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The American Board of Vocational Experts (ABVE) is a professional credentialing body established as a not-for-profit organization. Persons who have attained Diplomate or Fellow status have advanced academic preparation in the areas of rehabilitation, psychology or counseling and hold advanced degrees from an accredited institution of higher education. ABVE, representing both the private and public sectors of the rehabilitation enterprise, was founded in 1980 to ensure the integrity and uniqueness of the vocational expert and to set and maintain rigorous standards for ethical practice. As litigation continues to proliferate and the courts continue to delineate and refine the law, the need for qualified vocational experts becomes essential in the resolution of complex vocational issues in our ever-evolving society.

The certified vocational expert is expected to maintain currency of knowledge regarding the effects of personal injury on earning capacity, labor market changes, hiring practices, knowledge of occupational requirements, as well as the growth and decline of patterns in local labor markets. The American Board of Vocational Experts through the presentation of regularly scheduled professional educational seminars and through its various publications assists the certified vocational expert in the maintenance and expansion of various competencies. The ABVE holds one national conference each year to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas and information regarding forensic practice.
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Guidelines for Authors

The Journal of Forensic Vocational Analysis’ purpose is to explore and explicate total issues of interest to the vocational expert and practitioner; it is a journal that members of the American Board of Vocational Experts and other forensic practitioners may find both intellectually useful and more importantly, applicable to their forensic practice.

The Journal of Forensic Vocational Analysis seeks to publish original articles that are based on sound research methodology in accordance with the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (6th edition). In addition to the publication of original manuscripts, the Journal regularly features book reviews and commentaries. Occasional special issues that focus on a selected topic of interest to the membership as well as monographs may be published. Two issues of the Journal will be published each year.

Manuscripts representative of the following topical areas are especially desired:

- Conceptual and empirical manuscripts relevant to medical, economic, psychological, sociological, and rehabilitation principles and practices vis-à-vis vocational forensic issues.
- Methodologies of economic calculations in forensic practice, inclusive of calculations for loss of earning capacity and other monetary impacts regarding loss associated with disability acquired through product liability, malpractice, or trauma.
- Research and development in the areas of forensic practice including quantitative and qualitative studies relevant to the interdisciplinary nature of vocationology.
- Issues related to updated judicial protocol and procedures, relevance of decisions, and the impact of judicial proceedings on practice.
- Development of protocols for forensic expert testimony.

Proposals for the development of a special issue, monograph, or book or media reviews should be directed to the Editor. These proposals will be considered by selected members of the Editorial Board with the appropriate content expertness. Manuscripts will be reviewed by members of the Editorial Board who will (1) recommend publication to the manuscript as presented or (2) recommend publication with revisions or (3) not recommend publication. Feedback to authors submitting manuscripts not recommended for publication will directly refer to the major gaps or problems within the submitted document with recommendations for future submission.

All submitted manuscripts must be prepared in accordance with the guidelines of the Publications Manual of the American Psychological Association (6th ed., 2009). Do not submit manuscripts that are under review by other periodicals or that have been previously published. There is no prohibition to the acceptance of previously published material provided prior permission has been obtained from the copyright holder and only when such articles/monographs may be more fully dispersed as deemed by the Board of Directors of the American Board of Vocational Experts. Manuscripts should include a brief abstract, a short (3-5 sentence) author biography, and three learning objectives and multiple-choice questions related to the articles.

It is the preference of the Editor that all manuscripts be submitted electronically in Rich Text Format (rtf) to Chrisann Schiro-Geist, PhD, at chrisann@memphis.edu. E-mail your manuscript as an attachment without any identifying information in the filename. A cover page with all authors listed, addresses, e-mail and telephone numbers and other identifying information is required to be submitted as an attachment as well. Once received, an acknowledgment letter or e-mail will be transmitted to the submitting author or lead author. The review process will typically average approximately 60 days.
Editorial

Chrisann Schiro-Geist

Dear ABVE Colleagues and Readers,

We have an issue for you that is a special treat- the second treat of the year, after our first Special Issue on Transition. Some of the articles, are about you and your own professional decisions (Acklin, et al and Lychenko and Beveridge). We give you some space to think about what you are doing in this profession and in professionalism in general and when to maybe say, “enough”. Some are a follow-up to our special focus on Transitional issues (Bryant and Hunter) are continuing to guide us through the world of persons with intellectual disabilities and how we as forensic experts will respond to those issues in legal contests. They are all good reading and you will learn, and can earn your CEU’s from them. Let’s move forward and get on with 2020!

- Chris Schiro-Geist

Chrisann Schiro-Geist, Ph.D.
University of Memphis Institute on Disability
100 Ball Hall
Memphis, Tennessee 38152
cell number 312-961-9665
Certification Requirements and Categories

ABVE Diplomates and Fellows hold either a master’s degree or a doctorate in human services or a related field from an accredited institution; have specific experience and/or training in work sample assessment, functional capacity measures, psychological testing and measurement, job placement and job surveys; and have successfully completed work product evaluation and the National Certification Examination.

