

POLICY ANALYSIS SERIES

ISSUES RELATED TO WELSCH v. LEVINE / NO. 16

A STATEWIDE SUMMARY OF SHELTERED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS

<u>Contents</u>	
	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	1
II. Review of Literature and Historical Background	3
III. Methodology	6
IV. Results	7
Financial Results	7
Administrative Results	13
Individual Client Profile Results	23
V. Summary	27
VI. References	28

I. INTRODUCTION

This paper reports the results of a statewide study of 25 sheltered workshops. It is an extension of the study on services provided by developmental achievement centers (*Policy Analysis Papers No. 6, 7, 8, and 9*). The purpose of this study was to collect and analyze data on the fiscal and programmatic status of the workshops over a four-year period of time (federal fiscal years 1980 through 1983). Specific areas of concern were also addressed, e.g., program waiting lists, needed client services, and staffing patterns. This study was prompted by the need for detailed information to present to the Minnesota Legislature on the effects of budget reductions on vulnerable populations.

A sheltered workshop provides vocational training and/or employment to persons with disabilities. The agencies surveyed in this study primarily provide services to individuals with developmental disabilities.

Sheltered employment services vary among the 25 sheltered workshops. For the purposes of this paper, sheltered employment shall refer to the broad range of programs from external sheltered to work activity centers. The following categories represent the dimension of services offered in Minnesota:

- Vocational Evaluation (VE): A systematic and organized process employing: (a) validated work sample techniques

or (b) varied subcontract work which has been related to job families and validated to industrial norms. The above methods are used, in conjunction with psychological tests, to determine employability factors, e.g., skills, aptitudes, and physical tolerance. (*DVR Certification Standards Manual*, p. 23)

- Work Adjustment Training (WAT): A program of services designed to modify vocational and personal behavior based on identified individual potential and deficits. The program utilizes a work setting supplemented by supervision and counseling. The areas covered in a work adjustment training program include: developing work habits, developing physical capacity for work, and an orientation to the job market. (*DVR Certification Standards Manual*, p. 24)
- Long-Term Sheltered Work (LTSW): Employment which is:
(a) a step in the rehabilitation process for those who cannot be readily absorbed in the competitive labor market or (b) during such time as employment opportunities for those in the competitive labor market do not exist. (MINN. STAT. § 129A.01, Subd. (e))
- Work Activity (WAC): A program which utilizes manufacturing activities and other production work for the primary purpose of providing vocational skills development for the handicapped. (MINN. STAT. § 129A.01, Subd. (f))
- Skill Training (ST): A training program which prepares an individual for a specific occupation using work adjustment training techniques. (*DVR Certification Standards Manual*, p. 24)
- Work Component (WC): A work activity program which takes place within a developmental achievement center (DAC) licensed as such by the Department of Public Welfare. (*Cooperative Agreement between Department of Economic Security, DVR and Department of Public Welfare*, Draft, June 24, 1982)
- Other Programs: Other programs include placement and prevocational social services. An agency may contract with a client to seek a position in a competitive setting without work adjustment or long-term sheltered work services. Prevocational social services are programs that focus on the client's work habits (e.g., reporting on time, regular attendance, and calling in if ill) and ancillary skills (e.g., hygiene and dress).
- Vocational Services (VS): To facilitate reporting of some variables, three of the above programs (VE, WAT, and ST) have been combined within the text of this paper.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The last three decades have been a period of growth and change for sheltered workshops throughout the United States. Federal and state legislation encouraged growth in the number of clients served and in the total number of workshop programs. This legislation also facilitated changes in the client population by providing workshops with incentives to serve more severely disabled clients and those with different types of disabilities.

During the 1970s, the federal government sponsored several major studies of sheltered workshops (Greenleigh and Associates, 1975; U.S. Department of Labor (DOL), 1977, 1979; U.S. General Accounting Office, 1980). These studies gathered a considerable amount of national data on sheltered workshop services and clients, identified some major problems in the sheltered workshop service system, and made policy recommendations which addressed the identified problem areas.

Among the major findings of the studies were:

- By 1978, the national workshop population had increased to almost five times its 1968 level. A major portion of the growth occurred in work activity (WAC) programs, which accounted for almost two-thirds of the sheltered work population in 1978. (DOL, 1977, p. 35; DOL, 1979, p. 29)
- From an almost equal balance between physically and mentally handicapped persons in 1969, the workshop population shifted to being three-fourths mentally disabled (mentally retarded and/or mentally ill) persons by 1977. (DOL, 1977, p. 337; DOL, 1979, p. 29)
- The Department of Labor (1979) reported that the average hourly wage for all workshop clients was 81 cents an hour. The study found that two-thirds of the workshop clients received supplemental income or other support. (DOL, 1979, pp. 18, 59)
- Lack of suitable work in sufficient amounts was a major problem for many workshop programs; many workshops experienced difficulty in marketing products and services. (Greenleigh, 1975, pp. 29-30, 362; DOL, 1979, p. 38)
- Many workshops were substantially underutilized because of funding limitations; the size of the operating budget in many of the workshops was inadequate to support the programs. (DOL, 1977, p. 5)
- Clients moved from workshops into competitive employment at a rate of 12 to 13 percent of the total clients

served annually; the placement rate for work activity clients was 7 percent. (DOL, 1977, p. 6; Greenleigh, 1975, p. 341)

- The General Accounting Office (GAO) (1980) reported that several deficiencies in states' reevaluations (required by the Rehabilitation Act of 1973) were limiting sheltered workers' opportunities for placement in competitive employment. (GAO, 1980, p. i)

These studies drew considerable attention to several important sheltered work issues. From 1978 through 1980, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (DHEW) conducted a series of policy analysis activities designed to follow up on the recommendations of the Greenleigh and Department of Labor studies. Whitehead (1979a) reported on a number of the major policy questions addressed by DHEW, including several related to the organization of work activity centers, the provision of independent living services in workshops, the dual missions of transitional and extended employment services, the amount and types of work done in workshops, the income maintenance policies of federal programs such as SSI (Supplemental Security Income) and SSDI (Social Security Disability Insurance) and coordination of services and financial support in the workshop service system.

