUDY SAMPLE FOR THE CONTINUED FOLLOW-UP**  
**Center Completers, 1986 and 1987 Cohorts**

	1986 Cohort (N=66)		1987 Cohort (N=55)		Total (N=121)	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
<b>School</b>						
Mon Valley	15	(23)	4	(7)	19	(16)
Eastern Area	3	(5)	5	(9)	8	(7)
Sunrise	7	(11)	10	(18)	17	(14)
Middle Road	24	(36)	13	(24)	37	(31)
Western Hills	12	(18)	11	(20)	23	(19)
Pathfinder	5	(8)	12	(22)	17	(14)
<b>Primary Exceptionality</b>						
EMR	20	(30)	23	(42)	43	(36)
TMR	23	(35)	23	(42)	46	(38)
SPMR	18	(27)	6	(11)	24	(20)
SED/LAP	3	(5)	2	(4)	5	(4)
PH	2	(3)	1	(2)	3	(2)
<b>Race</b>						
White	59	(89)	51	(93)	110	(91)
Black	7	(11)	4	(7)	11	(9)

**THE STUDY SAMPLE FOR THE 1991 CONTINUED FOLLOW-UP**  
**Center and Mainstream Completers**

	1986 Center (N=66)		1987 Center (N=55)		1987 Mainstream (N=21)		Total (N=142)	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
<b>Sex</b>								
Male	46	(70)	34	(62)	14	(67)	94	(66)
Female	20	(30)	21	(38)	7	(33)	48	(34)
<b>Birth Year</b>								
1963	1	(2)	-		-		1	(1)
1964	25	(38)	-		-		25	(18)
1965	33	(50)	16	(29)	-		49	(35)
1966	3	(5)	30	(55)	-		33	(23)
1967	2	(3)	4	(7)	4	(19)	10	(7)
1968	-		1	(2)	13	(62)	14	(10)
1969	-		1	(2)	4	(19)	5	(4)
1971	1	(2)	-		-		1	(1)
Unknown	1	(2)	3	(5)	-		4	(3)

## LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

**SPMR:** The current living arrangements of the 24 SPMR cases in the sample are shown in the table below. The majority (67%) live in institutions, 21% live with parents or guardians, and 12% live in group living arrangements or CLAs.

### SPMR LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

Living Arrangement	1986 Cohort		1987 Cohort		Total	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Parent/Guardian	3	(17)	2	(33)	5	(21)
CLA	3	(17)	-		3	(12)
Institution	12	(67)	4	(67)	16	(67)
	18	(100)	6	(100)	24	(100)

Only one change occurred in the living arrangements of the SPMR sample since last year: an individual who had been living in an institution was transferred to a CLA.

**Total non-SPMR sample:** 75% of the non-SPMR completers live with parents or guardians. 11% live independently, 8% reside in a CLA or group home, and 7% in an institution. The living arrangements of each exceptionality group are shown in the table below.

### LIVING ARRANGEMENTS OF NON-SPMRs

Living Arrangement	EMR				Total					
	Mainstream		CENTER			TMR		PH/SED		
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)		
Parent/Guardian	14	(67)	35	(81)	35	(76)	4	(50)	88	(75)
Independent	7	(33)	5	(12)	-		1	(13)	13	(11)
CLA, Group Home	-		1	(2)	6	(13)	2	(25)	9	(8)
Institution	-		2	(5)	5	(11)	1	(13)	8	(7)
Total	21	(100)	43	(100)	46	(100)	8	(100)	118	(100)

Independent Living Arrangements: 12 (92%) of the 13 persons who live independently are EMRs -- 7 mainstream and 5 center. Of those living independently, nearly half (46%) are married, and 38% are single. 2 center EMRs are living with a companion. The marital status of 1 person was not known.

MARITAL STATUS OF THOSE LIVING INDEPENDENTLY

Marital Status	EMRs		SED/MR	Total
	Mainstream	Center		
	#	(%)	#	(%)
Married	5	(57)	1	(20)
Single	3	(43)	1	(100)
Living with companion	-		2	(40)
Unknown	-		1	(20)
	7	(100)	5	(100)
			1	(100)
				13 (100)

Marital Status and Children. 12 children have been born to those who live independently, 7 to married persons, 5 to unmarried persons.

NUMBER OF CHILDREN BY MARITAL STATUS OF MRs LIVING INDEPENDENTLY

Number of Children	MARITAL STATUS				Total	
	Married	Single	Companion	Unknown		
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
None	-		3	(60)	-	
One	3	(60)	1	(20)	2	(100)
Two	2	(40)	1	(20)	-	
Unknown	-		-		1	(100)
	5	(100)	5	(100)	2	(100)
					1	(100)
						13 (100)

This report now turns to a detailed discussion of the living arrangements of the two largest exceptionality groups: EMRs and TMRs.

**TMR:** Members of this group live in three types of living arrangements. 76% live with parents or guardians, 13% live in CLA's or group arrangements, and 11% live in institutions. None live independently. This breakdown is almost identical to that found last year.

**LIVING ARRANGEMENTS OF TMRS**

Living Arrangement	1986 Cohort		1987 Cohort		Total	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Parent/Guardian	17	(74)	18	(78)	35	(76)
CLA, Group Home	4	(17)	2	(9)	6	(13)
Institution	2	(9)	3	(13)	5	(11)
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>(100)</b>

**Changes in TMR Living Arrangements:** The living arrangements of the TMR group remained decidedly stable. Only one change was reported, the movement of one individual from an institutional setting to a CLA.

**COMPARISON OF TMR LIVING ARRANGEMENTS, 1990 AND 1991**

1990 Living Arrangement	1991 Living Arrangement	Center 1986	Center 1987	Total
	→	# (%)	# (%)	# (%)
<b>NO CHANGES</b>				
Parent/Guardian	→ Parent/Guardian	17 (74)	18 (78)	35 (76)
CLA	→ CLA	3 (13)	2 (9)	5 (11)
Institution	→ Institution	2 (9)	3 (13)	5 (11)
<b>CHANGES</b>				
Institution	→ CLA	1 (4)	-	1 (2)
		<b>23 (100)</b>	<b>23 (100)</b>	<b>46 (100)</b>
<b>NO CHANGES</b>		<b>22 (96)</b>	<b>23 (100)</b>	<b>45 (98)</b>
<b>CHANGES</b>		<b>1 (4)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1 (2)</b>
		<b>23 (100)</b>	<b>23 (100)</b>	<b>46 (100)</b>



**EMR:** Within the largest exceptionality represented in our sample, the EMRs, we find that a sizeable 77% continue to live with parents or guardians. 19% live independently, either alone, or with a spouse or roommate. 2% are in a CLA or group home, and 3% are in an institution. The mainstream group differs notably from the center EMR cohorts with regard to their living arrangements. The mainstream group is more likely to be living independently, 33%, and somewhat less likely to be living with parents or guardians, 67%. By contrast, 83% of those young people who completed their educations in centers in 1987 live with parents or guardians; only one person (4%) lives independently. Among the 1986 center group, 80% live with parent or guardian, 20% live independently, and none are in CLAs or group homes.

LIVING ARRANGEMENTS OF EMRs

Living Arrangement	1986 Center		1987 Center		1987 Mainstream		Total	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Parent/Guardian	16	(80)	19	(83)	14	(67)	49	(77)
Independent	4	(20)	1	(4)	7	(33)	12	(19)
CLA, Group Home	-		1	(4)	-		1	(2)
Institution	-		2	(9)	-		2	(3)
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>(100)</b>

There were only 4 changes in living arrangements reported by respondents for the EMR group affecting 3% of the sample. Two changes occurred within the 1986 center cohort. One person moved from the parent/guardian residence to an independent living arrangement, another moved back to the parent/guardian residence after living independently for a short while. The net change in living arrangements for the 1986 cohort was, therefore, nil. Within the mainstream cohort, 2 persons moved from their parents' residences to independent living arrangements. The net change for the entire EMR group, therefore, was a gain of two independent living arrangements and a loss of two parent/guardian living arrangements. (See table, following page).

COMPARISON OF LIVING ARRANGEMENTS OF EMRS, 1990 AND 1991

1990 Living Arrangement	1991 Living Arrangement	Center 1986 # (%)	Center 1987 # (%)	Mainstream 1987 # (%)	Total # (%)
<b>NO CHANGES</b>					
Parent/Guardian	Parent/Guardian	15 (75)	19 (83)	14 (67)	48 (75)
Independent	Independent	3 (15)	1 (4)	5 (24)	9 (14)
CLA	CLA	-	1 (4)	-	1 (2)
Institution	Institution	-	2 (9)	-	2 (4)
<b>CHANGES</b>					
Parent/Guardian	Independent	1 (5)	-	2 (9)	3 (5)
Independent	Parent/Guardian	1 (5)	-	-	1 (2)
		20 (100)	23 (100)	21 (100)	64 (100)
<b>NO CHANGES</b>		18 (90)	23 (100)	19 (81)	60 (97)
<b>CHANGES</b>		2 (10)	-	2 (9)	4 (3)
		20 (100)	23 (100)	21 (100)	59 (100)

1  
18  
1

## WORK SITUATIONS

Work-related activities are classified along a continuum which varies by degree of vocational content. Therapeutic Activities Centers (TACs) typically keep youngsters occupied in pre-vocational pursuits, such as activities of daily living. Individuals with more severe disabilities tend to be enrolled in TACs. Work Activities Centers (WACs) are the next step on the continuum. Participants typically are engaged in activities that involve rudimentary work skills such as assembling and packaging, and work at a pace that is less than 50% of that of an average worker. In this narrative, the term activities center refers to both TACs and WACs. Sheltered workshops move individuals closer to real work. Participants earn wages for working on contracts that may involving assembling, counting, packaging, wrapping and similar skills. They work at a pace that is at least 50% of that of an average worker and earn wages that usually depend on the number of items completed. Vocational training and work-oriented volunteer placements are also included in the continuum. Competitive work for our sample encompasses both regular and supported employment, a new initiative which provides on-the-job supports to workers and is designed to ease handicapped individuals' entry into the world of work. Work-related activity or work activity includes all the situations described above. An individual described as having no work activity, or idle, was involved in none of these activities at the time of interview.

SPMR: All but one of the SPMRs, an institutionalized individual, were enrolled in structured day programming. Two persons who were living in a parent/guardian situation and had no activity program last year were enrolled in programs at the time of this year's survey.

**Total Non-SPMR Sample:** The work arrangements of the total non-SPMR group are shown in the table below. 42 persons (36% of the sample) are in competitive employment situations: 37 have regular jobs (31%), 2 have two jobs (2%), and 3 are in supported work positions (3%). Sheltered workshops and activities centers make up another large segment of the work placements (39%), and 63% of the placements of the PH and SED groups.

**1991 WORK ACTIVITY OF NON-SPMR COMPLETERS, 1986 AND 1987 COHORTS**

Work Situation	EMR		TMR		PH/SED		Total			
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)		
Regular Job	11	(52)	23	(53)	2	(4)	1	(13)	37	(31)
Two Jobs	1	(5)	1	(2)	-		-		2	(2)
Supported Work	-		2	(5)	1	(2)	-		3	(3)
Training	1	(5)	-		-		-		1	(1)
Volunteer	1	(5)	-		2	(4)	-		3	(3)
Sheltered Workshop	-		5	(12)	7	(15)	3	(38)	15	(13)
Activities Center	-		4	(9)	25	(54)	2	(25)	31	(26)
Unknown	-		2	(5)	-		-		2	(2)
No Activity	7	(33)	6	(14)	9	(20)	2	(25)	24	(20)
<b>Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>(100)</b>

The work situations of TMRs and EMRs will now be discussed in detail.

**TMR:** A majority (54%) of the 46 TMRs are engaged in activities centers. Sheltered workshops make up 15% of all placements. 3 persons (7%) are in competitive employment positions: 2 in regular jobs, 1 in supported work. There are also 2 volunteers in this year's sample, 1 from each cohort. 20% of the TMRs have no work placement.

1991 WORK SITUATION OF TMRs, 1986 AND 1987 COHORTS

Work Situation	1986 Cohort		1987 Cohort		Total	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Regular Job	1	(4)	1	(4)	2	(4)
Supported Work	1	(4)	-		1	(2)
Volunteer	1	(4)	1	(4)	2	(4)
Sheltered Workshop	2	(9)	5	(22)	7	(15)
Activities Center	14	(61)	11	(48)	25	(54)
No Activity	4	(17)	5	(22)	9	(20)
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>(100)</b>

**Changes in TMR Work Situations:** As the table below shows, a number of persons in the TMR sample experienced changes in their work situations since last year's survey. 1 person moved from an activity center to a job (a supported work position). 9 persons who had no work placement last year moved into various work placements: 5 into activity centers, 2 into sheltered workshops, and 2 into volunteer positions. 1 person moved from a sheltered workshop to an activity center. Finally, 2 persons lost placements and are now idle. Altogether, 13 changes in work situation occurred within the TMR sample, affecting 28% of the group.