Diplomate status requires 7 years of vocational expert forensics experience, either in the assessment of vocational capacity and the demonstration of distinguished performance, or as a recognized vocational expert. Relevant work conducted by the latter might include published works, a leadership position in a professional organization, the presentation of papers at professional seminars, or service in study groups or on legislative committees to enhance the professionalism of the organization.

Fellow status requires 3 years of vocational expert forensics experience in the assessment of vocational capacity.

INTERNATIONAL PSYCHOMETRIC EVALUATION CERTIFICATION (IPEC)
An applicant for the International Psychometric Evaluation Certification (IPEC) shall hold a Master’s or Doctorate degree in Psychology (MA, MS, M.Ed.), School Psychology, Rehabilitation, Social Work, Therapy/Family Therapy/Counseling, Education, or other Health Related Field from an accredited institution. Applicant will have documented specific education courses and equivalents such as Tests & Measurements, Ethics, Assessment/Evaluation, Descriptive Statistics, Inferential Statistics, Multicultural/Ethnic Perspectives, Specialized Psychometric Training and Theories. Applicant will have specific experience in testing domains recognized in the Psychometric Industry such as Academic, Achievement, personality/Behavioral Health, Intelligence/Cognitive, Career/Vocational, Neuropsychology, Forensic, Speech Language, Work Evaluation/Work Capacity, Pain/Medical and Research. This level of membership in ABVE shall require demonstrated testing experience.
Balancing Your Personal and Professional Life in Higher Education

Carrie L. Acklin
University of Wisconsin-Stout

Keith B. Wilson
University of Kentucky

Si-Yi Chao
Southern Illinois University Carbondale

Abstract. Being a faculty member in higher education can be very rewarding; however, it is all too common that faculty find themselves having difficulty balancing teaching, research, and service. This imbalance can impact a faculty member’s overall health, wellbeing, and their work-life balance. This chapter will explore common stressors across all faculty members as well as added stressors for faculty of underrepresented groups. In addition, strategies for restoring and maintaining a healthy work-life balance will be discussed.
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Introduction

Overview of the Structure of Higher Education

Being an educator in higher education can be a very rewarding experience. Faculty members often have the ability to manage their own schedules and work in a variety of locations. However, it is often the case that many faculty members (especially new faculty members) struggle with finding a healthy work-life balance. The imbalance between work life and home life creates stress which can lead to burnout which, ultimately, impacts the faculty member’s overall quality of life, quality of work, productivity, and student satisfaction. Additionally, the imbalance between work and home life can lead to counterproductive behavioral health conditions such as depression and anxiety. Thus, this imbalance may also contribute to unhealthy coping mechanisms such as alcohol or other drug use and abuse. The purpose of this chapter is to examine the roles and responsibilities of tenure and non-tenure track positions, factors associated (and leading) to a work-life imbalance, and how to restore and maintain a healthy work-life balance. Second, this chapter will explore the unique barriers that are faced in academia by faculty members of underrepresented groups, more specifically, women, people of color, and members of the LGBTQIA+ population. Before discussing the implications of work-life imbalance, it is helpful to get an overall view of working in higher education as a faculty.

Roles, Responsibilities, and Expectations of Tenure vs. Non-tenure Track Faculty

Post-secondary faculty members (i.e., faculty teaching at colleges and universities) can be categorized into two main categories: Tenure track and non-tenure track. Tenure track faculty members are ranked as assistant professor, associate professor, or full professor. Assistant professors are placed on what is called a probationary period, which is usually six years. During this period, assistant professors are evaluated on their progress in the three main areas of being a faculty member: Teaching, research, and service. The teaching component is assessed typically by classroom observation and student course evaluations. The research component is assessed by the faculty member’s scholarly activities such as publications (e.g., journal articles, book chapters, books) as
well as local, national and international presentations. The service component is assessed by the faculty member’s involvement in the department, at the university level, and within the community. The service component typically involves being a member of a committee or an advisory board. As the faculty member engages in teaching, research, and service, he or she keeps track of activities which are reviewed by a committee when the faculty member applies for tenure (i.e., no longer on probation) and promotion (i.e., assistant professor to associate professor and associate to full professor). The committee assesses the faculty member’s performance and, if the performance is adequate, the assistant professor is promoted to the rank of associate professor. The faculty member then continues engage in teaching, research, and service for a number of years and is, again, reviewed for performance and, if it is determined that the faculty member’s progress is sufficient, he or she is promoted to full professor. The entire promotion and tenure process can take approximately 12 years from assistant to full professor. However, as we will see later in the chapter, the distinction between teaching, research, and service is important as it defines the roles and responsibilities of the faculty member. Non-tenure track faculty members are either (1) not required to engage in the research and service areas, or (2) are expected to conduct research and service, but at a lesser degree than tenure-track positions. Non-tenure track faculty members can be either lecturers or adjunct instructors. Lecturer positions typically have a ranking system of promotion, such as lecturer and senior lecturer. Adjunct instructors do not typically have a ranking system for promotion. Whereas tenure-track faculty members are expected to actively engage in research and service in addition to teaching, the primary responsibility of the non-tenure track faculty member is focused on teaching. Therefore, it is common that non-tenure track faculty members teach more classes than tenure track faculty. However, the amount of teaching a faculty member (both tenure and non-tenure) depends on what type of university he or she is employed at.