Whitehead summarized the actions recommended by the DHEW Task Force:

- We need to switch from the use of the term "work activities center" to think in terms of a work-oriented program of training and development rather than therapeutic, custodial type services. Legislative or regulatory changes are needed in the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA).
- Greater attention is needed to developing productivity and earnings of severely handicapped persons, thereby reducing their dependency on supplemental income but maintaining eligibility for the benefits of income support programs for those with special needs.
- The sheltered workshop must be recognized as an employer as well as service provider, and handicapped persons in long-term employment must be accorded status as employees rather than clients. Fringe benefits must be provided, but subsidy by government may be required. (Whitehead, 1979a, p. 40)

Several authors have used data from the national studies as a starting place for further analysis of specific sheltered work issues, particularly those related to the purpose of workshops and the benefits obtained by client/workers in workshop programs (Bellamy et al., 1981, in press; Leclair, 1976; Lilly, 1979; Whitehead, 1978, 1979b).

Bellamy et al. (1981, in press) have outlined a proposal for redesigning services by differentiating short-term transitional services leading to competitive employment from long-term structured employment opportunities for individuals who require ongoing support. Bellamy et al. advocate an emphasis on work and productivity at all service levels and a focus on work-related benefits for all consumers.

Most recently, the U.S. General Accounting Office (1982) issued a report on administration of the national vocational rehabilitation (VR)¹ program which has implications for the referral of VR clients to rehabilitation facilities. The report concluded that VR funds can be maximized by providing rehabilitation services only to individuals who have substantial handicaps to employment and can reasonably be expected to become gainfully employed.

In Minnesota, the emergence of sheltered workshops has paralleled national developments in terms of both growth and changing practices. Prior to 1954, six sheltered workshops existed in the state. Working agreements were established between DVR and 19 facilities between 1954 and 1964. During this period, several facilities began to offer vocational evaluation and work adjustment training. Two distinct types of facilities emerged--sheltered workshops and vocational centers; a few facilities combined features of both programs. In 1965, the Long Term Sheltered Work Act was passed (Minnesota Laws 1965, Chapter 283) authorizing local governments to expand the funds available for sheltered workshops (*Minnesota State Rehabilitation Services Plan*, 1980, pp. 10-11).

The period of most rapid growth in the number of individuals served in Minnesota rehabilitation facilities began in the late 1960s. Between 1970 and 1980, the number of long-term work slots increased over 500 percent, from 700 to 4,300. State funds appropriated for these slots increased from \$150,000 to over \$5.2 million during that period. Work activity programs began to develop in the late '60s and early '70s. In 1973, Minn. Stat. § 121.711 was amended so that DVR received expanded responsibility for work activity programs (*Minnesota State Rehabilitation Services Plan*, 1980, p. 11; *Brief History of Rehabilitation Facilities in Minnesota: 1970-1980*, p. i).

Since 1980, the legislature has funded an additional 300 slots to serve individuals leaving state institutions and Developmental Achievement Centers (DACs) as part of the *Welsch v. Levine* Consent Decree. By 1985, 300 more slots are scheduled to be in place.

During this period of rapid growth, the emphasis on the role of sheltered workshops shifted, at times, between training and job placement

¹In Minnesota, the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation is located in the Department of Economic Security.

and long-term employment. However, both functions continue to exist in most workshops today.

In recent years, Minnesota's sheltered workshops have experienced major changes in the disability levels and types of individuals entering their programs. In addition, changes in funding levels and sources, reporting requirements, and program standards have affected their operation. By July, 1984, all DVR-funded sheltered workshops must be in compliance with the standards established by the Commission on the Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF) in order to continue receiving funds.

III. METHODOLOGY

Twenty-six agencies were contacted regarding participation in the survey. Only one agency chose not to participate. Twenty-four of the participating agencies receive DVR funds to provide evaluation, training, work activity, and/or long-term sheltered employment services. One agency does not receive DVR funds but provides services similar to those of DVR-supported programs and elected to participate in the survey. The decision to survey the state's sheltered employment programs was reached in late September, 1982, in discussions between representatives of the Minnesota Association of Rehabilitation Facilities (MARF), the Developmental Disabilities Program, and the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR). Questions used in the survey were based on issues identified at the national and state levels and were also based, in part, on the 1981 survey of Minnesota's Developmental Achievement Centers in order to allow identification of issues which affect both programs. Selected sheltered workshop providers and representatives of MARF and DVR were involved in the development of the survey and reviewed the questionnaire prior to the final copy.

Agencies responded to three separate forms requesting financial, administrative, and individual information. The financial questionnaire assessed sources of revenue, agency expenditures, type of work performed, physical plant accessibility, and the average daily attendance of the programs. The administrator questionnaire assessed the distribution, wages, and turnover rates of employees, number of client hours per year, client movement and demographics, waiting lists, and program changes.

Individual questionnaires were completed on a 10 percent random sample of clients. The individual questionnaires were completed by the staff of the participating agency. To assure confidentiality, individual identification was removed from the form prior to submission of the surveys. The questionnaires assessed the client's disability, reason for referral, duration in agency programs, 1981 average wages, and the next placement level.

The survey forms were sent to participating agencies before scheduling interviews in order to allow agency staff time to collect the requested data. Surveys were mailed, and interviews began in October, 1982. The last survey was completed January 12, 1983. Both on-site and telephone interviews were conducted to achieve complete participation.

Protocols were edited and coded during December, 1982; January and February, 1983.

IV. RESULTS

A. Financial Results

The financial results section will be presented in the following order: (a) revenue, (b) expenditures,¹ (c) surplus/deficit, (d) client program time, (e) changes in work focus, (f) building accessibility, and (g) average daily attendance.

Revenue: The total revenue reported for Minnesota sheltered work facilities during 1980, 1981, 1982, and 1983 was \$30,693,240; \$33,987,168; \$35,746,058; and \$40,436,256 (estimated), respectively. These figures indicate a steady increase in revenue. However, the percentage increase is 10.7 percent compared to 12.3 percent inflation between FY 1980 and FY 1981; 5.2 percent compared to 9.7 percent inflation between FY 1981 and FY 1982;² and 13.1 percent compared to the estimated 5.8 percent inflation rate expected from FY 1982-83.³ The 1983 figures are projections only and appear optimistic. In addition to inflation rates, there have been increases in the number of new workers as will be discussed later.