COMPARISON OF TMR WORK SITUATIONS, 1990 AND 1991

1990 Work Situation	1991 Work Situation	Center 1986 # (%)	Center 1987 # (%)	Total # (%)
<b>NO CHANGES</b>				
Job	→ Job	2 (9)	-	2 (4)
Sh. Workshop	→ Sh. Workshop	2 (9)	3 (13)	5 (11)
Activity Ctr.	→ Activity Ctr.	12 (52)	7 (30)	19 (41)
No work	→ No work	3 (13)	4 (17)	7 (15)
<b>CHANGES</b>				
Activity Ctr.	→ Job	-	1 (4)	1 (2)
No Work	→ Activity Ctr.	2 (9)	3 (13)	5 (11)
No Work	→ Sh. Workshop	-	2 (9)	2 (4)
No Work	→ Volunteer	1 (4)	1 (4)	2 (4)
Sh. Workshop	→ Activity Ctr.	-	1 (4)	1 (2)
Activity Ctr.	→ No Work	1 (4)	-	1 (2)
Sh. Workshop	→ No Work	-	1 (4)	1 (2)
		23 (100)	23 (100)	46 (100)
<b>NO CHANGES</b>		19 (83)	14 (61)	33 (72)
<b>CHANGES</b>		4 (17)	9 (39)	13 (28)
		23 (100)	23 (100)	46 (100)

**Net Result of Changes in TMR Work Situations:** Overall, there was a notable improvement in the work situations of the TMR group, particularly the 1987 cohort. As the summary table below shows, there was a net gain of 7 work placements since last year, 1 job, 2 volunteer placements, and 4 activity center placements. The 1987 group showed substantial progress, with a welcome net loss of 5 "no work" situations.

**SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN TMR WORK SITUATIONS**

Work Situation	1986 Cohort	1987 Cohort	Total
Competitive Employment	0	+1	+1
Sheltered Workshop	0	0	0
Activity Center	+1	+3	+4
Volunteer	+1	+1	+2
No work	-2	-5	-7
	0	0	0

**EMR Work Situations:** A majority (59%) of the EMRs are engaged in competitive employment: 34 with regular jobs, 2 with 2 jobs, and 2 with supported work. 20% of the sample have no work placement. The rate of competitive employment varies considerably by cohort: 75% of the 1986 center cohort have jobs, compared to 48% of the 1987 center cohort and 57% of the 1987 mainstream group.

**1991 WORK SITUATIONS OF CENTER AND MAINSTREAM EMRS**

Work Situation	1986 Center		1987 Center		1987 Mainstream		Total	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Regular Job	14	(70)	9	(39)	11	(52)	34	(53)
Two Jobs	-		1	(4)	1	(5)	2	(4)
Supported Work	1	(5)	1	(4)	-		2	(4)
Training	-		-		1	(5)	1	(2)
Volunteer	-		-		1	(5)	1	(2)
Sheltered Workshop	1	(5)	4	(17)	-		5	(8)
Activities Center	3	(15)	1	(4)	-		4	(6)
No Activity	1	(5)	5	(22)	7	(33)	13	(20)
Unknown	-		2	(9)	-		2	(4)
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>(100)</b>

Changes in EMR Work Situation: 12 (18%) of the persons in the EMR sample experienced changes in their work situations since last year's survey. These changes are described below and also shown in the table on the following page.

3 persons acquired jobs: 1 had been in training, 1 had been in a sheltered workshop, and 1 had not been working last year. 2 persons acquired sheltered workshop placements: 1 had been in an activities center, 1 had not been working. 2 job placements were lost: 1 to training, another to a no-work situation. 1 activity center placement was lost. The work situation of one member of the sample who was not working last year is now unknown. Finally, one person whose work situation was not known last year is a volunteer this year.



COMPARISON OF WORK SITUATIONS OF EMRS, 1990 AND 1991

1990 Work Situation	----> 1991 Work Situation	Center 1986		Center 1987		Mainstream 1987		Total	
		#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
<b>NO CHANGES</b>									
Job	----> Job	14	(70)	8	(35)	11	(52)	33	(52)
Sh. Workshop	----> Sh. Workshop	1	(5)	2	(9)	-		3	(5)
Activity Ctr.	----> Activity Ctr.	3	(15)	1	(4)	-		4	(6)
No work	----> No work	1	(5)	4	(17)	6	(29)	11	(17)
<b>CHANGES</b>									
No work	----> Job	1	(5)	1	(4)	-		2	(3)
No work	----> Sh. Workshop	-		1	(4)	-		1	(2)
Activity Ctr.	----> No Work	-		1	(4)	-		1	(2)
Activity Ctr.	----> Sh. Workshop	-		1	(4)	-		1	(2)
Sh. Workshop	----> Job	-		2	(9)	-		2	(3)
Training	----> Job	-		-		1	(5)	1	(2)
Job	----> Training	-		-		1	(5)	1	(2)
Job	----> No work	-		-		1	(5)	1	(2)
Unknown	----> Volunteer	-		-		1	(5)	1	(2)
No Work	----> Unknown	-		1	(4)	-		1	(2)
<b>UNKNOWN</b>		-		1	(4)	-		1	(2)
		20	(100)	23	(100)	21	(100)	64	(100)
<b>NO CHANGES</b>		19	(95)	15	(65)	17	(74)	51	(80)
<b>CHANGES</b>		1	(5)	7	(30)	4	(17)	12	(18)
<b>UNKNOWN</b>		-		1	(4)	-		1	(2)
		20	(100)	23	(100)	21	(100)	64	(100)

Net Changes in EMR Work Situations. For the EMR group, the net changes in work situations were positive, particularly for the 1986 center group. This cohort experienced a net loss of 2 "no work" situations, and gained 3 competitive employment placements. The net changes for the 1986 center and 1987 mainstream cohorts were inconclusive.

**NET CHANGES IN WORK SITUATIONS**  
1986 and 1987 EMRs

Work Situations	Center 1986	Center 1987	Mainstream 1987	Total
Competitive Employment	+1	+3	-1	+3
Training	0	0	0	0
Sheltered Workshop	0	-2	0	-2
Activity Center	0	0	0	0
Volunteer	0	0	+1	+1
No Work	-1	-2	+1	-2
Unknown	0	+1	-1	0
	0	0	0	0

**SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN NON-SPMR LIVING AND WORK ARRANGEMENTS**

Living Arrangements

Overall, there was a slight move toward greater independence (+3) and group living (+1) and away from parent/guardian living arrangements (-2). There was one fewer individual living in an institution and one fewer individual whose living arrangement was "unknown".

**NET CHANGES IN LIVING ARRANGEMENTS**  
1986 and 1987 Non-SPMR Sample

Living Arrangement	Center 1986	Center 1987	Mainstream 1987	Total
Parent/Guardian	0	0	-2	-2
Independent	+1	0	+2	+3
CLA	+1	0	0	+1
Institution	-1	0	0	-1
Unknown	-1	0	0	-1
	0	0	0	0

## Work Situations

In general, there was a substantial move away from no-work situations (-8) and into work placements of various kinds, particularly competitive employment (+4) and volunteer positions (+3), as well as sheltered workshops (+1) and activities centers (+1).

Work Situation	Center 1986	Center 1987	Mainstream 1987	Total
Competitive Employment	+1	+4	-1	+4
Training	0	0	0	0
Sheltered Workshop	0	+1	0	+1
Activities Center	+1	0	0	+1
Volunteer	+1	+1	+1	+3
No work	-2	-7	+1	-8
Unknown	-1	+1	-1	-1
	0	0	0	0

## COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT

This year we find that 42 persons (33% of our non-SPMR sample) are competitively employed. 91% of competitively employed individuals are EMRs, both mainstream (29%) and center-based (62%). The remaining 4 individuals (9%) are also from the centers: three are classified TMR, 1 as SED/LAP. There are three individuals in supported work positions, 2 more than was found in last year's survey. For the first time since the longitudinal study began five years ago, we find persons holding two jobs simultaneously: one mainstream EMR and one center EMR.

### EXCEPTIONALITY OF WORKERS IN 1991

Exceptionality	#	(%)
-----		
Mainstream	12	(29)
Center:		
EMR	26	(62)
TMR	3	(7)
SED/LAP	1	(2)
-----		
Total	41	(100)

Types of jobs: The food service sector continues to be the single most important employer of the study's workers, though it is not as prominent an employment sector as we have previously found. 29% of workers had jobs in restaurants, fast food outlets and cafeterias, down from 34% last year. 19% worked in health care institutions, including nursing homes and hospitals; last year, 20% worked in health care institutions. This year, supermarkets employed a conspicuous portion of the study's workers -- 12% -- as stock, produce and customer service clerks. Additional jobs held include janitors (17%) and general laborers (7%). The full list of job types appears in the table on the following page.

**TYPES OF JOBS HELD BY THOSE WITH COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT**

TYPES OF JOBS	Mainstream (N=12)		Center (N=30)		Total * (N=42)	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Restaurant/fast food:	3	(25)	9	(30)	12	(29)
Dishwasher	1	(8)	4	(13)	5	(12)
Busboy	1	(8)	2	(7)	3	(7)
Cook	1	(8)	-		1	(2)
Miscellaneous	-		3	(10)	3	(7)
Nursing Home/Hospital:	1	(8)	7	(23)	8	(19)
Nurse Aide	1	(8)	3	(10)	4	(10)
Janitor	-		2	(7)	2	(5)
Dishwasher	-		1	(3)	1	(2)
Cook	-		1	(3)	1	(2)
Other:	9	(75)	15	(50)	24	(57)
Janitor	1	(8)	6	(20)	7	(17)
Laborer	-		3	(10)	3	(7)
Produce clerk	2	(17)	-		2	(5)
Cust. service clerk	1	(8)	1	(3)	2	(5)
Stock clerk	1	(8)	-		1	(2)
Bagger/runner	-		1	(3)	1	(2)
Navy	-		1	(3)	1	(2)
Messenger/courier	1	(8)	-		1	(2)
Dishwasher	-		1	(3)	1	(2)
Biology	-		1	(3)	1	(2)
Mechanic	-		1	(3)	1	(2)
Tire changer	1	(8)	-		1	(2)
Rug cutter	1	(8)	-		1	(2)
Construction worker	1	(8)	-		1	(2)

\* Note: Percentages add up to more than 100% because some workers held more than one job.

## PHYSICAL AND EMOTIONAL DISABILITIES

In this part of the report we examine the association between the physical or emotional disabilities of the study subjects and such outcomes as living arrangements and work placements. Up to this point, the focus has been upon individuals whose primary exceptionality has been classified as EMR or TMR. Within each of these groups are certain individuals who have some type of disability in addition to mental retardation. These persons may, as a secondary exceptionality, be classified as physically handicapped (PH) if they have conditions such as blindness or vision problems, deafness or hearing problems, seizures, or cerebral palsy. Others may have a secondary exceptionality that is categorized as socially and emotionally disturbed/learning and adjustment problems (SED/LAP). For each center completer in the study, primary and secondary exceptionalities were assigned as officially recorded in the school records. (Information on the secondary disabilities of those in the mainstream programs was not available for the study.)

Most of the study subjects classified as EMRs or TMRs do not have a secondary exceptionality. As the table below shows, 35 of the 43 (81%) individuals classified as EMRs have no secondary exceptionalities. Of the remaining 8 (19%), 2 have physical handicaps (PH) and 6 have emotional disabilities (SED/LAP). Similarly, 38 (83%) of the 46 study subjects classified as TMRs have no secondary exceptionality. Of the remaining 8 (17%), 6 persons have physical handicaps (PH) and 2 have emotional disabilities (SED/LAP).

### SECONDARY EXCEPTIONALITIES OF EMRs AND TMRs

Primary Exceptionality	<u>Secondary Exceptionality</u>			No Secondary Exceptionality	Total
	PH	SED/LAP	Total		
EMR	2	6	8	35	43
TMR	6	2	8	38	46
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>89</b>

In addition, there are 6 individuals within the study sample whose primary exceptionality is classified as PH or SED/LAP. As shown below, there are 2 persons whose primary exceptionality is PH and whose secondary exceptionality is designated as EMR. Four persons have a primary exceptionality of SED/LAP: 2 have a secondary exceptionality of EMR, and 2 have a secondary exceptionality of TMR.

SECONDARY EXCEPTIONALITIES OF PHs AND SED/LAPs

Secondary Exceptionality	Primary Exceptionality		Total
	PH	SED/LAP	
EMR	2	2	4
TMR	-	2	2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>

Thus, there are 48 (46+2) persons in the study sample whose primary or secondary exceptionality is TMR, and 47 (43+4) whose primary or secondary exceptionality is EMR. We will discuss the work and living arrangements of each of these groups, beginning with the TMRs.

TMRs: Of the 48 persons in the study sample with MR involvements at the TMR level, 10 have an additional disability, and 38 do not. As shown below, 36 of the 48 TMRs (75%) are living with parents or guardians, while the remaining 25% live in CLAs or institutions. The proportion of those without disabilities who are living at home (82%) is greater than that of the individuals with additional disabilities (50%); however this difference is not statistically significant.

LIVING ARRANGEMENTS OF TMRs BY PRESENCE OF ADDITIONAL DISABILITY

Living Arrangement	Presence of Additional Disability				Total	
	NO		YES		#	(%)
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Parent/Guardian	31	(82)	5	(50)	36	(75)
CLA, Group Home	5	(13)	2	(20)	7	(15)
Institution	2	(5)	3	(30)	5	(10)
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>(100)</b>



The presence of an additional disability does not appear to have affected the work placements of the TMRs. As seen in the table below, 25 of the 48 TMRs (52%) are in activities centers, and 8 (17%) are in sheltered workshops. The proportions in both subgroups are similar for these categories of placements. The proportion of those with disabilities who have no work placement (30%) is greater than that of the individuals without additional disabilities (18%); however this difference is not statistically significant.