Types of Higher Education Institutions

There are two main types of higher education institutions: Teaching institutions and research institutions. Each institution focuses on the faculty member’s expectations in each of the three main areas: teaching, research, and service. Teaching institutions place a stronger emphasis on the teaching and service areas whereas research institutions place a stronger emphasis on the research area. Therefore, it is common that faculty members at a teaching institution will teach more classes than a faculty member at a research institution. For example, it is common for faculty members at a teaching university to teach 12 credits per semester (typically four classes) whereas a faculty member at a research university might only be responsible for teaching 9 credits per semester (typically three classes). The nature of the degrees that are offered also differ between teaching and research universities. Teaching institutions typically offer bachelor’s and master’s degrees. However, research institutions offer bachelor’s, master’s, and doctoral degrees. Understanding the differences between teaching and research institutions is important as there are both similarities and differences between the types of stressors that are faced by faculty members based on the institution and curriculum (e.g., undergraduate, graduate) they may teach. Now that the groundwork for the types of faculty members (tenure track and non-tenure track), faculty member’s roles and responsibilities, and how these roles and responsibilities depend on the type of institution that the faculty member works at (teaching or research institutions), factors that create barriers in balancing teaching, research, and service will be discussed next.

The Impact of Not Balancing Teaching, Research, and Service

Balancing teaching, research, and service is key to overall levels of satisfaction with being a faculty member as well as overall satisfaction with work-life balance. However, many higher educators find themselves having a difficult time balancing teaching, research, and service. The imbalance between teaching, research, and service can lead to burnout. Burnout can be defined as “a prolonged response to chronic emotional and interpersonal job stressors, emotional exhaustion, cynicism, and inefficacy or reduced personal accomplishment” (Padilla & Thompson, 2015, p. 552). One of the key words in the definition of burnout is the word “prolonged”, meaning that burnout does not happen quickly, rather, it happens gradually. It is approximated that nearly 20% of faculty members experience burnout (Padilla & Thompson, 2015). Additionally, burnout can negatively impact a faculty member’s overall quality of life, job performance, classroom instruction, and overall levels of productivity (Sabagh, Hall, & Saroyan, 2017). While there are common factors that lead to burnout across all types (e.g., tenure and non-tenure track) of faculty members, there are unique factors that vary based on whether the faculty member is non-tenure or tenure track as well as whether the faculty member is a member of an underrepresented group (e.g., women, people of color, member of the LGBTQIA+ population). The next section examines the common and unique factors associated with burnout based on tenure.
status as well as how a faculty member identifies (e.g., gender, race, sexual orientation, age).

Factors Related to Burnout Based on Tenure Status

As discussed earlier in the chapter, a higher education educator can either be a non-tenure track or a tenure-track faculty member. Approximately half of all new faculty appointments are for non-tenure track positions and roughly three out of five new faculty appointments are tenure-track (Padilla & Thompson, 2015). Overall, faculty members experience high degrees of burnout. However, there are differences in levels of burnout when comparing tenure track faculty with non-tenure track faculty. For example, with the increase in non-tenure track positions, faculty members on the non-tenure track are experiencing an increase in the number of courses they are responsible for teaching each semester while tenure track faculty members are experiencing an increase in the amount of administrative duties they are responsible for (Padilla & Thompson, 2015). The increased teaching load for non-tenure track faculty and the increase in administrative duties for tenure track faculty can lead to increased pressure to fulfill other job duties such as research and service. This pressure can increase the amount of stress that the faculty member experiences and, thus, increase the risk of burnout. Although there are similarities across all types of faculty members, how a faculty member identifies can also increase the risk of burnout and, subsequently, work-life imbalance.

Identity is a critical component in a person’s life. How a person identifies shapes his or her perceptions, values, beliefs, and social networks. Additionally, a person’s identity impacts how this person is perceived, and treated, by others. The social network, perceptions, and treatment by others can impact how likely it is for a person to experience burnout in the workplace. For example, Sabagh, Hall, and Saroyan (2017) expressed that support from colleagues, from the institution, and general social support outside of the workplace decrease the likelihood of burnout. Therefore, support is a key component whether a person is at risk for burnout. However, the overall levels of support are impacted by how a person identifies.