In 1980, government sources (county, DVR, other training fees, and DVR client service fees) accounted for 36.0 percent of all revenues. Subcontract income equaled 34.5 percent, sales income totaled 17.5 percent, while other types of support (United Way, contributions, and grants) were reported at 12.0 percent.

¹Statewide totals reported in this paper differ from the Annual DVR Summary of Fiscal Data reports. Information provided for this survey comes from audited fiscal reports. This study also includes one agency not included in DVR reports and does not include one agency that is contained in DVR reports.

²The U.S. Department of Commerce reports the rate of inflation for the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area. The Consumer Price Index is kept only for the Twin Cities metropolitan area. There are no regional or statewide figures.

³The U.S. Department of Commerce does not estimate the future rate of inflation. L. R. Klein et al. (1982) provided the 5.8 percent estimation.

The revenue patterns for fiscal years 1981, 1982, and 1983 are summarized in Table 1. The shifts noted by respondents indicate a decline in government support and an increase in sales income in FY 1983.

Table 1
 Sources of Revenue
 (Minnesota Sheltered Employment
 Programs: 1982;
 100% Reporting)

Source of Revenue	FY 1981	FY 1982	FY 1983 (est.)
State	25.2%	23.7%	21.7%
County	6.9%	7.3%	7.6%
Other governmental	4.9%	5.0%	3.7%
Subcontract income	31.5%	32.9%	31.6%
Sales income	19.9%	19.1%	25.5%
Other income ^a	11.6%	12.0%	9.9%

^aUnited Way, contributions, and grants.

Expenditures: The financial questionnaire separated expenditures into five categories: personnel, transportation, occupancy, production supplies, and other program expenses.

The total expenditures for each fiscal year are: 1980 (\$30,404,580), 1981 (\$33,700,836), 1982 (\$36,146,322), and 1983 (an estimated \$40,673,601).

Personnel expenses have been divided into client wages and staff wages as presented in Table 2.

Table 2
 Personnel Expenses
 (Minnesota Sheltered Employment
 Programs: 1982;
 100% Reporting)

TYPE OF EXPENSE	FY 1980	FY 1981	FY 1982	FY 1983 (est.)
Staff wages	\$11,531,520	\$13,130,040	\$14,093,750	\$14,873,558
Client wages	\$ 6,519,462	\$ 6,993,498	\$ 7,131,431	\$ 7,761,510
Total taxes and fringes ^a	\$ 2,448,870	\$ 2,859,083	\$ 3,145,399	\$ 3,446,156
Subtotal of per- sonnel expenses	\$20,499,852	\$22,982,621	\$24,370,580	\$26,081,224
Percentages of total expenses	67.6%	68.2%	67.4%	64.1%

^aTaxes and fringe benefits for staff and clients are combined.

Transportation expenses (client, finished products, supplies, and some staff) for the respective fiscal years totaled: 1980 (\$766,666), 1981 (\$884,711), 1982 (\$883,119), and 1983 (an estimated \$929,650).

Occupancy expenses (rent, interest on mortgage, building insurance) were: FY 1980 (\$3,011,969), FY 1981 (\$3,095,343), FY 1982 (\$3,586,766), and FY 1983 (an estimated \$3,844,415).

Supplies for the production of work items for the respective fiscal years totaled: 1980 (\$3,058,012), 1981 (\$3,466,720), 1982 (\$5,033,934), and 1983 (an estimated \$6,336,051). The reader should note the direct relationship between estimated sales increases and supply expenses.

Professional fees and other program expenses which include all variable expenses not described above are: FY 1980 (\$3,068,081), FY 1981 (\$3,271,442), FY 1982 (\$3,271,923), and FY 1983 (an estimated \$3,482,261).

Surplus/Deficit: Surplus/deficit is defined as operating revenue minus expenditures. This is a simple calculation based upon stated totals which may not represent a true estimate of net worth based upon full accounting procedures. In FY 1980, there was a reported statewide surplus of \$288,660. In FY 1981, the surplus dropped to \$286,332. In FY 1982, the surplus turned to a deficit of \$400,274; while in FY 1983, the deficit is estimated to be \$237,345.

Client Program Time: Respondents were asked to estimate the average number of paid hours worked per week according to the following categories: vocational evaluation, work adjustment training, long-term sheltered work, work activity, skill training, work component, and other. (Definitions appear on pages 1 and 2.)

According to Table 3, in almost every program, clients experienced a decrease in the average number of work hours. There was a corresponding increase in the amount of "downtime" or time not working.

Table 3
 Client Work Hours (Paid) Per Week
 (Minnesota Sheltered Employment
 Programs: 1982;
 88% Reporting)

Type of Program	FY 1981	FY 1982
<u>Vocational Evaluation:</u>		
• Hours worked	24.2	21.6
• Agencies reporting	12	10 ^a
<u>Work Adjustment Training:</u>		
• Hours worked	27.5	25.4
• Agencies reporting	19	19
<u>Sheltered Work:</u>		
• Hours worked	28.6	26.0
• Agencies reporting	22	22
<u>Worked Activity:</u>		
• Hours worked	22.2	20.1
• Agencies reporting	18	18
<u>Skill Training:</u>		
• Hours worked	33.7	26.5
• Agencies reporting	3	3
<u>Work Component:</u>		
• Hours worked	6.3	5.5
• Agencies reporting	15	15
<u>Other:</u> ^b		
• Hours worked	38.0	38.0
• Agencies reporting	1	1

^aTwo programs provided 1981 data but were unable to provide 1982 client hours.

^bOne agency reported hours of clients in a competitive program.

Changes in Work Focus: Respondents were asked to describe what production-related changes had occurred in their facilities in the last three years. A list of possible changes was presented. In rank order of mention, the following changes have occurred: (1) higher average bid amount (N = 18); (b) increase in downtime (N = 15); (c) increase in number of subcontracts (N = 14); and (d) subcontracts are of shorter duration (N = 13). Fewer facilities reported decreases in number of subcontracts (N = 7) and subcontracts of longer duration (N = 7).

Agency representatives were also asked to comment on the type of work changes that had occurred over the past five years and the anticipated work changes for the next five years. In reviewing the past, 12 agencies reported an increase in light assembly work. In looking toward the future, 15 agencies anticipated increases in light assembly work, 14 predicted growth in high technology work, and 12 are preparing for growth in service fields.