WORK SITUATIONS OF TMRs BY PRESENCE OF ADDITIONAL DISABILITY

Work Situation	Presence of Additional Disability				Total	
	NO		YES		#	(%)
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Competitive Employment	2	(5)	1	(10)	3	(6)
Sheltered Workshop	6	(16)	2	(20)	8	(17)
Activities Center	21	(55)	4	(40)	25	(52)
Volunteer	2	(5)	-		2	(4)
No work activity	7	(18)	3	(30)	10	(21)
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>(100)</b>

**EMRs:** Of the 47 persons whose primary or secondary exceptionality is categorized as EMR, 12 have additional disabilities, 35 do not. As shown in the table below, the proportions of those living with parents or guardians do not differ significantly between the two subgroups. However, none of the 12 with additional disabilities are living independently, compared to 5 (14%) of those without disabilities. While this difference is notable, its statistical significance cannot be determined because of the small numbers involved.

LIVING ARRANGEMENTS OF EMRs BY PRESENCE OF ADDITIONAL DISABILITY

Living Arrangement	Presence of Additional Disability				Total	
	NO		YES		#	(%)
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Parent/Guardian	28	(80)	10	(83)	38	(81)
Independent	5	(14)	-		5	(11)
CLA, Group Home	1	(3)	1	(8)	2	(4)
Institution	1	(3)	1	(8)	2	(4)
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>(100)</b>

Work arrangements within the EMR group are quite different between the two subgroups. For example, 69% of those without an additional disability are competitively employed, in contrast to 25% of those with an additional disability. At the same time, 25% of the additionally disabled have no work activity, while only 9% of those without disabilities have no work activity.

WORK SITUATIONS OF EMRs BY PRESENCE OF ADDITIONAL DISABILITY

Work Situation	Presence of Additional Disability				Total	
	NO		YES		#	(%)
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Competitive Employment	24	(69)	3	(25)	27	(57)
Sheltered Workshop	5	(14)	2	(17)	7	(15)
Activities Center	2	(6)	3	(25)	5	(11)
No work activity	3	(9)	3	(25)	6	(13)
Not known	1	(3)	1	(8)	2	(4)
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>(100)</b>

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF EMRs, BY PRESENCE OF ADDITIONAL DISABILITIES

Work Situation	Presence of Additional Disability				Total	
	NO		YES		#	(%)
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Competitively employed	24	(69)	3	(25)	27	(57)
Not competitively employed	11	(31)	9	(75)	20	(50)
	35	(100)	12	(100)	47	(100)

$\chi^2 = 5.2720$

$p = .021$

## EXPECTATIONS AND OUTCOMES: A FIVE-YEAR RETROSPECTIVE

When we first contacted the parents and guardians of the 1986 and 1987 completers, five and four years ago, respectively, we asked them to indicate their preferences for their youngsters' eventual living and work arrangements 3-5 years into the future. We also asked them to indicate what they thought their youngsters' preferences were for the same factors. In this part of the report, we examine to what extent the expectations of years ago match the present realities.

### Living Arrangements

As shown in the chart below, 64 respondents to the initial survey indicated a preference for their youngster to be living at home. Of those, 94% reported that their youngsters are living at home this year. However, of the 18 respondents who initially expressed a preference for independent living arrangements, only 39% reported that their youngsters are living independently this year, while 61% are living with their parents. An even greater disparity is found among the group for which a group setting was the arrangement of choice. 21 respondents preferred that their youngsters live in a group setting; of those, only 29% reported that their youngsters are living in a CLA this year.

### COMPARISON OF NON-SPMR LIVING ARRANGEMENTS AND PARENT PREFERENCES 1986 and 1987 Cohorts

#### Living Arrangements Preferred by Parents and Guardians for Youngsters in Initial Survey

Percent By Actual Living Arrangements	Parent/ Guardian (N=64)	Group Setting (N=21)	Inde- pendent (N=18)	Not specified (N=8)	Total <sup>2</sup> (N=111)
	%	%	%	%	%
Institution	-	24	-	-	5
Parent/Guardian	94	43	61	88	78
CLA	3	29	-	-	7
Independent	3	5	39	13	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

<sup>2</sup> Totals for this group differ from those found elsewhere in the study because they include only parent/guardian respondents. Counselors and supervisors were not asked questions about preferred living and work arrangements.

**Youngster Preferences:** Parents and guardians were also asked in the initial survey to indicate what type of living arrangements they felt their youngsters would prefer in 3-5 years. The disparities between these projections of youngsters' expectations and reality nearly match those of the parents. As the chart below shows, a match between preference and outcomes was found for 90% of those whose choice was to live at home; 40% for those who preferred a group setting; and 33% for those who preferred to live independently.

**COMPARISON OF LIVING ARRANGEMENTS AND YOUNGSTER PREFERENCES**

**Youngster's Preferred Living Arrangement, as Indicated by Parent/Guardian in Initial Survey**

Percent By Actual Living Arrangements	Parent/ Guardian (N=61)	Group Setting (N=10)	Inde- pendent (N=27)	Not specified (N=13)	Total (N=111)
	%	%	%	%	%
Institution	2	20	-	8	4
Parent/Guardian	90	40	67	85	79
CLA	5	40	-	8	7
Independent	3	-	33	-	10
	100	100	100	100	100

Work Situations

The initial contact survey also asked parents and guardians to indicate the kinds of work situations they would prefer for their youngsters 3-5 years into the future, as well as what kind of placement they thought their youngsters would prefer. A more mixed picture emerged from an analysis of these projections, as discussed below.

Parent/Guardian Preferences: As the chart below shows, concurrence between preferences and outcomes occurred in 48% of the cases in which parents and guardians preferred competitive employment for their youngsters; 22% of those who preferred sheltered workshops; 64% of those who preferred activities centers; and 100% of those who preferred that their youngster not work.

COMPARISON OF NON-SPMR WORK SITUATIONS AND PARENT PREFERENCES  
1986 and 1987 Cohorts

Work Situations Preferred by Parents and Guardians for Youngsters in Initial Survey

PERCENT IN ACTUAL WORK SITUATIONS	Comp. Emply. (N=67)	Shelt. Wkshp. (N=18)	Activ. Center (N=11)	Did Not Specify (N=12)	No Work (N=3)	Total (N=111)
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Regular Job	48	6	18	42	-	36
Supported Work	4	-	-	-	-	3
Training	1	-	9	-	-	2
Volunteer	3	-	-	8	-	3
Sheltered Workshop	13	22	-	8	-	13
Activity Center	9	56	64	17	-	23
Unknown	1	-	-	-	-	1
No Work	19	17	9	25	100	21
	100	100	100	100	100	100

**Youngster Preferences:** For youngsters, concurrence between preferences and outcomes was found for 55% of those who preferred competitive employment; 33% of those who preferred sheltered workshop placements; 50% of those who preferred activities centers; and 80% of those who preferred not to work.

**COMPARISON OF NON-SEMR WORK SITUATIONS AND YOUNGSTER PREFERENCES**  
1986 and 1987 Cohorts

**Work Situations Preferred by Youngsters, as Indicated by Parent/guardians in Initial Survey**

PERCENT IN ACTUAL WORK SITUATIONS	Comp. Employ. (N=62)	Shelt. Wkshp. (N=12)	Activ. Center (N=6)	Did Not Specify (N=26)	No Work (N=5)	Total (N=111)
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Regular Job	55	-	-	8	20	33
Supported Work	3	-	-	4	-	3
Training	2	-	-	-	-	1
Volunteer	2	-	33	-	-	3
Sheltered Workshop	13	33	-	8	-	14
Activity Center	10	42	50	52	-	24
Unknown	2	-	-	4	-	2
No Work	15	25	17	24	80	21

**Summary:** The data has shown that the preferences of parents and guardians who had initial expectations that their youngsters would live at home have largely been realized. Greater disparities between expectations and outcomes exist for those with preferences for more independent living arrangements.

With regard to work placements, a less clear picture emerges from the data. Concurrences range from 2% for sheltered workshop preferences to 64% for activities centers, with competitive employment in between.

## HARD-CORE IDLE

In the section on work placements, we noted that a number of individuals in the study, particularly in the 1987 cohort, moved out of "no work" situations and into some type of placement. For the study group as a whole, therefore, there has been some progress in work activity this year. However, we also noted that 24 non-SPMRs are without a work placement this year. Of these 24, 16 (14% of the non-SPMR sample) are considered "hard-core" idle: that is, they have had little or no work activity since completing school. The circumstances of these individuals are summarized below in abbreviated case histories, arranged by primary exceptionality.

### EMR

**Case A:** Lives with her boyfriend, who works and supports them both. They do not have children.

**Case B:** Her parents indicate that because of her facial disfigurement and small stature, employers are reluctant to hire her. She also has transportation problems: public transit is not available, and she is too small to learn to drive a car.

**Case C:** Visually-impaired individual who had a job at a fast food restaurant, but was laid off shortly after the 1988 study. He has not worked since.

### TMR

**Case D:** Parents cite transportation problems as an impediment to placement in a work situation.

**Case E:** Parents removed their daughter from a TAC in 1987. They felt she was not properly supervised because the program was short-staffed. They indicated that their daughter watched TV all the time at the TAC and was bored. She has been on a CLA waiting list since then and has not had any programmed activity.

**Case F:** Is on a waiting list for an activity center.

**Case G:** Is on a waiting list for an activity center. Parents also cite transportation problems.

**Case H:** Has chronic seizures and requires medication.

**Case I:** Father reports that his son suffered "brain damage" from abuse by mother and is not capable of regular work.



**Case J:** Parents removed their son from a TAC in 1989 because they were dissatisfied with the program ("all they cared about was going to eat"). They could not enroll him in an alternate program because of transportation problems.

SED

**Case H:** Mother reports that her daughter is living with a couple she met through a national telephone hotline. Mother claims the couple is exploiting her daughter for her social security checks. Mother describes it as a "dangerous situation", but cannot take remedial steps because her daughter is considered a consenting adult. This situation has prevailed for 4 years.

**Case I:** Mother claims that her son was misdiagnosed as MR but is really autistic. The mother, a certified teacher, is instructing her son at home and feels that he may be capable of working in 5-10 years.

Mainstream

**Case J:** Married, husband works.

**Case K:** Married, 1 child. Mother reports that her daughter is "too slow", and was fired from each of a series of jobs at fast-food restaurants.

**Case L:** Parents cite transportation problems.

**Case M:** Single, 1 child, living independently.

The obstacles or disincentives to work placement cited by the respondents are summarized in the table below.

OBSTACLES/DISINCENTIVES TO WORK PLACEMENT CITED BY PARENTS

	# of Cases	
	(N=16)	(%)
Supported by Spouse/Companion	3	(19)
Transportation Problems	4	(25)
Waiting Lists	3	(19)
Health/Physical Problems	3	(19)
Emotionally Disturbed	2	(13)
Dissatisfaction with Available Programs	2	(13)
Child-care Responsibilities	1	(6)

**FOLLOW-UP OF 1990 COHORT  
ONE YEAR AFTER COMPLETION**

## **FOLLOW-UP OF MENTALLY RETARDED YOUTH: 1990 SCHOOL COMPLETERS**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The second aspect of the HWP/CRA research this year involves the continued followup of those who completed school in the 1989-1990 school year. Parents and guardians of youngsters who completed their educations in the Allegheny Intermediate Unit's (AIU's) special education programs were contacted. Respondents were queried as to the youngster's living arrangements and work situations. Findings for this cohort are of interest because they represent the first wave of graduates since the increased emphasis on transition planning in the school system began in 1989. Their situations can also be compared with those of earlier study cohorts: the 1985-1986 and 1986-1987 completers.

This report segment presents findings related to living arrangements, work situations, and training. Conclusions regarding the effects of transition planning, as well as comparisons between the 1990 cohort and cohorts examined in our previous studies, are also included.

### **FINDINGS**

**Living Arrangements:** The majority (83%) of the non-SPMR sample live with parents or guardians, including all but one of the mainstream EMRs. Seven (8%) are living independently, six (7%) are in group homes, and two (2%) are living in dormitory arrangements.

**Work Situations:** Post-school work placements have been arranged for 54 (63%) of the non-SPMR completers. The proportion of completers without a post-school placement differs by exceptionality. For center completers, the proportions range from 31% for those in the TMR group to 38% for those in the PH/SED group. 43% of mainstreamed EMRs are without a placement.

**Job Placements:** Of those in competitive employment positions, 89% have regular jobs; 11% are in supported work placements. Schools were an important source of job information and referral for 32% of the center EMRs, but for none of the mainstream EMRs. 32% of the center EMRs and 67% of the mainstream EMRs found jobs on their own.

**Post-school Training:** Twenty-one persons (24%) have completed or are attending training programs. Ten persons now attending training programs include two mainstream EMRs (20%), four center EMRs (40%), two TMRs (20%), and one each from the PH and SED/LAP groups. Food Service programs comprise the largest segment of trainees, 43%; Child Care, 19%.

**Training and Placement:** Eleven persons (13%) have completed training programs; Of these 11, 6 (55%) found jobs, 5 (45%) did not.

**Transition Planning and Outcomes:** A majority of youngsters were able to find work placements in the past year, regardless of the participation of parents and guardians in transition planning while they were in school. 65% of the youngsters whose parents or guardians participated in transition planning have a work placement; 35% do not. Major factors behind unsuccessful planning outcomes include: appropriate placements were not available, 62%; the planned placements were only temporary, 13%; youngster did not follow through on transition plan, 25%. 52% of those whose parents and guardians were not involved in transition planning also have a work placement. Major sources of information and referral for these placements included: self (31%); friends/family members (31%); and schools (23%).