Each person has a primary and secondary identity based on the demographic variables of the individual (e.g., gender, race, sexual orientation). A person’s primary identity is the demographic variable that the person considers to be the most salient (Wilson & Acklin, 2018). For example, a person may identify as a female who works in higher education, has two children, and identifies as being Catholic. While the person may present with several of the aforementioned demographic variables, the person may consider being female as being the most salient. In other words, in the example mentioned above, the person’s primary identity would be being a female. There is one major distinction between a primary and a secondary identity.

A secondary identity can be defined as a demographic variable that the person does not belong to, but the person relates to due to having a relationship (e.g., family member, partner, friend) with the person that has the particular demographic variable. For example, a person might identify their secondary identity as disability because the person has a brother or sister that has a disability. Identity is inextricably linked to social support. One aspect of social support is how a person advocates for another person within their support network. Advocacy can be described as going “against the grain” in a major way for another person, or group of people (Wilson & Acklin, 2018). Advocacy might look like a department chair supporting a faculty member, or a fellow faculty member advocating for one of his or her colleagues. In a study conducted by Wilson and Acklin (2018), it was reported that people found it easier to advocate for others who share similar primary and secondary identities. It was also reported that people found it more difficult to advocate for others who do not share similar primary and secondary identities. The results of this study are critical for two main reasons. First, Wilson’s and Acklin’s study is the first of its kind that examines the relationship between identity and advocacy. Second, their study provides insight to why members of underrepresented groups face certain barriers in higher education. The next section of this chapter will highlight unique barriers that are faced by faculty members of underrepresented groups in higher education.

Unique Stressors for Faculty of Underrepresented Groups

Women in Higher Education

More women are earning their doctorate degrees and entering into higher education, but women only represent approximately one quarter of all faculty members (Misra, Lundquist, Holmes, & Agiomavritis, 2011). In their study, Misra and colleagues found that women are less likely than men to become promoted and, when women are promoted, it takes between one and three years longer. Other findings from their study showed that men tend to engage in more research activities when compared with women who spend more time in administrative roles such as undergraduate program directors. It was also found that when women serve as program directors, the promo-
tion process takes even longer – approximately 12 years from the rank of associate professor to full professor. In addition to serving in administrative roles, women tend to engage in more service work when compared to men. Traditionally, service work has not held as much weight in the tenure and promotion process as research does. The combination of additional job duties and time spent on service activities contributes to the lower rates and increased time in the tenure and promotion process (Misra et al., 2011). To provide additional support to the findings from Misra and colleagues, Sotello, Gonzalez, and Wong (2011) highlighted what stressors look like for women in higher education. For example, regarding additional duties and service work, one woman in their study reported that her stress levels are often discredited. She noted “... if you start mentioning specific instances, they’ll say you over reacted or you’re oversensitive and they don’t realize it’s the combination of all these things over many years” (p. 207). Being discredited and invalidated can have serious implications for women’s overall health and add to the unbalancing of the personal and professional lives of women in higher education.

Women of color

Acklin (2018) indicated that the presence of mental health diagnoses is more prevalent in women than men. Acklin further indicated that the presence of a mental health diagnosis increases the likelihood of having a co-occurring substance use disorder. This is especially true for women in higher education. The likelihood of having a mental health diagnosis and a substance use disorder increases when a person has more than one demographic variable of discrimination. For instance, there is a growing body of literature that examines the additional stressors and barriers faced by women of color. Traditionally, unique issues related to women of color have been largely overlooked in the literature. Part of the reason is because much of the research is focused on only women in general and not women of color. Sotello and colleagues (2011) highlighted how women of color are already underrepresented in higher education but become even more underrepresented at higher faculty ranking. For example, when examining women faculty, Sotello and colleagues asserted that according to the Almanac, less than 1% of faculty positions in the United States were held by American Indian women, 4% by Latinas, approximately 7% by Asian American and 7% by African American women, compared to approximately 78% of their white women counterparts. Further, women of color face additional stressors when compared to white women in general. For example, in their study, Sotello and colleagues reported that women of color tend to feel more pressure to conform, experience feelings of being on display, have more difficulties establishing credibility, are stereotyped, and experience isolation and a lower level of support when compared to their white female counterparts. Further, Sotello and colleagues noted that women of color reported experiencing “hostile, racist, sexist classroom experiences despite their field of study, type of institution, and faculty ranks” (p. 205). The isolation and discrimination that women of color face ultimately impacts the likelihood of promotion, tenure, hiring, and retention (Ford, 2011). Much like women of color having unique and additional barriers in higher education, the same can be said for faculty members of the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer, Questioning (LGBTQIA+) community.