Building Accessibility: For the 25 agencies participating in this study, there were 64 buildings with 1,089,295 square feet of space. Not all the buildings are physically separate. Respondents were asked to report on exterior and interior accessibility. Buildings with exterior accessibility are those that a person who is able to operate a wheelchair can enter without help. If a person is able to operate a wheelchair and use all floors and all bathrooms without help, then the building was defined as having total interior accessibility. Partially accessible buildings are those in which some of the floors and some of the bathrooms are useable by people in wheelchairs. Table 4 presents the type of accessibility for the 64 buildings.

Table 4
 Type of Building Accessibility
 (Minnesota Sheltered Employment
 Programs: 1982;
 100% Reporting)

Building Accessibility	Number of Buildings Totally Accessible	Number of Buildings Partially Accessible	Number of Buildings Not Accessible ^a	Total Number of Buildings
Exterior	53	0	11	64
Interior	40	18	6	64

^aInclude some buildings used for warehousing materials.

Average Daily Attendance: Table 5 presents the average number of clients attending the programs in fiscal years 1980 through 1983. In FY 1982, there were 4,727 clients receiving services from the 25 agencies surveyed. Fifty-three percent (2,495) of these persons were in long-term sheltered work programs. All 25 agencies provided long-term sheltered work. Long-term sheltered work programs experienced an average yearly increase from FY 1980 through FY 1982. This pattern is expected to continue during FY 1983.

Table 5
Statewide Average Daily Attendance
(Minnesota Sheltered Employment
Programs: 1982)

TYPE OF PROGRAM	NUMBER OF CLIENTS PER DAY			
	FY 1980 ^a	FY 1981 ^b	FY 1982 ^c	FY 1983 ^b
Vocational evaluation	7.4	6.1	4.3	5.4
Work adjustment training ^d	22.2	20.5	14.4	15.0
Long-term sheltered work	90.7	95.9	99.8	102.8
Work activity	37.8	42.1	45.2	40.2
Skill training	15.8	16.0	10.6	10.0
Work component	72.5	70.2	66.9	68.9 ^e
Other ^f	7.5	16.5	11.8 ^e	13.8 ^e
TOTAL	194.9	197.3	189.1	197.9

^aAgencies reporting: 21 of 25. Variation is due to non-reporting, not changes in the number of programs within the state.

^bAgencies reporting: 23 of 25. Variation is due to non-reporting, not changes in the number of programs within the state.

^cAgencies reporting: 25 of 25.

^dIncludes information on vocational evaluation from one agency.

^eChange from previous years includes an additional program.

^fOther programs include placement and prevocational social services.

The reporting agencies have experienced steady declines in average daily attendance in vocational services from FY 1982 through FY 1983. Vocational evaluation and work adjustment training programs anticipate an increase in the average daily attendance during FY 1983.

During FY 1982, 13 programs provided work component services to 870 DAC clients. The 19 work activity centers had an average attendance of 858 persons.

B. Administrative Results

The administrative results section¹ will be presented as follows: (a) personnel, (b) staff training, (c) staff turnover, (d) staff wages, (e) program hours and days, (f) waiting lists, (g) client movement, (h) program changes, (i) age of clients, (j) place of residence, (k) disabilities, and (l) level of functioning.

Personnel: Respondents were asked to report the number of hours that constitute a full-time employee (FTE). Only one agency changed their FTE definition between 1980 and 1982 when staff hours were "reduced for six months due to a budget shortfall." The temporary reduction does not affect the statewide averages; therefore, the base numbers reported for all years are equivalent.

In 1982, there were 781.8 persons employed to provide sheltered work services in Minnesota (see Table 6). The total administrative staff was 144.5. The range within agencies was from only 1 administrative person up to 22 persons. This administrative number included agency directors, program coordinators, secretaries, and/or accountants. The statewide total for program staff was 424.7. Agencies ranged from 5 to 51 persons in this category. Program staff included counselors, vocational evaluators, and/or supervisors. Support staff during 1982 totaled 212.6. The range was from 0 to 31 staff. Support staff included maintenance, food service, shipping, and/or receiving personnel.

¹Due to differences in individual agency accounting methods, administrative data reported by year categories may not be comparable to financial data reported by federal fiscal years.

Table 6
 Type of Personnel
 (Minnesota Sheltered Employment
 Programs: 1982;
 100% Reporting)

Type of Personnel	1980	1981	1982	1983 ^a
	Total	Total	Total	Total (est.)
Administration	138.8	149.2	144.5	141.0
Professional/Para-professional	434.6	429.5	424.7	398.0
Support staff	<u>212.4</u>	<u>221.1</u>	<u>212.6</u>	<u>203.3</u>
TOTAL	785.8	799.8	781.8	742.8

^aOne agency did not provide 1983 estimations.

Staff Training: Respondents were asked to estimate the percentage of program staff that had either a bachelor's or master's degree. In 1982, the agency staff with a bachelor's degree ranged from 0.0 to 88.0 percent with an average of 22.6 percent. During the same period, the percentage of agency staff with a master's degree ranged from 0.0 to 41.0 percent with an average of 14.2 percent.

Individuals with training in vocational rehabilitation comprise 32 percent of the program staff. Other types of academic training include: psychology (21 percent), education (20 percent), sociology/social work (13 percent), and sales or business administration (14 percent).

Staff Turnover: Respondents were asked to calculate separately the rate of turnover for program, administrative, and production staff during 1981 and 1982. As shown in Table 7, the highest turnover occurred in program staff with 16.3 percent reported in 1981 and 18.2 percent reported in 1982.

Table 7
 Staff Turnover Rate
 (Minnesota Sheltered Employment
 Programs: 1982;
 100% Reporting)

TYPE OF STAFF	1 9 8 1			1 9 8 2		
	Mean Rate	Range	Agencies with No Turnover	Mean Rate	Range	Agencies with No Turnover
Administrative	14.8%	0 to 50%	11	12.1%	0 to 66%	12
Program	16.3%	0 to 50%	6	18.2%	0 to 66%	4
Production	14.9%	0 to 53%	6	16.2%	0 to 100%	6

The most frequently stated reasons why personnel left the agency are presented in rank order below:

1 9 8 1	1 9 8 2
Career changes, better positions	Career changes, better positions
Poor performance, fired	Lay-off
Lay-off	Moved
Moved	Poor performance, fired
Returned to school	Personal leave, family reasons
Retired or death	Retired, worker's compensation
Personal leave, family reasons	

The reasons are similar to other labor economic studies, particularly in the human services field. The number of staff who were laid off represent the effects of the general recessionary trends.