## CONCLUSIONS

### **Obstacles to Successful Outcomes of Transition Planning:**

- \* Lack of immediate job opportunities for persons completing post-school training programs;
- \* Waiting lists for activity center and sheltered workshop placements;
- \* Short-term or interrupted placements.

### **Implications for Transition:**

- \* The study finds no evidence that involvement of parents and guardians in formal transition planning through contacts with schools and service providers makes a significant difference in outcomes in the first year out of school.
- \* Many youngsters, especially mainstreamed EMRs, are "on their own", relying upon informal sources to find work placements.

**Comparison of Three Cohorts:** While the 1990 sample differs somewhat in composition from the previous ones, the findings suggest that, at this early stage, the groups do not substantially differ in terms of outcomes. The 1990 cohort had fewer individuals in the SPMR group than the 1986 and 1987 cohorts, and notably more individuals in the PH and SED/LAP

groups. Differences in the proportions of TMRs and EMRs in various types of living, working and training situations, however, are not significant.

#### IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

- \* A second year of follow-up would determine whether obstacles to the successful outcomes of transition planning are overcome. Key points to identify and examine are the primary factors related to eventual placements of those persons: 1) completing training programs, 2) on waiting lists for placements, and 3) whose parents/guardians were not involved in transition planning.
  
- \* After the first year out of school, the outcomes for the 1990 cohort do not differ notably from those of the 1986 and 1987 cohorts at the same point in time. A clearer picture of the effects of the emphasis on transition planning experienced by the 1990 cohort may be obtained by second-year comparisons of the three cohorts.

**STUDY SECTION:  
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The second component of the HWP/CRA research this year involved the continued followup of those who completed school in the 1989-1990 school year. The parents and guardians of these individuals were contacted again this year through the use of a mail survey and telephone follow-up. Respondents were queried as to the youngster's living arrangements, work situations and training experience. Findings for this cohort are of interest because they represent the first wave of graduates since the increased emphasis on transition planning in the school system began in 1989. Their situations can also be compared with those of earlier study cohorts: the 1985-1986 and 1986-1987 completers.

This section will summarize the study findings related to living arrangements, work situations, and training. Conclusions regarding the effects of transition planning, as well as comparisons between the 1990 cohort and the cohorts examined in our previous studies, close out this section.

### LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

SPMR: Of the 7 SPMRs in the sample, 4 (57%) are living in institutions and 3 (43%) are living with parents or guardians.

Total non-SPMR sample: The majority (83%) of the non-SPMR sample lives with parents or guardians, including all but one of the mainstream EMRs. 7 (8%) are living independently, 6 (7%) are in group homes, and 2 (2%) are living in dormitory arrangements provided by their training program.

### WORK SITUATIONS

The SPMR Group: All 4 of those who live in institutions are placed in activities centers. Of the 3 who live with parents or guardians, only 1 is currently in an activities center.

#### Total Non-SPMR Group:

- \* 54 (63%) of the 86 non-SPMRs has one of the work placements listed above.



- \* 28 (33%) persons are engaged in competitive employment: 25 in regular jobs, 3 in supported work. 1 person is holding two jobs.
- \* 10 persons (12%) are currently enrolled in post-school training programs.
- \* 14 persons (16%) have placements in sheltered workshops or activities centers.
- \* 1 person has a volunteer placement.
- \* 32 persons (37%) have no work placement.

### **COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT**

- \* Of the 28 persons engaged in competitive employment, 25 (89%) are EMRs: 6 mainstream and 19 center completers. 1 person from the TMR group and 2 persons from the SED/LAP group.
- \* Supported work positions are held by three persons, 1 each from the center EMR, TMR and SED/LAP groups.
- \* Schools were an important source of job information and referral for of the center EMRs, but not for any of the mainstream EMRs. Two-thirds (67%) of the mainstream EMRs and 26% of the center EMRs found jobs on their own. Training programs referred 5 (18%) of the 28 jobholders.

### **TRAINING AND PLACEMENT**

- \* 11 persons (13%) have completed training programs since last year's interview. Of these, 6 are currently working, 5 are not.
- \* Of the six who completed training courses and are now working, 5 have jobs in the fields for which they were trained: 3 were trained as Child Care Aides and were placed in child care centers; 2 were trained in Food Service and obtained placements at restaurants.
- \* 10 persons now attending training programs include 2 mainstream EMRs (20%), 4 center EMRs (40%), 2 TMRs (20%), and 1 each from the PH and SED/LAP groups.

## TRANSITION PLANNING AND OUTCOMES

The SPMR Group: Only one parent reported being involved in transition planning last year. That parent's youngster was on a waiting list for an activity center last year and is now placed. There was no parent involvement reported for the other 6 individuals. Two of the six live at home, and have no placement. The remaining four live in institutions and are enrolled in activities centers.

### The Non-SPMR Group:

- \* Of the 71 parents and guardians whose youngsters live at home, 30 (65%) reported having participated in transition planning while the youngster was in school; 25 (35%) indicated that they were not involved in transition planning.
- \* A majority of youngsters were able to find work placements, regardless of the participation of parents and guardians in transition planning. 65% of the youngsters whose parents or guardians participated in transition planning have a work placement; 52% of those whose parents and guardians were not involved in transition planning have a work placement.
- \* For 16 of the individuals in the study, the parents were involved in transition planning, but no placement resulted. The reasons for the lack of placements in these cases can be summarized as follows: appropriate placements were not available, 62%; the planned placements were only temporary, 13%; youngster did not follow-through on transition plan, 25%.
- \* 13 persons whose parents reported that they did not participate in transition planning found work placements. Major sources of information and referral for these placements included: self (31%); friends/family members (31%); and schools (23%).

## COMPARISON OF THREE CENTER COHORTS

- \* The proportion of 1990 TMRs placed in activities centers is lower than that of the 1986 and 1987 cohorts combined (15% vs. 29%), while the proportion placed in sheltered workshops is higher (31% vs. 23%). However, because the size of the 1990 TMR sample is small, the significance of these distinctions cannot be determined.

- \* There were no outstanding differences in work placements can be found among center EMR cohorts.
- \* While the 1990 sample differs somewhat in composition from the previous ones, the findings suggest that, one year after completion of school, the groups do not substantially differ in terms of living arrangements and work placements.

#### COMPARISON OF THE TWO MAINSTREAM COHORTS

- \* The 1990 mainstream EMRs showed greater representation in the parent/guardian living arrangement (93%) than their predecessors in the 1987 cohort (80%). This difference, while noteworthy, is not statistically significant.
- \* 43% of the 1990 mainstream EMR group is without work, compared to 27% of the 1987 group. This difference is not statistically significant.

**STUDY SECTION:**  
**FOLLOW-UP OF 1990 COHORT**  
**ONE YEAR AFTER COMPLETION**

## FOLLOW-UP OF 1990 COHORT ONE YEAR AFTER COMPLETION

Last year a new cohort of youngsters, comprised of those who completed school during the 1989-1990 school year, was added to the follow-up project. The parents and guardians of these individuals were contacted again this year in conjunction with the survey of the 1986 and 1987 cohorts. (A detailed discussion of the methodology used in this effort is described in the first section of the report). Parents and guardians who responded to last year's survey were initially sent a mail questionnaire this year; non-respondents were then followed up with a telephone interview. The table below summarizes the results of the efforts to contact and interview the respondents from last year.

### RESPONSE SUMMARY FOR 1990 COHORT

Initial universe (last year's respondents):	102	
Deceased:	1	
-----		
1991 universe:	101	
Type of response	#	(%)
-----		
Parent/guardian completed mail questionnaire	45	(44.6)
Parent/guardian responded to follow-up call	42	(41.6)
CLA supervisor responded to follow-up call	6	(5.9)
Parent/guardian refused to participate	3	(3.0)
Wrong number	1	(1.0)
Phone disconnected/mail undeliverable	3	(3.0)
Unreachable by phone or mail	1	(1.0)
-----		
	101	(100.0)
% responded by mail:	44.6	
% reached by follow-up:	47.5	
-----		
Total response rate:	92.1 %	

As the table shows, a very high response rate, 92%, was achieved through the combination of the mail survey and telephone follow-up. Because of the high response rate, the characteristics of the respondents closely matched those of the initial universe. The characteristics of respondents and non-respondents are shown in table form on page 45 (center completers) and page 46 (mainstream completers).

**COMPARISON OF RESPONDENTS AND NON-RESPONDENTS**  
**Center Completers, 1990 Cohort**

	RESPONDED	DID NOT RESPOND	TOTAL	PERCENT RESPONDING
<b>SCHOOL</b>				
Mon Valley	18	1	19	(95)
Eastern Area	6	2	8	(75)
Sunrise	10	-	10	(100)
Middle Road	16	-	16	(100)
Western Hills	8	-	8	(100)
Pathfinder	21	3	24	(88)
<b>WEALTH RATING OF COMMUNITY</b>				
Very High	19	3	22	(86)
High	20	-	20	(100)
Middle	12	-	12	(100)
Low	11	1	12	(92)
Very Low	11	1	12	(92)
Unknown	6	1	7	(86)
<b>PRIMARY EXCEPTIONALITY</b>				
EMR	43	2	45	(96)
TMR	13	2	15	(87)
SPMR	7	-	7	(100)
PH	9	1	10	(90)
SED/LAP	7	1	8	(88)
<b>SEX</b>				
Male	42	4	46	(91)
Female	37	2	39	(95)
<b>RACE</b>				
White	72	5	77	(94)
Black	7	1	8	(88)
-----				
Total	79	6	85	(93)

**COMPARISON OF RESPONDENTS AND NON-RESPONDENTS**  
**Mainstream Completers, 1990 Cohort**

	<b>RESPONDED</b>	<b>DID NOT RESPOND</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>PERCENT RESPONDING</b>
<b>WEALTH RATING OF COMMUNITY</b>				
Very High	3	-	3	(100)
High	4	-	4	(100)
Middle	-	1	1	-
Low	2	-	2	(100)
Very Low	4	1	5	(80)
Unknown	1	-	1	(100)
<b>SEX</b>				
Male	8	2	10	(80)
Female	6	-	6	(100)
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>				
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>(88)</b>



## LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

**The SPMR Group:** There are 7 persons in the SPMR sample. Of these, 4 (57%) live in institutions, and 3 (43%) live with parents or guardians.

**The Total Non-SPMR Sample:** There are 86 persons in the total non-SPMR sample. The majority (83%) live with parents or guardians, including all but one of the mainstream EMRs. Seven (8%) are living independently, six (7%) are in group homes, and two (2%) are living in dormitory arrangements while enrolled in training programs out of town.

### NON-SPMR LIVING ARRANGEMENTS 1990 Cohort

Living Arrangement	Mainstream		Center		TMR		PH/SED		Total	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Parent/Guardian	13	(93)	35	(81)	10	(77)	13	(81)	71	(83)
Independent	1	(7)	4	(9)	-		2	(13)	7	(8)
CLA, Group Home	-		2	(5)	3	(23)	1	(6)	6	(7)
Dormitory	-		2	(5)	-		-		2	(2)
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>(100)</b>

**Changes in Non-SPMR Living Arrangements:** Of the 86 persons in the sample, 9 (10%) experienced changes in their living arrangements since last year's survey. These changes are described below and also shown in the table on the following page.

Most of those changes involved 6 individuals in the center EMR group: 3 moved from their parent/guardian residences to independent living arrangements, 2 moved from parent/guardian to dormitory living, and 1 moved from independent living to a CLA. In addition, 1 mainstream EMR who was living with parent/guardian last year is now living independently. Two changes occurred in the PH/SED group, both involving a move to independent living: 1 moved out of a parent/guardian residence, another from a dormitory. There were no changes in the living arrangements of the TMR group in the past year.

**COMPARISON OF 1990 AND 1991 NON-SEMR LIVING ARRANGEMENTS  
1990 COHORT**

1990 Living Arrangement	→ 1991 Living Arrangement	Center		EMR Mainstream		TMR		PH/SED		Total	
		#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
<b>NO CHANGES</b>											
Parent/Guardian	→ Parent/Guardian	35	(81)	13	(93)	10	(77)	13	(81)	71	(83)
Independent	→ Independent	1	(2)	-		-		-		1	(1)
CLA	→ CLA	1	(2)	-		3	(23)	1	(6)	5	(6)
								0			
								0			
<b>CHANGES</b>											
Parent/Guardian	→ Independent	3	(7)	1	(7)	-		1	(6)	5	(6)
Parent/Guardian	→ Dormitory	2	(5)	-		-		-		2	(2)
Dormitory	→ Independent	-		-		-		1	(6)	1	(1)
Independent	→ CLA	1	(2)	-		-		-		1	(1)
		43	(100)	14	(100)	13	(30)	16	(114)	86	(100)
<b>NO CHANGES</b>		37	(86)	13	(93)	13	(100)	14	(87)	77	(90)
<b>CHANGES</b>		6	(14)	1	(7)	-		2	(13)	9	(10)
<b>TOTAL</b>		43	(100)	14	(100)	13	(100)	16	(100)	86	(100)

- 48 -

Summary of Changes in Living Arrangements: Since last year, there has been a general movement away from parent/guardian living arrangements (-7) and towards independent living (+5) as well as CLA (+1) and dormitory (+1) arrangements. For the TMR group, there has been no net change in living arrangement. Independent living arrangements increased for the mainstream (+1), EMR (+2) and PH/SED (+2) groups.

SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN LIVING ARRANGEMENTS, NON-SPMR SAMPLE

Living Arrangement	EMR		TMR	PH/SED	Total
	Mainstream	Center			
Parent/Guardian	-1	-5	0	-1	-7
Independent	+1	+2	0	+2	+5
CLA	0	+1	0	0	+1
Institution	0	0	0	0	0
Dormitory	0	+2	0	-1	+1
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0

## WORK SITUATIONS

**The SPMR Group:** Of the 7 persons in the SPMR group, 5 (71%) are enrolled in activities centers. Four of the 5 who have placements are living in institutions, and 1 is living at home. The remaining two who do not have placements are living with parents or guardians.

**The Total Non-SPMR Sample:** Post-school work placements have been arranged for 54 (63%) of the non-SPMR completers. The proportion of completers without a post-school placement differs by exceptionality. For center completers, the proportions range from 31% for those in the TMR group to 38% for those in the PH/SED group. 43% of mainstreamed EMRs are without a placement.

### NON-SPMR WORK SITUATIONS 1990 Cohort

Work Situation	EMR		TMR	PH/SED	Total
	Mainstream	Center			
	# (%)	# (%)	# (%)	# (%)	# (%)
Regular Job(s)	6 (43)	18 (42)	-	1 (6)	25 (29)
Supported Work	-	1 (2)	1 (8)	1 (6)	3 (3)
Training	2 (14)	4 (9)	2 (15)	2 (13)	10 (12)
Volunteer	-	-	-	1 (6)	1 (1)
Sheltered Workshop	-	2 (5)	4 (31)	1 (6)	7 (8)
Activities Center	-	2 (5)	2 (15)	3 (19)	7 (8)
Unknown	-	-	-	1 (6)	1 (1)
No Work Placement	6 (43)	16 (37)	4 (31)	6 (38)	32 (37)
<b>Total</b>	<b>14 (100)</b>	<b>43 (100)</b>	<b>13 (100)</b>	<b>16 (100)</b>	<b>86 (100)</b>

COMPARISON OF 1990 AND 1991 NON-SEMR WORK SITUATIONS  
1990 COHORT

1990 Work Situation	→ 1991 Work Situation	Center		EMR Mainstream		TMR		PH/SED		TOTAL	
		#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
<b>NO CHANGES</b>											
Job	→ Job	17	(40)	3	(21)	-		2	(13)	22	(26)
Sh. Workshop	→ Sh. Workshop	2	(5)	-		4	(31)	-		6	(7)
Training	→ Training	1	(2)	-		-		-		1	(1)
Activity Ctr.	→ Activity Ctr.	1	(2)	-		1	(8)	1	(6)	3	(3)
No work	→ No work	10	(23)	3	(21)	2	(15)	2	(13)	17	(20)
<b>CHANGES</b>											
Training	→ Job	1	(2)	1	(7)	-		-		2	(2)
Sh. Workshop	→ Job	1	(2)	-		-		-		1	(1)
No Work	→ Job	-		2	(14)	1	(8)	-		3	(3)
Job	→ Training	2	(5)	1	(7)	1	(8)	2	(13)	6	(7)
No work	→ Training	1	(2)	1	(7)	1	(8)	-		3	(3)
No Work	→ Sh. Workshop	-		-		-		1	(6)	1	(1)
No work	→ Activity Ctr.	1	(2)	-		-		1	(6)	2	(2)
Sh. Workshop	→ Activity Ctr.	-		-		1	(8)	1	(6)	2	(2)
Summer AC/SW	→ Volunteer	-		-		-		1	(6)	1	(1)
Job	→ No work	5	(12)	2	(14)	1	(8)	2	(13)	10	(12)
Training	→ No Work	1	(2)	1	(7)	-		1	(6)	3	(3)
Activity Ctr.	→ No work	-		-		1	(8)	-		1	(1)
Sh. Workshop	→ No work	-		-		-		1	(6)	1	(1)
Training	→ Unknown	-		-		-		1	(6)	1	(1)
		43	(100)	14	(100)	13	(100)	16	(100)	86	(100)
<b>NO CHANGES</b>		31	(72)	6	(43)	7	(54)	5	(31)	49	(31)
<b>CHANGES</b>		12	(28)	8	(57)	6	(46)	11	(69)	37	(69)
		43	(100)	14	(100)	13	(100)	16	(100)	86	(100)

Summary of Changes in Work Situations

Overall, there was a substantial net loss in competitive employment positions (-10) and sheltered workshop placements (-4). These were offset somewhat by increases in other types of vocational placements, such as training (+3) activities center (+3) and volunteer assignments. However, the net effect of the changes was a net increase in no-work situations (+6).

SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN WORK SITUATIONS, NON-SPMR SAMPLE

Work Situation	EMR		TMR	PH/SED	Total
	Mainstream	Center			
Competitive Employment	0	-5	-1	-4	-10
Training	0	+1	+2	0	+3
Sheltered Workshop	0	-1	-1	-2	-4
Activities Center	0	+1	0	+2	+3
Volunteer	0	0	0	+1	+1
Unknown	0	0	0	+1	+1
No work	0	+4	0	+2	+6
	0	0	0	0	0

## COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT

Of the 28 persons engaged in competitive employment, 25 (89%) are EMRs: 6 mainstream and 19 center completers. Most (89%) of those in competitive employment positions have regular jobs; 11% are in supported work placements. Supported work positions are held by 1 person each from the center EMR, TMR and SED/LAP groups.

### EXCEPTIONALITY OF THOSE WITH COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT

	Regular Job		Supported Work		Total	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Mainstream EMR	6	(24)	-		6	(21)
Center:						
EMR	18	(72)	1	(33)	19	(68)
TMR	-		1	(33)	1	(4)
PH/SED	1	(4)	1	(33)	2	(7)
<b>Total</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>(100)</b>

Nearly one-third (32%) of the center completers, and 67% of the mainstream completers, found their jobs through their own efforts. Persons at school (guidance counselors, teachers) provided information or referral regarding opportunities for 32% of the center completers with jobs; however, this source was not utilized by any of the mainstreamers. Other sources of information included training programs, friends and family members. Two persons found their jobs through MR service agencies, and one person retained a co-op job held while in school.

### SOURCES OF JOB INFORMATION AND REFERRAL

SOURCE	Mainstream		Center		Total	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Student (self)	4	(67)	5	(23)	9	(32)
School	-		7	(32)	7	(25)
Training program	1	(17)	4	(18)	5	(18)
Friend/Family member	1	(17)	3	(14)	4	(14)
MR Agency	-		2	(9)	2	(7)
Co-op Job	-		1	(5)	1	(4)
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>(100)</b>



**Types of Jobs:** As the table below indicates, the food services sector is the single largest source of employment for those with jobs. Of the 28 persons with jobs, 11 (39%) are employed by restaurants, fast-food outlets, or cafeterias. For the most part, these positions are held by center completers: only 1 food service employee is a mainstreamed EMR.

**TYPES OF JOBS HELD BY THOSE WITH COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT**

TYPES OF JOBS	Center		Mainstream		Total	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Restaurant/fast food:	10	(45)	1	(17)	11	(39)
Dishwasher	1	(5)	1	(17)	2	(7)
Busboy	4	(18)	-		4	(14)
Cook	2	(9)	-		2	(7)
Janitor	2	(9)	-		2	(7)
Miscellaneous	1	(5)	-		1	(4)
Other:	12	(55)	5	(83)	17	(61)
Bagger	3	(14)	1	(17)	4	(14)
Janitor	3	(14)	-		3	(11)
Day Care Aide	2	(9)	-		2	(7)
Auto Body Repair	-		1	(17)	1	(4)
Laborer	-		1	(17)	1	(4)
Recyc. Ctr. Driver	-		1	(17)	1	(4)
Drug Store Clerk	-		1	(17)	1	(4)
Farmer	1	(5)	-		1	(4)
Dishwasher	1	(5)	-		1	(4)
Clerical Worker	1	(5)	-		1	(4)
Glass Installer	1	(5)	-		1	(4)
<b>Total</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>(100)</b>

## TRAINING AND PLACEMENT

We noted in last year's report that a substantial number (19) of the 1990 completers were either enrolled in training courses or had planned to enter training programs in the near future. This year's follow-up survey revealed that 21 persons in the sample were attending or had completed training programs. As the table below shows, nearly half (48%) of those with training involvement are center EMRs; 29% are mainstream EMRs; and persons from the TMR, PH and SED groups make up the remaining 25%.

### TRAINING EXPERIENCE OF 1990 COMPLETERS, BY EXCEPTIONALITY

	Still		Completed		Total	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Mainstream EMR	2	(20)	4	(36)	6	(29)
Center:						
EMR	4	(40)	6	(55)	10	(48)
TMR	2	(20)	-		2	(10)
PH	1	(10)	1	(9)	2	(10)
SED/LAP	1	(10)	-	0	1	(5)
<b>Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>(100)</b>

Subject of Training: Within the group of 21 trainees, those enrolled in Food Service made up the largest segment, 9 (43%). In addition, 4 persons (19%) enrolled in Child Care Aide courses. Mercy Hospital was the training agency for the 3 Child Care Aide enrollees, while Community College provided training for Nurse Aide, Janitorial and Food service occupations. Others providing instruction in Food Service include: Vocational Rehabilitation Center, Goodwill, Rainbow Kitchen, and Clelian Heights. A summary table of training programs and providers is presented in the table below.

TRAINING INVOLVEMENT, BY SUBJECT AND PROVIDER AGENCY

Training Subject	CCAC	Mercy Hosp.	H. G. Andrews	Trade School	Other	Total
Food Service	4				5	9
Child Care Aide		3	1			4
Nurse Aide	2					2
Janitorial	2					2
Material Handling				1		1
Clerical			1			1
Laundry Work					1	1
Banking				1		1
	8	3	2	2	6	21

## TRANSITION PLANNING AND OUTCOMES

The 1990 cohort was the first group to complete school since the inception of the initiatives regarding transition planning instituted by the Pennsylvania Department of Education. Accordingly, this section examines the effects of transition planning for the 1990 cohort, as measured by placement outcomes after one year out of school. The data regarding parental involvement in transition planning was taken from last year's survey and pertains only to the period while the youngster was in school.

The SPMR group: There are three individuals who are living with their parents or guardians. Only one parent reported being involved in transition planning last year. That parent's youngster was on a waiting list for an activity center last year and is now placed. There was no parent involvement reported for the other two individuals, and these two have no current placement. No parental involvement was reported for the 4 persons living in institutions; these all have activity center placements.

The total Non-SPMR sample: There are 71 non-SPMRs who live with their parents or guardians. Of the 43 persons whose parents were involved in transition planning, 30 (65%) are in a work placement of some kind. Of the 25 persons whose parents were not involved in transition planning, 13 (52%) are in a work placement. Thus, a majority of youngsters have found work placements, regardless of parental involvement in transition planning. The degree of difference between those with parental participation and those without is not statistically significant.

### NON-SPMR WORK SITUATIONS BY INVOLVEMENT OF PARENT/GUARDIAN IN TRANSITION PLANNING

WORK SITUATION	<u>PARENT/GUARDIAN INVOLVEMENT</u>				TOTAL*	
	<u>NOT INVOLVED</u>		<u>INVOLVED</u>			
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
With work placement	13	(52)	30	(65)	43	(61)
No work placement	12	(48)	16	(35)	28	(39)
	25	(100)	46	(100)	71	(100)

$x^2=1.18$

\*Total is based on those living at home for whom the parent/guardian involvement in transition planning is known.

Why is parental involvement in transition planning not a more meaningful contributor to outcomes? To attempt to address this question, we must further examine two groups of cases: those whose parents were involved but are not working, and those whose parents were not involved but are working.

Parental Involvement in Transition Planning without Placement: For 16 of the individuals in the study, the parents were involved in transition planning, but no placement resulted. An examination of these 16 cases reveals the kinds of circumstances behind the non-placement situation. The table below shows the events that took place for these 16 cases during the one-year period between the initial contact interview and this year's follow-up survey.

NON-SPMRs WITH NO WORK PLACEMENT, PARENT INVOLVED IN PLANNING

1. Evaluated by agency, not placed	4
2. Completed training program, not placed	4
3. On waiting list for placement	2
4. Had summer job last year, not working now	2
5. Entered training program, dropped out	2
6. Planned to enroll in training program, did not follow through	2
-----	
	16

In categories 1-3 above, there was follow-through on the transition plan, but no permanent placement resulted. These 10 cases make up the majority (62%) of the those who have no placement despite parental involvement in planning. In each of these cases, the lack of a placement was due to the unavailability of appropriate placements within the service system or job market. The two cases (13%) in category 4 had a planned placement, but the placement was only temporary. The remaining 4 cases (25%) involve transition planning with no follow-through. Thus the outcomes of transition planning for these cases can be summarized as follows:

- \* Lack of available placements: 62%
- \* Availability of temporary placements only: 13%
- \* Lack of follow-through on transition planning: 25%

Placement without Parental Involvement in Transition Planning. 52% of those whose parents and guardians were not involved in transition planning also have a work placement. Major sources of information and referral for these placements included: self (31%); friends/family members (31%); and schools (23%). Thus, while the parents and guardians of these youngsters were not involved in formal transition planning, many of the youngsters received effective help in securing work placements from other sources, both formal and informal.