Members of the LGBTQIA+ Community

Faculty members of the LGBTQIA+ community face unique stressors in higher education. For example, Billimoria and Stewart (2009) expressed that LGBTQIA+ faculty members experience hostile or “chilly” working environments that impacts their overall work performance, health, and wellbeing. Much like women, and women of color, LGBTQIA+ faculty face discrimination in hiring, promotion, and salary (Billimoria & Stewart, 2009). In the same study, Billimoria and Stewart further expressed that many LGBTQIA+ faculty members intentionally do not disclose their sexual orientation to avoid discrimination and a hostile working environment. When it comes to research, LGBTQIA+ faculty members often become “tokens” for the LGBTQIA+ community and are expected to research LGBTQIA+ issues by their colleagues; however, when such research is conducted, it is often devalued and discredited (Billimoria & Stewart, 2009). Discrimination, discreditation, and sexism become even more pronounced for LGBTQIA+ faculty members of color (LaSala, Jenkins, Wheeler, & Goldsen, 2008) when compared to white faculty members who are LGBTQIA+. LGBTQ faculty members and LGBTQIA+ faculty members of color continuously have to mitigate gender bias, homophobia, racism, and heterosexism in the workplace (LaSala et al., 2008). The additional stressors faced by women, women of color, LGBTQIA+ faculty, and LGBTQIA+ faculty of color contributes to the work-life imbalance.

Restoring the Work-Life Balance

It has been well established that faculty members, in general, face stress related to balancing teaching, research, and service. It has also been established that these stressors become increasingly complex for members of underrepresented groups, and even more complex when a
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It is likely due to inefficiency. Here are some strategies that faculty members can improve their efficiency:

1. Front-load your courses: What is meant by front-loading? Front-loading means preparing your courses ahead of time instead of working on them throughout the semester. Faculty can be more efficient in the classroom by taking one to two weeks between semesters and devote their work time with preparing their courses. This preparation can help make the course flow smoother during the semester. Another way to front-load a course is ensuring that your syllabus is specific and detailed. This means having details about attendance, assignments, late-policies, academic dishonesty, and a course schedule with lecture topics and due dates of assignments at the end of the syllabus. Having a detailed syllabus helps with being consistent in the classroom and clarity about students’ expectations. Let’s return to Deanna for a moment. Deanna was asked once how many hours per semester did she think she spent on student emails. Deanna estimated that she spent approximately 5 hours per semester responding to student emails. The person who asked Deanna the question was surprised that so few hours were being spent responding to students. The person asked Deanna how this was possible. Deanna explained that she found that when she had a detailed syllabus, students were clear about what the expectations were and, if a student had an issue, all Deanna had to do was direct the student to the specific page and section of the syllabus. Approximately 95% of the time, that information was sufficient for the student.

2. Knowing that you do not have to work with everyone: Often, faculty members tend to feel that the more people there are on a team, the more efficient and productive the team is on projects like journal articles or presentations. While that might be the case at times, generally, the more people who are involved on a project, the more time consuming and less efficient that project is. One reason for the increase in time and a decrease in efficiency is due to the amount of time that is spent communicating expectations and content, which can be a significant portion of the work time spent on a project. Faculty can be more efficient in the classroom and clarity about students’ expectations. Let’s return to Deanna for a moment. Deanna was asked once how many hours per semester did she think she spent on student emails. Deanna estimated that she spent approximately 5 hours per semester responding to student emails. The person who asked Deanna the question was surprised that so few hours were being spent responding to students. The person asked Deanna how this was possible. Deanna explained that she found that when she had a detailed syllabus, students were clear about what the expectations were and, if a student had an issue, all Deanna had to do was direct the student to the specific page and section of the syllabus. Approximately 95% of the time, that information was sufficient for the student.

3. Working on projects that are in your “wheel-house”: A faculty member’s “wheel-house” is considered projects that the faculty member can complete with minimal effort and while producing outstanding output. There is the saying “you don’t have to re-invent the wheel” and the same holds true for research projects as well. Build
up upon your previous work instead of trying to research several topics at once. By doing so, you will find that writing journal articles, books, or even grants to become smoother and more efficient.

As can be seen by the three major points above, efficiency is possible in higher education. However, efficiency is only one key aspect of achieving a work-life balance. The second key component is advocacy. There is self-advocacy and advocacy for others. As was mentioned with the Wilson and Acklin (2018) study, advocacy can be defined as going against the grain in a major way for a person or group of people. To build upon this definition, advocacy can also be for oneself. What is meant by advocacy for oneself? Often, it is the case that most faculty members conform to departmental norms and do not advocate for resources they need to do their job more efficiently. One golden rule to self-advocacy is that if you do not ask, the answer is always “no”. However, there may be reasons that people do not advocate for themselves or for others – their self-identity. As previously mentioned, people tend to find it more difficult to advocate for others if others are not part of their group (Wilson & Acklin, 2018). The difficulty in advocating might be a male faculty member not advocating for his female colleague, or a faculty member of color not advocating for themselves because of being in the minority. Again, there are several reasons faculty do not advocate for other faculty members. However, in not doing so, they are putting themselves at a disadvantage, even more so if the faculty member is of color.