Staff Wages: The average hourly wage for program personnel in sheltered work facilities is presented in Table 8. Program personnel include: counselors, vocational evaluators, and work supervisors. The 1982 statewide average hourly wage was \$8.08 for employees with college degrees and \$5.66 for those with less than a four-year degree. These figures indicate a steady increase in wages. The percentage increase is generally less than the rate of inflation.

Table 8
 Staff Wages
 (Minnesota Sheltered Employment
 Programs: 1982)^a

YEAR	LESS THAN 4-YEAR DEGREE			4-YEAR DEGREE OR MORE		
	Mean Wage	Range	Number of Agencies Reporting	Mean Wage	Range	Number of Agencies Reporting
1980	\$5.10	\$3.63-\$6.25	15	\$6.96	\$5.25-\$8.50	18
1981	\$5.42	\$3.67-\$6.39	18	\$7.56	\$5.75-\$8.70	20
1982	\$5.66	\$4.00-\$7.20	20	\$8.08	\$6.49-\$9.46	21
1983 (est.)	\$6.10	\$4.15-\$7.44	17	\$8.47	\$6.84-\$9.80	19

^aAgencies reporting varies because the data were unavailable or there were no staff in the category during the agency's year.

Program Hours and Days: Respondents were asked to provide information on the number of client hours per year for the agency. Vocational services and long-term sheltered work programs annually provide between 245 and 250 days of service. The average number of service days has decreased slightly from 1980 to 1983 (estimated). This is the result of a sharp reduction in program days in two agencies.

Some agencies have experienced a decline in work and thus reduced the number of client hours per day. Three agencies reduced the number of hours in vocational service programs. Eight of the long-term sheltered work programs were reduced, while one agency increased the number of long-term sheltered work hours. Seven of the nineteen work activity center programs reduced the service hours per day.

Respondents were asked for the annual number of client hours provided by each program. The 25 agencies surveyed provided a total of 4,543,743 service hours to clients in 1982. Sixty-eight percent (3,101,665) of these hours were in the 25 long-term sheltered work programs. Eighteen percent (819,741) of the hours were reported by 19 work activity centers. Vocational services (including vocational evaluation, work training, skill training, and prevocational services) provided a total of 622,337 hours (13 percent).

Finally, respondents provided information on the number of clients served by program category (see Table 9). The changes experienced by the programs indicate continued growth in the open-ended, long-term programs. Sheltered work positions increased by 271 clients between 1980 and 1982, while work activity centers grew by 95 clients during this period. The vocational service programs served fewer clients in 1982 than they did in 1980: vocational evaluation, 37 fewer clients; work adjustment training, 124 fewer clients; and skill training, 13 fewer clients. Work-component programs have also experienced a decline with 25 fewer clients in 1982 than 1980.

Table 9
Net Number of Clients Served
(Minnesota Sheltered Employment
Programs: 1982)

TYPE OF PROGRAM	1980-1982 (actual)		1980-1983 (estimated)	
	Number of		Number of	
	Total Clients	Agencies Reporting	Total Clients	Agencies Reporting
Vocational evaluation	- 37	13	- 21	13
Work adjustment training	-124	18	-108	17
Long-term shel- tered workshop	+271	19	+335	18
Work activity	+ 95	15	+162	14
Skill training	- 13	4	- 23	4
Work component	- 25	10	+ 15	10
Other ^a	+ 32	3	+ 40	3
TOTAL	+199	19	+400	18

^a Other programs include prevocational training and placement.

Agencies are projecting a more optimistic picture for 1983. Long-term programs (long-term sheltered work, work activity center, and work components) project a net increase of clients from 1980 to 1983. Vocational service programs expect a net decrease from 1980 to 1983.

Waiting Lists: Twenty-two agencies (88 percent) have a total of 870 clients on waiting lists. The range is from 1 client to 151. One agency that did not have a waiting list noted that it was at its program capacity and no longer accepted applications.

Approximately 80 percent of the clients are on waiting lists for programs in urban areas.

The number of people on waiting lists breaks down as follows: work activity (N = 425), long-term sheltered work (N = 172), work adjustment training (N = 105), vocational evaluation (N = 99), skill training (N = 44), and other (N = 25). An examination of the waiting lists for developmental achievement centers reveals a duplication of 126 clients on the work activity center lists (*Policy Analysis Paper No. 17*).

Client Movement: There are 637 clients currently participating in the 25 sheltered work programs who are ready to move to another work setting. Thirty-seven percent (N = 236) are perceived as employable in a competitive position. Another 26.6 percent (N = 169) are ready for a sheltered position within a competitive employment setting. There are 232 clients (36.4 percent) who are waiting for openings in other programs within their own agency.

Forty-eight reasons for lack of movement were received from the 25 agencies. Responses were generally of four basic types: (a) the economy and recession (N = 22), (b) lack of placements (N = 16), (c) limited funding (N = 5), and (d) inability to match client needs with available resources (N = 5).

Program Changes: Table 10 reports the number of agencies which expanded and reduced programs and activities. The greatest changes are in the reduction of either the days or hours of services provided. During the three-year period, 19 agencies (76 percent) expanded their placement programs while 6 reported a decline in placement services.

Administrative and program staff employed by the responding agencies were generally reduced during 1981 and 1982.