SOURCES OF PLACEMENT INFORMATION AND REFERRAL FOR YOUNGSTERS WHOSE PARENTS/GUARDIANS WERE NOT INVOLVED IN TRANSITION PLANNING

Source of Information/Referral	#	(%)
Self (completer)	4	(31)
Friend/family member	4	(31)
School	3	(23)
Training program	1	(8)
Not known	1	(8)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>(100)</b>

**COMPARISON OF WORK AND LIVING ARRANGEMENT OF THREE COHORTS  
ONE YEAR AFTER COMPLETION**

Having examined the living arrangements and work situations of the 1990 cohort, we now consider the question of whether the circumstances of the members of this cohort differ significantly from those of cohorts examined previously in this research: 1986 and 1987 completers. It will be shown that, at the same point in time -- one year after completion -- the groups do not significantly differ in terms of outcomes.

This section focuses on two factors related to the transition from school to adult life: living arrangements and work placements. These two aspects will be examined for the recent group of completers, the 1990 cohort, and compared with those of two previous follow-up groups, the 1986 and 1987 completers. For the two oldest groups, the data used is drawn from the first interview conducted after the individuals completed school. Thus, the comparison of outcomes for the groups relates to situations one year after completion.

It should be noted that the 1990 cohort differed from the 1986 and 1987 cohorts with respect to the proportional representation of each exceptionality group. For example, looking at the table below, we can see that the 1990 center-based cohort contains a larger EMR group (54%) than the combined 1986 and 1987 cohorts (41%). At the same time, the 1990 cohort shows a smaller TMR group (16%) than is found in the combined 1986 and 1987 cohorts (34%). These differences are substantial, but not statistically significant.

1986, 1987 AND 1990 CENTER COMPLETERS, BY PRIMARY EXCEPTIONALITY

Primary Exceptionality	1986 & 1987 Cohorts		1990 Cohort		Total	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
EMR	62	(41)	43	(54)	105	(45)
TMR	52	(34)	13	(16)	65	(28)
SPMR	26	(17)	7	(9)	33	(14)
PH	4	(3)	9	(11)	13	(5)
SED/LAP	8	(5)	7	(9)	15	(8)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>(100)</b>



It is significant that the 1990 cohort contains a higher proportion of persons in the PH and SED/LAP classifications. Sixteen (20%) of the 79 members of the 1990 center cohort are classified PH or SED/LAP. Only 12 (8%) of the combined 152-member 1986 and 1987 cohorts are so classified.

In addition, the 1990 SPMR group, containing 7 members, is the smallest among the three cohorts. In part, this may be attributable to recent changes in the residential arrangements of institutionalized mentally retarded older adults in other counties. Some of these older persons have been relocated to community living arrangements within Allegheny County formerly occupied by younger SPMRs, while some younger persons have been relocated to residences outside Allegheny County. One result is that fewer SPMR completers were enrolled in the six AIU centers.

Because the small sample sizes of these three exceptionality groups prohibits meaningful comparison across cohorts, this analysis will focus on the EMR and TMR groups. In addition, mainstream EMRs will be treated separately from the center EMRs. Because information about the 1986 mainstream EMRs was not available for this study when it first began, the analysis of the mainstream exceptionality group will be confined to the 1987 and 1990 cohorts.

#### Living Arrangements

**TMRs:** As the table below shows, first-year living arrangements of TMRs after one year were quite different between the two comparison groups. Within the combined cohorts, 84% lived with parents and guardians, 8% lived in CLAs, and 8% were in institutions. For the 1990 TMR cohort, 77% lived with parents and guardians, 23% were in CLAs. These differences, while notable, are not statistically significant.

#### FIRST-YEAR LIVING ARRANGEMENTS OF TMRs, 1986, 1987 AND 1990

Living Arrangement	1986 & 1987 Cohorts		1990 Cohort		Total	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Parent/Guardian	45	(84)	10	(77)	55	(85)
CLA, Group Home	3	(8)	3	(23)	6	(9)
Institution	4	(8)	-		4	(6)
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>(100)</b>

**Center EMRs:** As was the case with the TMRs, the comparison of first year living arrangements of the EMRs reveals that parent/guardian living arrangements were less prevalent within the 1990 cohort (81%) than the combined 1986/1987 cohorts (89%). In addition, some members of the 1990 cohort were found to be living in arrangements not featured in the older cohorts: dormitory living (5%), and CLA residence (5%). However, the difference in the proportions of persons living independently is not statistically significant.

**FIRST-YEAR LIVING ARRANGEMENTS OF CENTER EMRS, 1986, 1987 AND 1990**

Living Arrangement	1986 & 1987 Cohorts		1990 Cohort		Total	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Parent/Guardian	55	(89)	35	(81)	90	(86)
Independent	5	(8)	4	(9)	9	(9)
Dormitory	-		2	(5)	2	(2)
CLA, Group Home	-		2	(5)	2	(2)
Institution	1	(2)	-		1	(1)
Unknown	1	(2)	-		1	(1)
<b>Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>(100)</b>

**Mainstream EMRs:** First-year living arrangements for the 1987 mainstream cohort fell into two categories: parent/guardian (80%) and independent (20%). In contrast to the 1990 TMRs and EMRs examined above, the 1990 mainstream EMRs showed greater representation in the parent/guardian living arrangement (93%) than their predecessors in the 1987 cohort. Again, this difference, while noteworthy, is not statistically significant.

**FIRST-YEAR LIVING ARRANGEMENTS OF MAINSTREAM EMRS, 1987 AND 1990**

Living Arrangements	1987 Cohort		1990 Cohort		Total	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Parent/guardian	24	(80)	13	(93)	37	(84)
Independent	6	(20)	1	(7)	7	(16)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>(100)</b>

## Work Placements

**TMRs:** Two conspicuous differences between the 1990 cohort and the earlier cohorts are evident from the table below. The first is that the 1990 cohort showed a smaller proportion of persons without a work placement (31%) than the combined 1986/1987 groups (40%). The second is that the proportion of 1990 TMRs placed in activities centers is lower (15% vs. 29%), while the proportion placed in sheltered workshops is higher (31% vs. 23%). In addition, two persons from the 1990 cohort were enrolled in training programs, while none were found to be in training in the other first-year groups. However, because the size of the 1990 TMR sample is small and therefore distributed widely among these various placements, the significance of these distinctions cannot be determined.

### FIRST-YEAR WORK SITUATIONS OF TMRs, 1986/1987 AND 1990 COHORTS

Living Arrangement	1986 & 1987 Cohorts		1990 Cohort		Total	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Competitive Employment	3	(6)	1	(8)	4	(6)
Training	-		2	(15)	2	(3)
Volunteer	1	(2)	-		1	(2)
Sheltered Workshop	12	(23)	4	(31)	16	(25)
Activities Center	15	(29)	2	(15)	17	(26)
No Activity	21	(40)	4	(31)	25	(38)
<b>Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>(100)</b>

**Center EMRs:** While the more numerous EMR cohorts afford a better opportunity for significant comparisons, it can be seen from the table below that no outstanding differences in work placements can be found among the two groups.

**FIRST-YEAR WORK SITUATIONS OF EMRs, 1986/1987 AND 1990 COHORTS**

Work Situation	1986 & 1987 Cohorts		1990 Cohort		Total	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Competitive Employment	28	(45)	19	(44)	47	(45)
Training	2	(3)	4	(9)	6	(6)
Sheltered Workshop	5	(8)	2	(5)	7	(7)
Activities Center	3	(5)	2	(5)	5	(5)
Unknown	1	(2)	-		1	(1)
No Activity	23	(37)	16	(37)	39	(37)
<b>Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>(100)</b>

**Mainstream EMRs:** Although 43% of the 1990 mainstream group is without work, compared to 27% of the 1987 group, the difference is not great enough to be significant.

**FIRST-YEAR WORK SITUATIONS OF MAINSTREAM EMRs, 1987 AND 1990**

Work Situation	1987 Cohort		1990 Cohort		Total	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Competitive Employment	17	(57)	6	(43)	23	(52)
Training	5	(17)	2	(14)	7	(16)
Unknown	1	(3)	-		1	(2)
No Work	8	(27)	6	(43)	14	(32)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>(100)</b>

**Summary:** While the 1990 sample differs somewhat in composition from the previous ones, the findings suggest that, one year after completion of school, the groups do not substantially differ in terms of outcomes. The 1990 cohort has fewer individuals in the SPMR group than the 1986 and 1987 cohorts, and more individuals in the PH and SED/LAP groups. Differences in the proportions of TMRs and EMRs in various types of living, working and training situations, however, are not significant.

**FOLLOW-UP OF MENTALLY RETARDED YOUTH:  
1991 SCHOOL COMPLETERS**

## **FOLLOW-UP OF MENTALLY RETARDED YOUTH: 1991 SCHOOL COMPLETERS**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The third aspect of the HWP/CRA research this year involves following an additional cohort of youngsters, those completing school in the 1990-1991 school year. Parents and guardians of youngsters who completed their educations in the Allegheny Intermediate Unit's (AIU's) special education programs were contacted. Youngsters with an MR involvement of any degree who had attended one of the six special education centers were followed. Also included in the 1991 sample were youngsters who had been in mainstreamed MR classes under AIU auspices in regular district high schools. These individuals were all classified educable mentally retarded (EMR). The respondents were interviewed in the summer immediately following their youngster's graduation from school.

As in studies from previous years, respondents were queried as to youngster's living arrangement and work situations, including jobs held during the time the youngster was attending school, and post-school placements planned or in progress. They were also asked to supply information about household size, family income and ages of parents. In addition, parents were queried as to their involvement in transition planning for their youngsters, using questions asked last year of the 1990 cohort. While findings for this cohort are of interest in themselves, it is also helpful to compare their characteristics with those of last year's cohort at the time of school completion.

This section of the report, then, presents findings as to living arrangements, work situations arranged and in-progress, and training. Conclusions regarding transition planning, and comparisons between the 1990 cohort, are also included.

### **FINDINGS**

**Living Arrangements:** The vast majority (85%) of the total non-SPMR sample live with parents or guardians, including 92% of the mainstreamed EMRs and all of the SED/LAPs. Two others (3%), one mainstream and one center EMR, live independently. An additional six (8%), including three EMRs, are in group situations or CLAs.

**Work Situations:** Post-school work placements have been arranged for 41 (55%) of the non-SPMR completers. The proportion of completers without a post-school placement differs by exceptionality. For center completers, the proportions range from 22% for those in the PH/SED group to 61% for those in the TMR group. 33% of mainstreamed EMRs are without a placement.



**Post-school Job Placements:** Of those who have job placements, 30% have summer jobs; 70% have permanent placements. None of the jobholders is in a supported work placement.

**Post-school Training:** Nine persons (12%) have training placements planned or in progress. 22% of those in training programs are center EMRs, 55% are mainstreamed. Four training subjects are being pursued: food service, 33%; child care 33%; janitorial 22%; and teacher aide 11%.

**Parent Involvement in Transition Planning:** 78% of parents/guardians within the TMR group, and 83% of parents/guardians within the SED/LAP group indicated some involvement in post-school planning. The lowest participation rates were found among the mainstream (50%) and center EMRs (44%). 67% of those in the PH group reported some involvement in planning. Participation rates were significantly lower for respondents with annual family incomes under \$25,000. Also notable is that post-school placement rates are significantly lower for individuals from families with incomes under \$25,000. Rates of post-school placement are significantly higher for individuals whose parents or guardians reported that they were involved in transition planning.

## CONCLUSIONS

**Obstacles to Full Parental Involvement in Transition Planning:** Lower rates of participation in transition planning are found among lower-income families, and families of mainstream and center-based EMRs.

### **Comparison of 1990 and 1991 Cohorts:**

- \* The 1991 TMR group shows a significantly higher proportion of completers without a post-school work placement (61%) than did the 1990 TMR group (27%) last year.
- \* A significantly smaller proportion of families with incomes under \$25,000 are found within the 1991 cohort (46%) than was found within the 1990 cohort (64%).
- \* The proportions of parents and guardians participating in transition planning are nearly identical for the 1990 cohort (59%) and the 1991 cohort (57%).
- \* 1991 parents and guardians were twice as likely to attend a transition planning meeting (23%) than the 1990 parents and guardians (11%).



## **IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

- \* The examination of the 1990 cohort one year after completion discerned no significant correlation between parent involvement in transition planning and work outcomes. Continued follow-up of both the 1990 and the 1991 cohorts would yield a larger body of data with which to address this issue and reach more reliable conclusions.
  
- \* Mainstream EMRs in both the 1990 and 1991 cohort showed the lowest rates of parental involvement in transition planning. The 1992 cohort of completers will be the first to graduate since the restructuring of the special education program and increased emphasis on mainstreaming. Collection of information on the next cohort of completers would allow a comparison with the 1990 and 1991 cohorts. Key points to be examined would include: 1) the effects of the restructuring on the level of parent involvement in transition planning, and 2) the effects of restructuring on the post-school placement rates of completers.

**STUDY SECTION:  
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The third aspect of the HWP/CRA project underwritten by the Edith L. Trees Charitable Trust research this year involved following an additional cohort of youngsters, those completing school in the 1990-1991 school year. Parents and guardians of youngsters who completed their educations in the Allegheny Intermediate Unit's (AIU's) special education programs were contacted. Youngsters with an MR involvement of any degree who had attended one of the six special education centers were followed. Also included in the 1991 sample were youngsters who had been in mainstreamed MR classes under AIU auspices in regular district high schools. These individuals were all classified educable mentally retarded (EMR). The respondents were interviewed in the summer immediately following their youngster's graduation from school.