So far, the importance of efficiency and advocacy has been highlighted as two key factors in achieving work-life balance. The last key factor is diversity. It is well known that diverse and inclusive environments foster supportive working relationships which can, in turn, foster a healthier workplace environment and increase faculty morale and productivity (LaSala et al., 2008; Sabagh et al., 2017). It is important to note here that not every higher education department will be diverse; however, it is still possible to have a work-life balance in less diverse environments. One way to have a work-life balance in a homogeneous department is to let other people’s “stuff” be their “stuff”. What is meant by that? Everyone has their own issues. We know that racism, discrimination, sexism, or any of the other -isms exist in academia. While we are not saying that any of the -isms are right, we contend that one can learn to navigate these systems and still have a healthy and productive career. When we are able to not internalize other people’s “stuff”, we free up mental and emotional energy to continue to be productive in the workplace. The intersection of efficiency, advocacy, and diversity in maintaining a healthy work-life balance is undeniable. Having a balance of efficiency, advocacy, and diversity can significantly improve a faculty member’s experience in higher education.

**Conclusion**

Being a faculty member in higher education can be difficult and many faculty members find themselves with a work-life imbalance, some of which have reported working upwards to 60 hours per week. However, having a work-life balance can make academia rewarding. Most faculty members are not “taught” how to navigate the higher education system. Other faculty members (such as women, faculty of color, faculty of the LGBTQIA+ community) face additional barriers and stressors in higher education that increase the likelihood of burnout. As was seen in this article, several faculty members face stressors related to teaching, research, and service and these stressors become more prevalent and complex with faculty of underrepresented groups. Although these barriers and stressors are prevalent, it is possible to achieve a work-life balance. For example, as was seen, if a faculty member can establish efficiency, advocacy, and diversity, the potential for a work-life balance is increased. First, efficiency in the classroom, with research, and service all contribute to work-life balance. Second, advocacy for one’s self and others can contribute to forming supportive relationships and fostering healthy collaboration among colleagues. Last, diversity in the workplace can foster an inclusive and healthy workplace. Also, it was recognized that even if a workplace is not diverse, it is still possible to be productive and have a work-life balance.
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Abstract. The primary purpose of this longitudinal research was to examine the relationship between Individualized Plan for Employment (IPE) goals and vocational rehabilitation (VR) employment outcomes to determine whether obtaining a job congruent to the IPE goal increased vocational satisfaction, wages and job retention. A longitudinal sample of vocational rehabilitation clients (N = 18) served by the Maryland State Department of Education’s Division of Rehabilitation Services (DORS) who were successfully rehabilitated and closed (Status 26) in 2002 were assessed. Results generally supported the relationship between Holland’s person-environment congruence construct and employment outcomes for this population. A significant relationship was found between disability category (cognitive, physical, sensory) and employment outcome congruence with the vocational rehabilitation IPE goal. Education and outcome congruence with the vocational rehabilitation goal was also found to be significant. However, person-environment congruence did not significantly increase participants’ vocational satisfaction nor wage variance.

Keywords: longitudinal vr outcomes, congruence, job retention, vocational satisfaction

Literature Review

The state-federal vocational rehabilitation (VR) services program was established in 1917 to provide assistance obtaining and retaining employment for people with disabilities. Securing and maintaining employment are the primary goals for vocational rehabilitation programs. Major labor market indicators show that employment for people with a disability has improved, with unemployment rate declining from a high of 15% in 2001 to a low of 9.2% in 2017 (United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2017). However, people with a disability have a much lower employment rate at 37% than people without a disability at 77.2% (Lauer, E.A. & Houtenville, A.J., 2019).

The current study provides a second longitudinal follow-up to Beveridge and Fabian’s (2007) study that investigated the extent to which congruence between the stated goal in a consumer’s individualized plan for employment (IPE) and the actual job acquired predicted vocational satisfaction and wages. The foundational study used a random sample of 171 people with disabilities who received vocational rehabilitation services through the Maryland State Department of Education’s Division of Rehabilitation Services (DORS), obtained employment, and were successfully closed in the DORS fiscal year 2002-2003 (Beveridge & Fabian, 2007). The results of the study indicated that there was a relationship between disability and demographic variables and obtaining an employment outcome congruent with the VR goal. Men were found to have obtained slightly higher rates of congruent employment outcomes compared to women. Also, participants with a cognitive disability were less likely to obtain a congruent employment outcome compared with participants in the physical disability category and sensory disability category (Beveridge & Fabian, 2007). The study also found that participants who obtained a successful employment outcome congruent with their VR goal earned higher wages as compared to participants who did not obtain a congruent employment outcome. Finally, results did not indicate that there is a positive
relationship between job satisfaction and obtaining an employment outcome congruent to the VR goal.