Table 10
 Program and Staffing Changes Due to Budget
 Considerations by Statewide Total
 (Minnesota Sheltered Employment
 Programs: 1982;
 100% Reporting)

TYPE OF CHANGE	1 9 8 1 ^a		1 9 8 2 ^a		1 9 8 3 ^a (est.)	
	Number of Agencies Reporting Decrease	Number of Agencies Reporting Increase	Number of Agencies Reporting Decrease	Number of Agencies Reporting Increase	Number of Agencies Reporting Decrease	Number of Agencies Reporting Increase
<u>Program/Activity Area:</u>						
• Days of service	6	1	7	1	4	1
• Hours of service	5	3	14	1	7	2
• Counseling	2	1	1	3	1	2
• Leisure/recreational	2	3	2	5	2	4
• Cognitive/academics	2	2	3	6	1	4
• Self-care skills	1	1	0	4	0	2
• Communication	1	1	3	1	1	1
• Prevocational	2	2	2	5	1	3
• Independent	1	0	1	4	0	3
• Placement	2	7	3	8	1	4
• Transportation	0	2	1	1	2	1
• Meals	0	0	0	0	0	1
<u>Staff:</u>						
• Counselors	4	2	5	4	2	0
• Vocational evaluators	3	2	8	2	0	0
• Work supervisors	4	4	7	2	0	2
• Consultants	1	0	4	3	1	1
• Occupational therapists	1	0	1	0	0	1
• Speech therapists	1	0	2	0	0	1
• Physical therapists	1	0	1	0	0	1
• Behavior therapists	1	1	1	0	0	1
• Activity therapists	1	1	1	1	1	2
• Administrative	4	0	9	0	1	0
• Maintenance	1	0	4	2	0	1
• Food service	1	0	2	0	1	0
• Transportation	2	1	4	0	1	0
• Procurement	3	1	3	3	2	2
• Production	4	1	6	4	1	2

Age: The age of clients attending sheltered work programs range from 15 to 79 years. These programs include work evaluation of high school students. Twenty-one agencies reported the ages of 3,675 clients. The largest number of these clients (N = 1,616, 44 percent) were in the age category of 22 to 35 years. Another 1,108 clients (30.1 percent) were in the 36- to 50-year old age group. Smaller numbers of clients were distributed in the following categories: 16 to 21 years, 345 clients (9.4 percent); 50 to 65 years, 488 clients (13.3 percent); and over 65 years, 118 clients (3.2 percent).

Place of Residence: Table 12 presents the residential arrangements of 3,281 workers reported by 19 agencies. ICF-MR facilities provide housing for 991 sheltered workers (30 percent) while 894 people live in their natural homes. Clients living independently or receiving semi-independent living services represent 18 percent (N = 596) of the respondents.

Table 11
 Living Arrangements
 (Minnesota Sheltered Employment
 Programs: 1982;
 76% Reporting)

Type of Living Arrangement	Number of Clients	Percent of Clients
ICF-MR (group home)	991	30%
Natural home	894	27
Independent/semi-independent living	596	18
Foster care	284	9
Board and lodging--board and care	196	6
Other	162	5
Nursing home	102	3
State hospital	56	2
TOTAL	3,281	100%

Primary and Secondary Disabilities: The majority of clients in sheltered employment services are mentally retarded. Twenty-three facilities responded that 2,394 clients (61.7 percent) have a primary disability of mental retardation. Mental illness affects the next largest number of clients (720, 18.6 percent). Table 13 provides both primary and secondary disabilities of clients.

Table 12
 Client Primary and Secondary Disabilities
 (Minnesota Sheltered Employment
 Programs: 1982;
 92% Reporting)

TYPE OF DISABILITY	PRIMARY DISABILITY		SECONDARY DISABILITY	
	Number of Clients	Percent of Clients	Number of Clients	Percent of Clients
Mental retardation	2,394	61.7%	227	21.1%
Mental illness	720	18.6	230	17.6
Other physical disability	212	5.5	209	16.0
Cerebral palsy	133	3.4	46	3.5
Visual impairment	125	3.2	47	3.6
Other disability	114	2.9	132	10.1
Epilepsy	83	2.1	245	18.7
Chemical dependency	50	1.3	52	4.0
Hearing impairment	47	1.2	69	5.3
Autism	2	0.1	3	0.2
TOTAL	3,890	100.0%	1,310	100.1% ^a

^aTotal does not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

Level of Functioning: Eighteen agencies reported level of functioning information on 2,622 individuals. Table 13 reveals that the vocational service programs tend to have clients who are either borderline or mildly retarded. The long-term sheltered workers tend

Table 13
 Level of Client Functioning
 (Minnesota Sheltered Employment
 Programs: 1982;
 72% Reporting)

LEVEL OF CLIENT FUNCTIONING	VOCATIONAL SERVICES		LONG-TERM SHELTERED WORK		WORK ACTIVITY CENTER		OTHER ^a	
	Number of Clients	Percent of Program	Number of Clients	Percent of Program	Number of Clients	Percent of Program	Number of Clients	Percent of Program
Not retarded	72	20%	246	19%	25	3%	0	0%
Borderline	98	27	162	13	39	5	5	2
Mild	107	29	378	29	166	22	28	14
Moderate	69	20	341	26	323	43	89	43
Severe	8	2	78	6	196	26	53	26
Profound	0	0	14	1	2	0	0	0
Unknown or un- determined	10	2	77	6	5	1	31	15
TOTAL	364	100%	1,296	100%	756	100%	206	100%

to be either mildly or moderately retarded, while the largest number of persons served by work activity centers are moderately retarded.

Sheltered employment services are provided to 335 severely retarded (13 percent of the total) persons. Sixteen individuals who are profoundly retarded represent less than 1 percent of the reported population of retarded persons.

C. Individual Client Profile Results

In addition to the administrative and financial questionnaires, sheltered employment staffs were asked to complete an individual profile questionnaire¹ for a 10 percent random sample of their current (1982) clients. With the assistance of direct service staff members and case records, a special set of questions was completed on 352 clients. The purpose of the questionnaire was to obtain more descriptive and detailed information on the personal characteristics and service needs of people enrolled in sheltered employment programs. The results of this portion of the survey will be presented as follows: (a) sex, (b) age, (c) level of retardation, (d) reason for referral, (e) years of participation, (f) history of day services, (g) future day program placements, and (h) income.

Sex: Approximately 47 percent (n = 163) of the sample population are female, while 53 percent (n = 189) are male clients.

Age: The average age of the sample population is 34.7 years. The youngest client in the sample is 15, the oldest is 74 years.

Level of Retardation: According to the sample responses, the level of functioning is borderline (13 percent), mild (31 percent), moderate (27 percent), severe (9 percent), profound (0 percent), and unknown (4 percent). Of the sample, 16 percent are not retarded.