As with last year's cohort, respondents were queried as to youngster's living arrangement and post-school work placements planned or in progress. They were also asked to supply information about household size, family income and ages of parents. The survey also included questions asking parents about their involvement in transition planning for the youngster. Findings for this cohort are of interest in light of the state-level emphasis placed upon transition planning since 1989, particularly when compared with those of last year's cohort, the first group of completers involved in this particular planning approach.

This section will summarize the study findings. It will include aspects of living arrangements, work situations arranged and in-progress, and training. Conclusions regarding transition planning and comparisons between the 1991 cohort and the 1990 cohort as examined in last year's study close out this section.

### LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

SPMR: 31% (4 of 13) SPMRs live in institutions, 46% live with parents or guardians, and 23% live in group living arrangements or CLAs.

Total non-SPMR sample: The vast majority (85%) of the total non-SPMR sample lives with parents or guardians, including 92% of the mainstreamed EMRs and all of the SED/LAPs. Two others (3%), one mainstream and one center EMRs, live independently. An additional six (8%), including three EMRs, are in group situations or CLAs.

## WORK SITUATIONS

For this report, post-school work situations refer both to those that are: 1) in progress at the time of the interview, and 2) imminent, i.e., arrangements are definite and placements are scheduled to begin within a few months. They include: 1) summer jobs, and 2) combinations of work and training, in which the duration of the work is for the summer and the training portion is to begin in the fall. Work situations in this context include involvements in sheltered workshops, activities centers, training and competitive employment.

The SPMR Group: Six (46%) of the 13 individuals in the SPMR group are attending activities programs; all 6 are living in group residences or institutions. Seven are not attending activities programs; 6 live at home and 1 lives in an institution. Of the 7 who are not attending activities programs, 3 are on waiting lists with no definite starting date; the remainder have no placements arranged or planned.

### Total Non-SPMR Group:

- \* Post-school work placements have been arranged for 41 (55%) of the non-SPMR completers.
- \* 27 persons (36% of the non-SPMR sample) have placements involving competitive employment, which includes regular jobs, supported work, and summer jobs.
- \* 9 persons (12%) have training placements planned or in progress. 4 of these plan to enter training programs after working in summer or temporary jobs.
- \* 4 persons in the sample (5%) are in work situations that are only for the summer and have no planned placements beyond August of 1991.
- \* 45% of all the non-SPMR completers have no arrangements for post-school work placements.
- \* The proportion of completers without a post-school placement differs by exceptionality. For center completers, the proportions range from 22% for those in the PH/SED groups to 61% for those in the TMR group. 33% of mainstreamed EMRs are without a placement and 47% of the center EMRs have no placement.
- \* None of these without a post-school placement are on waiting lists, or have a planned placement with a definite starting date.

## **JOB PLACEMENTS**

Post-school job placements include regular jobs, summer jobs and supported work. Jobholders are found mainly in the EMR group, both center (59%) and mainstream (19%).

- \* Of those who have job placements, 30% have summer jobs; 70% have permanent placements. No one is in a supported work position.
- \* The vast majority of job placements (59%) involve work at restaurants, fast food outlets and cafeterias.
- \* Friends or family members were a source of job information and referral for 37% of job placements. 22% of the job placements were obtained through MH/MR agencies and 22% were obtained through the student's own efforts. Schools were a source of information or referral for only 4% of the job placements.

## **POST-SCHOOL TRAINING PLACEMENTS**

- \* 9 (12%) of non-SPMRs have begun or will begin training programs.
- \* 2 of those in training programs are center EMRs, 5 are mainstreamed; 1 is a TMR; and 1 is SED/LAP.
- \* Four training subjects are being pursued: food service, (3 students); child care (3); janitorial (2); and teacher aide (1).

## **PARENT/GUARDIAN PARTICIPATION IN TRANSITION PLANNING**

Parents utilize several measures to plan and arrange future work placements, including: 1) meeting with (or calling) guidance counselors or teachers, 2) attending a transition planning meeting; 3) contacting government agencies or providers of vocational services, such as training programs and sheltered workshops; 4) networking and parent groups.

The SPMR Group: All of the parents who were contacted reported that they were involved in placement planning.

### The Non-SPMR Group:

- \* 57% of the respondents indicated that they participated in transition planning.
- \* 78% of parents/guardians within the TMR group, and 83% of parents/guardians within the SED/LAP group indicated some involvement in planning. The lowest participation

rates were found among the mainstream (50%) and center EMR (44%). 67% of those in the PH group reported some involvement in planning.

- \* The most frequent planning measures taken by parents include: meeting with the guidance counselor (33%); contacting the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation (31%); and contacting the Allegheny County MH/MR office (25%).
- \* 23% of the respondents reported that they had attended a transition planning meeting.
- \* Only one respondent reported directly contacting a provider agency in the course of transition planning.
- \* 41% reported that they had contacted school personnel (guidance counselor or teacher) or attended a transition planning meeting.
- \* The participation rate for respondents from families with annual incomes over \$25,000 was 74%; for those with annual incomes below \$25,000, 46%. This difference was statistically significant.
- \* Post-school placements are arranged or in progress for 65% of the individuals whose parents or guardians reported that they were involved in transition planning, and 32% of those whose parents were not involved. This was a statistically significant difference.
- \* 79% of the completers from families with annual incomes of \$25,000 or more have a post-school placement, compared to 27% of those from families with incomes under \$25,000. This difference was statistically significant.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

### **Obstacles to Full Parental Involvement in Transition Planning**

- \* Lower rates of participation in transition planning among lower-income families.
- \* Lower participation rates among families of mainstream and center EMRs.

### **Outcome of Full Parental Involvement in Transition Planning**

- \* Significantly higher rate of in-progress or arranged post-school placements for individuals who had parents or guardians involved in transitional planning.

**STUDY SECTION:**  
**FOLLOW-UP OF MENTALLY RETARDED YOUTH:**  
**1991 SCHOOL COMPLETERS**



## **FOLLOW-UP OF MENTALLY RETARDED YOUTH: 1991 SCHOOL COMPLETERS**

The third segment of the HWP/CRA research this year involves following an additional cohort of youngsters, those completing school in the 1990-1991 school year. Parents and guardians of youngsters who completed their educations in the Allegheny Intermediate Unit's (AIU's) special education programs were contacted. Youngsters with an MR involvement of any degree who had attended one of the six special education centers were followed. Also included in the 1991 sample were youngsters who had been in mainstreamed MR classes under AIU auspices in regular district high schools. These individuals were all classified educable mentally retarded (EMR). The respondents were interviewed in the summer immediately following their youngster's graduation from school.

Telephone interviews were used to survey parents and guardians of the 1991 completers. Where completers were residing in institutions or CLAs, resident supervisors or counselors were contacted.

As in studies from previous years, respondents were queried as to youngster's living arrangement and work situations, including jobs held during the time the youngster was attending school, and post-school placements planned or in progress. They were also asked to supply information about household size, family income and ages of parents. In addition, parents were queried as to their involvement in transition planning for their youngsters, using questions asked last year of the 1990 cohort. While findings for this cohort are of interest in themselves, it is also helpful to compare their characteristics with those of last year's cohort at the time of school completion.

This section of the report, then, presents findings as to living arrangements, work situations arranged and in-progress, and training. Conclusions regarding transition planning, and comparisons between the 1990 cohort, are also included.

## THE STUDY SAMPLE

As the table shows, a very high response rate, 89.8%, was achieved through the use of the telephone interview. Because of the high response rate, the characteristics of the respondents closely matched those of the initial universe. Comparisons of respondents and non-respondents are shown in table form on page 71 (center completers) and page 72 (mainstream completers). The characteristics of the final sample are presented on pages 73 and 74.

### RESPONSE SUMMARY Survey of the 1991 Cohort

Initial universe:	101	
Declined to participate:	3	
-----		
1991 universe:	98	
Type of response	#	%
-----		
Parent/guardian responded to follow-up call	81	(82.7)
CLA supervisor responded to follow-up call	7	(7.1)
Wrong number	4	(4.1)
Phone disconnected	2	(2.0)
Unreachable by phone or mail	4	(4.1)
-----		
	98	(100)
Total response rate:	89.8 %	

**COMPARISON OF RESPONDENTS AND NON-RESPONDENTS**  
**Center Completers, 1991 Cohort**

	RESPONDED	DID NOT RESPOND	TOTAL	PERCENT RESPONDING
<b>SCHOOL</b>				
Mon Valley	27	-	27	(100)
Eastern Area	10	1	11	(91)
Sunrise	12	3	15	(80)
Middle Road	10	1	11	(91)
Western Hills	13	-	13	(100)
Pathfinder	4	1	5	(80)
<b>WEALTH RATING</b>				
Very High	10	1	11	(91)
High	19	-	19	(100)
Middle	13	1	14	(93)
Low	10	3	13	(77)
Very Low	17	1	18	(54)
Unknown	7	-	7	(100)
<b>PRIMARY EXCEPTIONALITY</b>				
EMR	36	3	39	(92)
TMR	18	1	19	(95)
SPMR	13	-	13	(100)
PH	3	-	3	(100)
SED/LAP	6	2	8	(75)
<b>SEX</b>				
Male	39	3	42	(93)
Female	37	3	40	(93)
<b>RACE</b>				
White	60	5	65	(92)
Black	16	1	17	(94)
-----				
Total	76	6	82	(93)

**COMPARISON OF RESPONDENTS AND NON-RESPONDENTS**  
**Mainstream Completers, 1991 Cohort**

	RESPONDED	DID NOT RESPOND	TOTAL	PERCENT RESPONDING
<b>WEALTH RATING</b>				
Very High	4	-	4	(100)
High	2	-	2	(100)
Middle	1	1	2	(50)
Low	2	-	4	(50)
Very Low	-	2	2	-
Unknown	1	1	2	(50)
<b>SEX</b>				
Male	4	4	8	(50)
Female	8	-	8	(100)
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>				
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>(75)</b>

**CHARACTERISTICS OF THE 1991 SAMPLE**  
**Center Completers**

	#	(%)
<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>		
<b>School</b>		
Mon Valley	27	(36)
Eastern Area	10	(13)
Sunrise	12	(16)
Middle Road	10	(13)
Western Hills	13	(17)
Pathfinder	4	(5)
<b>Primary Exceptionality</b>		
EMR	36	(47)
TMR	18	(24)
SPMR	13	(17)
SED/LAP	6	(8)
PH	3	(4)
<b>Secondary Disability</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>(%)</b>
SED/LAP	4	(5)
Wheelchair-user	1	(1)
Hearing	1	(1)
Spina Bifida	1	(1)
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>(9)</b>
<b>Race</b>		
White	60	(79)
Black	16	(21)
	<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>	<hr style="border-top: 1px dashed black;"/>
	76	(100)

**CHARACTERISTICS OF THE 1991 SAMPLE**  
**Center and Mainstream Completers**

	1991 Mainstream		1991 Center		Total	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
<b>Sex</b>						
Male	4	(33)	39	(51)	43	(49)
Female	8	(67)	37	(49)	45	(51)
<b>Birth Year</b>						
1969	-		12	(16)	12	(14)
1970	1	(8)	41	(54)	42	(48)
1971	1	(8)	5	(7)	6	(7)
1972	8	(67)	8	(11)	16	(18)
1973	1	(8)	7	(9)	8	(9)
Unknown	1	(8)	3	(4)	4	(5)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>(100)</b>

## LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

**SPMR:** There are 13 persons in the SPMR group. Of these, 31% live in institutions, 46% live with parents or guardians, and 23% live in group living arrangements or CLAs.

**Total non-SPMR sample:** The non-SPMR group is comprised of 75 persons. The vast majority (85%) of the sample live with parents or guardians, including 92% of the mainstreamed EMRs and all of the SED/LAPs. Two others (3%), one mainstream and one center EMRs, live independently. An additional six (8%), including three EMRs, are in group situations or CLAs.

### NON-SPMR LIVING ARRANGEMENTS, 1991 COHORT

Living Arrangement	EMR		TMR	PH/SED	Total					
	Mainstream	Center								
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)				
Parent/Guardian	11	(92)	30	(83)	16	(89)	7	(78)	64	(85)
Independent	1	(8)	2	(6)	-	-	-	-	3	(4)
CLA, Group Home	-	-	3	(8)	2	(11)	1	(11)	6	(8)
Institution	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	(11)	1	(1)
YMCA Shelter	-	-	1	(3)	-	-	-	-	1	(1)
<b>Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>(100)</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>(100)</b>



## WORK SITUATIONS

For this report, post-school work situations refer both to those that are: 1) in progress at the time of the interview, and 2) imminent, i.e., arrangements are definite and placements have a scheduled starting date. They include involvements in sheltered workshops, activities centers, training and competitive employment. Competitive employment includes: 1) summer jobs, which have a definite termination point; 2) regular jobs, which are considered to be permanent placements; and 3) combinations of separate work and training arrangements, in which the duration of the work is for the summer and the training portion is to begin in the fall.

The SPMR Group: Six (46%) of the 13 individuals in the SPMR group are attending activities programs; all 6 are living in group residences or institutions. Seven are not attending activities programs; 6 live at home and 1 lives in an institution. Of the 7 who are not attending activities programs, 3 are waiting lists with no definite starting date; the remainder have no placements arranged or planned.