The follow up 10 year longitudinal study in 2013 enabled a longitudinal analysis of employment outcomes as related to the stated VR goal on a consumer’s IPE. The results of the 10 year follow up study found that (20, 69%) of the sample were currently working eight years after case closure (Status 26). Out of the participants who were currently working (13, 65%) obtained a congruent employment outcome to the client’s IPE goal, (4, 20%) obtained a related employment outcome and 15% obtained an employment outcome that was not congruent to the client’s IPE goal. Thus, the congruence of the IPE goal and VR employment outcome increased participant’s job retention.

A relationship between disability category and participants vocational profile was also found. Participants within the physical disability category (20, 69%) earned a mean hourly wage of $23.07, a mean hours worked per week of 37.25, a mean of job tenure of 6.35 years and a mean vocational satisfaction score of 4.7 on a Likert scale of 1-6. Participants within the sensory disability category (6, 20.7%) earned a mean hourly wage of $14.52, a mean hours worked per week of 31.17, a mean of job tenure of 10.5 years and a mean vocational satisfaction score of 5.0 on a Likert scale of 1-6. Participants within the cognitive disability category (3, 10.3%) earned a mean hourly wage of $4.50, a mean hours worked per week of 20, a mean of job tenure of .25 years and a mean vocational satisfaction score of 3.0 on a Likert scale of 1-6.

A relationship between educational attainment and wages was also indicated. Participants in the high school graduate category (13, 44.8%) earned a mean hourly wage of $22.09, had a minimum of $7.00 and a maximum of $60.00 a range of $53. Participants in the bachelor's degree category (2, 6.9%) earned the highest mean wages $46.40, had a minimum of $25.50 and a maximum of $67.30 a range of $41.80. Participants in the secondary education category (2, 6.9%) earned mean wages of $16.03, had a minimum of $8.50 and a maximum of $23.56 a range of $15.06. Participants in the post-secondary education category (3, 10.4%) earned mean wages of $15.85, had a minimum of $8.00 and a maximum of $36.05 a range of $28.05. Participants in the master's degree category (4, 13.8%) earned mean wages of $15.28, had a minimum of $9.75 and a maximum of $28.84 a range of $19.09. Participants in the associate of arts degree and vocational certificate category (2, 6.9%) earned mean wages of $12.19, had a minimum of $9.00 and a maximum of $15.38 a range of $6.38. Participants in the elementary education and special education categories did not report working and thus did not have a mean wage per hour in this sample. This study seeks to further examine the extent to which congruence between IPE goals and job acquired influence vocational outcomes such as satisfaction and weekly wages 17 years post closure.

**Individualized Plan for Employment**

The Rehabilitation Act Amendments (1992) and the Workforce Investment Act (1998) mandate consumer choice and self-determination in the VR process (Beveridge & Fabian, 2007). According to this legislation, consumers must be actively involved in identifying and selecting a vocational goal. An Individualized Plan for Employment (IPE) is required for people with disabilities thereby enabling them to make informed choices in their own employment. IPEs detail the specific rehabilitation services that are being provided and the methods that will be used to provide services. The IPE must be “consistent with the strengths, resources, priorities, concerns, abilities, capabilities, interests, and informed choice of the individual” (Rehabilitation Services Administration, 2003).

**Congruence**

Holland’s six-letter hexagon is a comprehensive theory that tests the person–environment fit and has been widely used as a theoretical framework to address various outcomes, such as job satisfaction and performance. John Holland’s (1992) theory postulated that consistency between an individual’s vocational interest and job choice predicts job satisfaction and satisfactoriness. Consistency is defined in this theory as congruence, or the degree of “fit” between the individual’s personality and the work environment (Beveridge & Fabian, 2007). Holland Codes are composed of three letters used to describe patterns of values, attitudes, and behaviors that represent the diverse ways people think and act. Holland believed that there are six major personality types (realistic, investigative, artistic, social, enterprising, conventional) and that people and occupations can be categorized according to combinations of these types. Congruence, according to Holland, is the degree of similarity between an individual’s personality and any given work environment, can be determined and can be used to predict job satisfaction, job performance, and job stability (Toomey, Levinson, & Palmer, 2009, p.82). According to Holland, people are more likely to be satisfied and stay with jobs that are congruent or consistent with their vocational choice (Holland, 1992).
Variables Related to Employment Outcomes

The United States Department of Education’s Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA) defines successful employment outcome as employment for at least 90 days in an integrated employment setting. Martz and Yonghong (2008) reported that the VR outcome of competitive employment could be predicted using demographic, functional limitation, and service provision information. Previous studies have investigated job factors like support, training (Oswald, 2016), wage (Beveridge & Fabian, 2007), education (Tucker & Degeneffe, 2017), disability type (Yonghong & Martz, 2010; Jun, S., Osmanir, K., Kortering, L., & Zhang, D., 2015), age and age of disability onset (Choe, C., & Baldwin, M., 2017), gender (Lindsay, S., Cagliostro, E., Albarico, M., Srikanthan, D., & Mortaji, N., 2018) and race and ethnicity (Shogren, K., & Shaw, L., 2017) in relation to successful employment outcomes. Understanding these intersecting needs assists in the determination of which approach works best for whom, how, and under what conditions in order to improve employment outcomes.