Reason for Referral: Respondents were asked to record the reason(s) an individual had been referred to the program (see Table 14). Evaluation and assessment were the most frequently cited responses, n = 238. One hundred seventeen (117) persons were referred for reduction of specific work-related problems, 37 had completed a public school program, 36 had completed a DAC program, 35 were referred for skill training, 10 were transferred from a DAC program to make room for clients transferred into the DAC from state hospitals, and 4 were transferred from a state hospital. Fifty-five (55) persons were referred for other reasons.

¹Information in this section is calendar year data for 1982.

Table 14
 Reason for Referral to Programs
 (Minnesota Sheltered Employees;
 10% Random Sample: 1982; n = 352)

Reason for Referral	Number of Clients ^a	Percent of Total Sample
Evaluation and assessment	238	68%
Reduction of specific work- related problems	117	33%
Completed public school program	37	11%
Completed DAC program	36	10%
Skill training	35	10%
Transferred from DAC (Welsch v. Levine)	10	3%
Transferred from state hos- pital (Welsch v. Levine)	4	1%
Other ^b	55	16%

^aTotal number is greater than 352 due to multiple responses.

^bOther includes increase productivity level, decrease passivity, requested to be moved closer to home, and employment in a smaller workshop.

Years of Participation: Respondents were asked to indicate the number of years the sample workers have participated in the facility's programs. The responses do not necessarily represent consecutive years of enrollment, nor do they necessarily represent the total number of years of sheltered employment services. Clients could have, at one time, received services from other agencies.

Table 15 presents the years of participation in five categories. Half of the workers surveyed (n = 176) have worked less than five years. The average length of participation was 5.3 years (n = 352) for the entire sample. The range was from less than six months to 24 years.

Table 15
 Years of Participation
 (Minnesota Sheltered Employees;
 10% Random Sample: 1982; n = 352)

Years of Participation	Number of Clients	Percent of Clients
0 to 4 years	176	50%
5 to 9 years	127	36
10 to 14 years	39	11
15 to 19 years	6	2
20 years and over ^a	4	1
TOTAL	352	100%

^aOne worker in the sample had been employed 24 years which was the maximum reported.

History of Day Services: Respondents were asked to identify where the sample population had received day program services during the past five years (see Table 16). In 1982, over 90 percent of the clients received services from the agencies' long-term sheltered workshop (n = 253, 72 percent) or work activity center (n = 73, 21 percent) programs. This compares with a 1978 total of 54 percent of clients receiving long-term sheltered work and work activity services. A large shift in the delivery of services is represented by the 40 individuals who graduated from school programs.

Table 16
 Day Program Services Received
 (Minnesota Sheltered Employees;
 10% Random Sample: 1982; n = 352)

TYPE OF SERVICES	CY 1978		CY 1979		CY 1980		CY 1981		CY 1982	
	Number of Clients	Percent of Clients	Number of Clients	Percent of Clients	Number of Clients	Percent of Clients	Number of Clients	Percent of Clients	Number of Clients	Percent of Clients
Long-term sheltered workshop	137	40%	166	47%	179	51%	220	63%	253	72%
Work activity	49	14	53	15	59	17	64	18	73	21
Public school	49	14	42	12	22	6	12	3	9	3
Community--DAC	28	8	19	5	18	5	14	4	5	1
Did not receive day services	25	7	18	5	21	6	13	4	1	0
Competitive	18	5	18	5	16	5	6	1	2	1
Long-term sheltered workshop--another agency	12	3	9	3	10	3	7	2	3	1
State hospital--DAC	6	2	2	1	4	1	1	0	0	0
Work activity--another agency	5	1	7	2	6	2	4	1	4	1
Other ^a	23	7	18	5	17	5	11	3	2	1
TOTAL	352	100%	352	100%	352	101% ^b	352	99% ^b	352	101% ^b

^a Other day services included posthigh school education, work adjustment training, and working on the family farm.

^b Total percentages do not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

Future Day Program Placements: Respondents were asked to identify which day program would be most appropriate for the individual. External placements, either competitive (20 percent) or external sheltered (15 percent), represented the largest segment of this sample population. Sixty-five (18 percent) of the individuals are expected to move into a long-term sheltered work program. Ninety-eight (28 percent) of the clients were not expected to move from their current sheltered employment position.

Income: Respondents were asked to provide information on 1981 annual wages, average hourly rate, and average industrial rate. Workers' total 1981 wages were provided on 297 people (84 percent of the sample). The range was from \$16 to \$8,878 during 1981. There were four workers who earned below \$100 and four that earned more than \$6,000. The median¹ income was \$1,460. The reader is reminded that these total yearly incomes do not necessarily represent an individual's 12-month income. Individuals from the sample may have worked only a fraction of the calendar year.

Information was collected on the worker's average industrial rate and average hourly wage. Wages in sheltered work programs are set according to federal wage and hour standards. An individual's work speed, his/her average industrial rate, is determined by a series of work performance time trials and/or a record of piece-rated job performance. Income is calculated by multiplying work speed (e.g., 30 percent of the industrial norm) by the prevailing industrial rate (e.g., \$3.35). The result is referred to as their average hourly wage (e.g., 30 percent \times \$3.35 = \$1.01).

Respondents provided the average industrial rate on 300 workers (85 percent of the sample). The median was 37 percent. The range was from 6 to 114. Sixteen persons working in a long-term sheltered workshop were rated below 25 percent. Information on average hourly wage was provided on 312 workers (89 percent of the sample). The median was \$1.25. The range was from \$0.14 to \$4.46. Nine of the individuals in the sample received over \$3.35.

V. SUMMARY

This policy analysis paper presented the findings of a survey of 25 sheltered workshops throughout the state. The survey collected data for federal fiscal years 1980 through 1982, and estimated data for fiscal year 1983. The sheltered employment programs covered in the survey included vocational evaluation, work adjustment training, long-term

¹Median is a measurement of central tendency that identifies the midpoint of the range, i.e., half of the numbers are above this number and half are below.

sheltered work, skill training, work activity, and work components. The major findings of the study included:

- Total revenues for 1982 were \$35,746,048, an increase of 5.2 percent over 1981. Government revenues accounted for 36.0 percent, subcontract income for 32.9 percent, sales income for 19.1 percent, and other types of support for 12.0 percent of total revenues.
- Total sheltered work expenditures for 1982 were \$36,146,322. Personnel costs (client and staff wages and benefits) accounted for 67.4 percent, production supplies 11.2 percent, occupancy 9.9 percent, transportation and other program costs 11.5 percent of the total.
- The workshops reported a total operating deficit of \$400,032 for 1982.
- Changes in average daily attendance in 1981 and 1982 varied according to the type of sheltered employment program. Long-term sheltered work and work activity programs showed increases in average daily attendance over this period of time, while vocational services (vocational evaluation, work adjustment training, and skill training) and work components showed declines.
- Sheltered workshops are experiencing lengthy waiting lists for services. A total of 807 persons were identified on waiting lists in 1982. Of these individuals, 69 percent were waiting for work activity or long-term sheltered work placements.
- Several agencies cited a lack of available work as the primary reason for staffing and program changes during 1982. There was an overall trend toward service reductions in 1982: seven facilities reduced their days of service and fourteen facilities reduced their hours of service.