### Total Non-SPMR Group:

- \* Post-school work placements have been arranged for 41 (55%) of the non-SPMR completers.
- \* 27 persons (36% of the non-SPMR sample) have placements involving competitive employment, which includes regular jobs and summer jobs.
- \* 9 persons (12%) have training placements planned or in progress. 4 of these plan to enter training programs after working in summer or temporary jobs.
- \* 4 persons in the sample (5%) are in work situations that are only for the summer and have no planned placements beyond August of 1991.
- \* 45% of all the non-SPMR completers have no arrangements for post-school work placements.
- \* The proportion of completers without a post-school placement differs by exceptionality. For center completers, the proportions range from 22% for those in the PH/SED groups to 61% for those in the TMR group. 33% of mainstreamed EMRs are without a placement and 47% of the center EMRs have no placement.
- \* None of those without a post-school placement are on waiting lists, or have a planned placement with a definite starting date.

NON-SPMR WORK SITUATIONS BY PRIMARY EXCEPTIONALITY, 1991  
1991 Cohort

POST-SCHOOL WORK ACTIVITY	EMR		Center # (%)	TMR		PH/SED		Total	
	Mainstream # (%)			# (%)	# (%)	# (%)	# (%)	# (%)	
Regular Job	3 (25)		13 (36)	1 (6)		2 (22)		19 (25)	
Training	3 (25)		2 (6)	-		-		5 (7)	
Work, Training	2 (17)		-	1 (6)		1 (11)		4 (5)	
Summer Job	-		3 (8)	-		1 (11)		4 (5)	
Sheltered Workshop	-		-	-		1 (11)		1 (1)	
Activities Center	-		1 (3)	5 (28)		2 (22)		8 (11)	
No Work Placement	4 (33)		17 (47)	11 (61)		2 (22)		34 (45)	
<b>Total</b>	<b>12 (100)</b>		<b>36 (100)</b>	<b>18 (100)</b>		<b>9 (100)</b>		<b>75 (100)</b>	

## JOB PLACEMENTS

Post-school job placements include permanent jobs, summer jobs and supported work. There are 27 persons with job placements in the sample. Jobholders are found mainly in the EMR group, both center (59%) and mainstream (19%).

### EXCEPTIONALITY OF WORKERS IN 1991

Exceptionality	#	(%)
-----		
Mainstream	5	(19)
Center:		
EMR	16	(59)
SED/LAP	4	(15)
TMR	2	(7)
-----		
Total	27	(100)

- \* Of those who have job placements, 30% have summer jobs; 70% have permanent placements. No one is in a supported work placement.
- \* Friends or family members were a source of job information and referral for 37% of job placements. 22% of the job placements were obtained through MH/MR agencies and 22% were obtained through the student's own efforts. Schools were a source of information or referral for only 4% of the job placements.
- \* The vast majority of job placements (59%) involve work at restaurants, fast food outlets and cafeterias. In fact, 84% of the permanent placements fall into this category. A complete list of summer and permanent job placements appears on the following page.

### TYPES OF SUMMER AND PERMANENT JOBS

TYPES OF JOBS	Summer		Permanent		Total	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Restaurant/cafeteria	-		16	(84)	16	(59)
Dishwasher	-		3	(16)	3	(11)
Busboy	-		1	(5)	1	(4)
Food service	-		3	(16)	3	(11)
Miscellaneous	-		8	(42)	8	(30)
Waiter/Waitress	-		1	(5)	1	(4)
Other:	8	(100)	3	(16)	11	(41)
Assembler	2	(25)	-		2	(7)
Janitor	2	(25)	-		2	(7)
Laborer	1	(13)	-		1	(4)
Child Care Aide	1	(13)	-		1	(4)
Clerical	1	(13)	-		1	(4)
Beauty Shop Asst.	1	(13)	-		1	(4)
Cust. Serv. Clerk	-		1	(5)	1	(4)
Newspaper Delivery	-		1	(5)	1	(4)
Gas Station Attendant	-		1	(5)	1	(4)
Total	8	(100)	19	(100)	27	(100)

### POST-SCHOOL TRAINING PLACEMENTS

- \* 9 (12%) of non-SPMRs have begun or will begin training programs.
- \* 2 of those in training programs are center EMRs, 5 are mainstreamed; 1 is a TMR; and 1 is SED/LAP.
- \* Four training subjects are being pursued: food service, (3 students); child care (3); janitorial (2); and teacher aide (1).

## TRANSITION PLANNING

Parents utilize several measures to plan and arrange future work placements, including: 1) meeting with (or calling) guidance counselors or teachers, 2) attending a transition planning meeting; 3) contacting government agencies or providers of vocational services, such as training programs or sheltered workshops; 4) networking and parent groups. Parents were considered to be involved in, or participating in, transition planning if they utilize at least one of these resources.

The SPMR Group: All of the parents who were contacted reported that they were involved in transition planning.

### The Non-SPMR Group:

- \* 57% of the respondents indicated that they participated in transition planning.
- \* 78% of parents/guardians within the TMR group, and 83% of parents/guardians within the SED/LAP group indicated some involvement in planning. The lowest participation rates were found among the mainstream (50%) and center EMRs (44%). 67% of those in the PH group reported some involvement in planning.
- \* The most frequent planning measures taken by parents include: meeting with the guidance counselor (33%); contacting the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation (31%); and contacting the Allegheny County MH/MR office (25%).
- \* 23% of the respondents reported that they had attended a transition planning meeting.
- \* Only one respondent reported directly contacting a provider agency in the course of transition planning.
- \* 41% reported that they had contacted school personnel (guidance counselor or teacher) or attended a transition planning meeting.

A table showing all of the methods used in transition planning by parents and guardians appears on the following page.

**PARENT/GUARDIAN INVOLVEMENT IN TRANSITION PLANNING**  
**Non-SPMRs, 1991 Cohort**

Parental involvement in transition planning	EMR		TMR (N=18) %	PH (N=3) %	SED/LAP (N=6) %	Total (N=75) %
	Mainstream (N=12) %	Center (N=36) %				
Parent involved, steps taken:	50	44	78	67	83	57
Attended transition meeting	17	19	33	33	17	23
Met with counselor	50	22	50	33	17	33
Met with MH/MR	-	19	61	-	17	25
Met with OVR	42	28	22	33	50	31
Met with teacher	-	14	6	33	33	12
Met with representative of activities center	-	-	6	-	-	1
Parent not involved	50	47	22	-	17	37
Parent involvement unknown	-	8	-	33	-	5

- 91 -

**Transition Planning and Outcomes:** Post-school placements are arranged or in progress for 65% of the individuals whose parents or guardians reported that they were involved in transition planning, and 32% of those whose parents were not involved. This was a statistically significant difference.

**PLACEMENT BY PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN TRANSITION PLANNING**

ANY POST-SCHOOL WORK PLACEMENT?	<u>PARENT/GUARDIAN INVOLVEMENT</u>				TOTAL *	
	NOT INVOLVED		INVOLVED			
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
NO	19	(68)	15	(35)	34	(48)
YES	9	(32)	28	(65)	37	(52)
	28	(100)	43	(100)	71	(100)

\* Total includes only those for whom income and involvement were known.

$x^2 = 7.39, p. < .001$

**Transition Planning and Family Income:** As the table below indicates, there is a significant difference between the rate of involvement in transition planning of low-income parents and that of higher-income parents. 74% of the parents with incomes of \$25,000 or more reported that they took part in transition planning, while only 46% of the low-income parents indicated that they were involved.

**INVOLVEMENT IN TRANSITION PLANNING, BY FAMILY INCOME**

PARENT/GUARDIAN INVOLVEMENT IN TRANSITION PLANNING	<u>PARENT/GUARDIAN INCOME</u>				TOTAL *	
	< \$25,000		\$25,000+			
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
Not Involved	18	(54)	9	(26)	27	(40)
Involved	15	(46)	26	(74)	41	(60)
	33	(100)	40	(100)	68	(100)

\* Total includes only those for whom income and involvement were known.

$x^2 = 5.89, p = .015$



Income also correlates strongly with placement outcomes. As the table below indicates, 79% of the completers from families with annual incomes of \$25,000 or more have a post-school placement, compared to 27% of those from families with incomes under \$25,000. This difference was statistically significant.

<u>PARENT/GUARDIAN INCOME</u>						
ANY POST-SCHOOL WORK PLACEMENT?	< \$25,000		\$25,000+		TOTAL *	
	#	(%)	#	(%)	#	(%)
NO	24	(73)	8	(21)	32	(45)
YES	9	(27)	30	(79)	39	(55)
	33	(100)	38	(100)	71	(100)

\* Total includes only those for whom income and involvement were known.

$\chi^2 = 19.05$   
 $p. < .001$

## COMPARISON OF TWO COHORTS

The 1991 cohort examined here and the 1990 cohort described in the second section of this report have certain factors in common which present an opportunity for comparison. First, they both completed school after the institution of transition planning initiatives in the school system. Secondly, they were both brought into the research project during the summer immediately after they completed school, rather than one year later, as was the case with the 1986 and 1987 cohorts. Thus, it is possible to compare a number of findings, including those related to transition planning and placements, from this year's survey of the 1991 cohort and last year's survey of the 1990 cohort. This section presents those comparisons.

**Exceptionality:** The two cohorts contained nearly the same proportions of mainstream and center EMRs, as well as TMRs. However, the proportion of SPMRs in the 1991 cohort (15%) was more than twice that found in the 1990 cohort (7%), while the proportion of PHs and SED/LAPs combined (10%) was nearly half that of the 1990 cohort (18%).

EXCEPTIONALITY	1990		1991	
	#	(%)	#	(%)
Mainstream EMR	16	(16)	12	(14)
Center EMR	46	(45)	36	(41)
TMR	15	(15)	18	(20)
SPMR	7	(7)	13	(15)
SED/LAP	10	(10)	6	(7)
PH	8	(8)	3	(3)
	102	(100)	88	(100)

**Transition Planning:** The extent of parental involvement in transition planning was nearly identical among the non-SPMR groups in each cohort.

### PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN TRANSITION PLANNING 1990 and 1991 Non-SPMRs

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT IN TRANSITION PLANNING	1990		1991	
	#	(%)	#	(%)
Involved in Planning	56	(59)	43	(57)
Not involved in Planning	36	(38)	28	(37)
Involvement Not Known	3	(3)	4	(5)
	95	(100)	75	(100)

**Non-SPMR Post-School Placements:** There were some differences in the numbers and types of post-school placements between the 1990 cohort and the 1991 cohort. The proportion of 1990 completers who were placed in summer jobs with subsequent training enrollments (13%) was more than twice that of the 1991 cohort (5%). The 1990 cohort also contained a higher proportion of sheltered workshop placements (8% vs. 1%), but a lower proportion of activities center placements (5% vs. 11%). Unlike the 1990 cohort, the 1991 cohort was not characterized by any supported work or summer activities center/sheltered workshop placements. None of these differences are statistically significant.

**NON-SPMR POST-SCHOOL PLACEMENTS**  
1990 and 1991 Non-SPMRs

POST-SCHOOL WORK ACTIVITY	1990		1991	
	#	(%)	#	(%)
Regular Job	21	(22)	19	(25)
Summer Job	4	(4)	4	(5)
Supported Work	1	(1)	-	
Work, then training	12	(13)	4	(5)
Training	7	(7)	5	(7)
Sheltered Workshop	8	(8)	1	(1)
Activities Center	5	(5)	8	(11)
Summer AC/SW	5	(5)	-	
No Work Placement	32	(34)	34	(45)
Total	95	(100)	75	(100)

From the standpoint of transition planning, the difference which is most conspicuous is the higher proportion of 1991 completers with no work placement, 45%, compared to 34% for the 1990 cohort. Stated another way, the post-school placement rate for the 1990 cohort was 66%, compared to 55% for the 1991 cohort. Indeed, placement rates differ not only between the two cohorts, but also between similar exceptionality groups. As the table below shows, the 1991 mainstream EMRs showed a higher rate of post-school placement (67%) than those in the 1990 cohort (50%). In addition, 100% of the 1991 PH group were placed, compared to 60% for the 1990 PH group. On the other hand, the 1990 cohort was characterized by comparatively higher placements rates for the center EMRs (67% vs. 47% in the 1990 cohort), SED/LAPs (88% vs. 67%) and TMRs (73% vs. 39%). The contrast between the two TMR groups is statistically significant, while the other differences are not.

PERCENT WITH POSTSCHOOL PLACEMENT, BY EXCEPTIONALITY  
1990 and 1991 Cohorts

EXCEPTIONALITY	1990 (%)	1991 (%)
-----		
Mainstream EMR	50%	67%
Center: EMR	67%	47%
TMR	73%	39%
PH	60%	100%
SED/LAP	88%	67%
-----		
	66%	55%

Other Significant Findings:

- \* A substantially smaller proportion of families with incomes under \$25,000 are found within the 1991 cohort (46%) than was found within the 1990 cohort (64%).
- \* 1991 parents and guardians were twice as likely to attend a transition planning meeting (23%) than the 1990 parents and guardians (11%).

**APPENDIX**

## **KEY TO REPORT ABBREVIATIONS**

<b>AIU</b>	<b>Allegheny Intermediate Unit</b>
<b>EMR</b>	<b>Educable Mentally Retarded</b>
<b>SPMR</b>	<b>Severely and Profoundly Mentally Retarded</b>
<b>TMR</b>	<b>Trainable Mentally Retarded</b>
<b>PH</b>	<b>Physically Handicapped</b>
<b>SED/LAP</b>	<b>Socially and Emotionally Disturbed/Learning and Adjustment Problems</b>