VI. REFERENCES

- Bellamy, G. T., Rhodes, L. E., Bourbeau, D. M., & Mank, D. M. Mental retardation services in sheltered workshops and day activity programs: Consumer outcomes and policy alternatives. In W. Williams & G. T. Bellamy (Eds.), Appraisal of Work Opportunities and Related Services for Adults with Retardation. Washington, DC: President's Committee on Mental Retardation, in press.
- Bellamy, G. T., Horner, R. H., Sheehan, M. R., & Boles, S. M. Structured employment and workshop reform: Equal rights for severely handicapped individuals. In J. Lapadaski, J. Ansley, & J. Lowitt (Eds.), Work, Services, and Change: Proceedings from the National Institute

on Rehabilitation Facilities. Menomonie, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, Stout, 1981.

Brickey, M., Browning, L., & Campbell, K. Vocational histories of sheltered workshop employees placed in projects with industry and competitive jobs. Mental Retardation, April 1982, 20(2), 52-57.

Dettrich, A. C. Work activity and the developmentally disabled: Estimated needs and present services in New Jersey. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University, Disability and Health Economics Research, 1975.

Greenleigh Associates, Inc. The role of the sheltered workshops in the rehabilitation of the severely handicapped. Washington, DC: July 1975.

Hardy, R. E. & Cull, J. G. Administrative techniques of rehabilitation facility operation. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1974.

Hardy, R. E. & Cull, J. G. Services of the rehabilitation facility. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1975.

Hutchinson, J. Rehabilitation workshops: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, Fall 1973, 4(3), 149-156.

Klein, L. R., et al. Econometric forecast for the United States, 1982.3-1984.2. Wharton Magazine, Fall 1982, 7(1), 49-51.

LeClair, R. R. Are workshops effective in rehabilitation? American Rehabilitation, May/June 1976, 1(5), 24-27.

Lilly, K. L. Redefining the purpose of sheltered workshops. Amicus, 1979, 4(5. 6), 277-280.

Minnesota Department of Economic Security, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Background information--Minnesota's long-term sheltered employment/work activity program. St. Paul: Author, March 1981.

Minnesota Department of Economic Security, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Brief history of rehabilitation facilities in Minnesota, 1970-1980. St. Paul: Author, 1980.

Minnesota Department of Economic Security, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Long term sheltered work/work activity certification standards manual. St. Paul: Author.

Minnesota Department of Economic Security, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Minnesota state rehabilitation facilities plan--1980 edition. St. Paul: Author, 1980.

Minnesota Department of Economic Security, Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Program and financial plan--Fiscal years 1979, 1980, and 1984 for the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, State of Minnesota. St. Paul: Author, 1978.

- Nelson, N. Workshop for the handicapped in the United States. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1971.
- Parham, J. D. & Wainwright, C. O. Funding and referral sources for vocationally oriented rehabilitation facilities. Journal of Rehabilitation Administration, August 1978, 2(3), 110-113.
- Power, P. W. & Marinelli, R. P. Normalization and the sheltered workshop: A review and proposals for change. Rehabilitation Literature, March 1974, 35(3), 66-72.
- Redkey, H. A different kind of workshop. Amicus, 1979, 4(5, 6), 270-272.
- Summary of major findings of the U.S. Department of Labor Sheltered Workshop study. Amicus, 1979, 4(5, 6), 276.
- Ugland, D. Minnesota rehabilitation personnel manpower survey, 1980-81. Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, Fall 1981, 12(3), 156-159.
- U.S. Department of Labor. Sheltered workshop study: Study of handicapped clients in sheltered workshops (Volume II). Washington, DC: March 1979.
- U.S. Department of Labor. Sheltered workshop study: Workshop survey (Volume I). Washington, DC: June 1977.
- U.S. General Accounting Office. Better reevaluation of handicapped persons in sheltered workshops could increase their opportunities for competitive employment. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, March 11, 1980.
- U.S. General Accounting Office. Improved administration of the vocational rehabilitation program would provide more effective utilization of program funds. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, September 22, 1982.
- Whitehead, C. U. A comprehensive action program for sheltered workshops. Journal of Rehabilitation Administration, August, 1978, 2(3), 115-121.
- Whitehead, C. W. A comprehensive action program for sheltered workshops-- Part II. Journal of Rehabilitation Administration, February 1979, 3(1), 32-41.
- Whitehead, C. W. Sheltered workshops: Effective accommodation or exploitation. Amicus, 1979, 4(5, 6), 273-275.
- Whitehead, C. W. Sheltered workshops in the decade ahead: Work and wages, or welfare. In G. T. Bellamy, G. O'Connor, & O. C. Karan (eds.), Vocational Rehabilitation of Severely Handicapped Persons: Contemporary Service Strategies. Baltimore: University Park Press, 1979, 71-84.

The *Policy Analysis Series* is published by the Minnesota Governor's Planning Council on Developmental Disabilities and the Developmental Disabilities Program, Department of Energy, Planning and Development.

Richard Nelson, M.D., Council Chair--Colleen Wieck, Ph.D., Director.

The purpose of this series is to enhance communication among state and local agencies, service providers, advocates, and consumers on timely issues. We encourage reader participation by giving us feedback on your ideas and perceptions. This paper may be cited:

Developmental Disabilities Program. *Policy Analysis Series Paper No. 16: A Statewide Summary of Sheltered Employment Programs*. St. Paul, MN: Developmental Disabilities Program, Department of Energy, Planning and Development, April, 1983.