During the time in which individuals are participating in VR services, monetary support for those incurring additional costs that are necessitated by the individual’s participation in an assessment for determining eligibility and VR needs or while receiving services under an IPE (such as uniforms and room and board for training opportunities) was found as predictive of service engagement and employment at closure (Oswald, 2016). Post-employment, it was found that compensation and benefits were important for employment outcomes as well. Decent pay, regular paychecks, steady hours, and flexible work schedules were identified as important for positive employment outcomes (Freedman, 1996; Anand, P., & Sevak, P., 2017). Additional benefits, such as merchandise discounts, free meals, transportation vouchers, and company holiday parties were also identified as positive employment advantages.

Disability type.

Disability-type has a direct impact on successful employment outcomes in individuals (Yonghong & Martz, 2010; Jun, S., Osmanir, K., Kortering, L., & Zhang, D., 2015). Research shows that individuals with disabilities are employed at lower rates than individuals without disabilities (Jang, Wang, & Lin, 2014) and persons with psychiatric disabilities have fewer employment outcomes than any other disability group (Cook, Burke-Miller, Roessel, 2016; Moran, Russionova, Yim, & Sprague, 2014). People with disabilities often encounter a multitude of barriers when seeking employment including a lack of familial support, limited work history, low educational attainment, chronic work absenteeism, lack of participation in employment services and clinical services, and employer attitudes towards this population (Jang, Wang, & Lin, 2014). In addition, this population experiences higher poverty rates and often reside in communities with limited resources than individuals with no disability (O’Keefe & Schnell, 2007).

Because respective disabilities affect different modes of functioning, it was found that certain disabilities may be more amenable to work and are more easily accommodated. In addition, depending on the severity of the disability, certain disabilities have better support, accommodations, and specialized services available to them. In addition, disability-type had a direct effect on the number of jobs obtained, which may be related to the attitudes of individuals without disabilities as some people may view certain disabled groups as more acceptable and capable to perform certain types of jobs than those with other disabilities (Jang, Wang, & Lin, 2014). Consequently, a disabled individual’s ability to obtain employment may potentially be largely dependent on employers’ negative attitudes towards certain disability-types.

Variance in types of disabilities has been observed in relation to employment outcomes achieved. In 2017, the employment percentages were 52.9% for individuals with hearing disabilities, 44.2% for individuals with vision disabilities, 27.8% for individuals with cognitive disabilities, 25.3% for individuals with ambulatory disabilities, and 16% for individuals with self-care disabilities (Lauer, E.A. & Houtenville, A.J., 2019). Different types of disabilities manifest unique risk factors when taking into account successful employment outcomes. There is conflicting evidence that show how the significance of a disability affects successful employment outcomes. Since the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 was passed, the state-federal system has been mandated that vocational rehabilitation agencies give priority to those clients with the most significant disabilities. This may suggest that more time and effort is put into these cases, while those consumers with less significant disabilities do not fare as well. Pack and Szirony (2009) found that consumers with more significant disabilities were more likely to achieve successful employment. However, this was in contrast to studies by Capella (2002) and Pack, Roessler, Turner and Robertson (2007), who found that employment outcomes were improved when the limitations of disability were not as severe.
Age and onset of disability

The prevalence of disability increases with age. About 3 out of every 10 individuals age 65 and older, and about 15% of individuals ages 55 to 64 (United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2017). Previous research has found that age of onset of disability is often associated with adaptation to the disability, in that individuals generally adapt to their disabilities over time and that adaptation suggests there has been an integration of a disability into one’s life and work-life (Livneh & Martz, 2003; Choe & Baldwin, 2017). Employment-related variables that were found to be significant reflected that work experience significantly increased the probability of successful employment outcomes. Age and age of disability-onset have a direct impact on employment outcome, in that older age and a longer time with a disability are more likely to lead to a successful outcome. This suggests that a greater maturity that comes with age may be important in successful outcome of the employment process. In addition, older individuals have a higher likelihood of having a more extensive work-history, which may lead to an increased understanding of the accommodations required of an individual’s respective disability in the work setting and more translatable skills for a new occupation. However, according to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics (2017), among people age 65 and older, people without a disability (24.2%) were about 3 times more likely to participate in the labor force than people with a disability (7.7%).

Vocational training

Kosciulek, Prozonic, and Bell (1995) investigated the congruence between vocational evaluation job recommendations, vocational skills training, and jobs obtained by successfully rehabilitated state VR clients. Results indicated that many successfully rehabilitated clients were placed in occupational areas they were not trained for. Out of the sample that was studied, only half of the subjects obtained jobs congruent with the training they received. In addition, less than half of the subjects obtained jobs that were congruent with the jobs recommended in their vocational evaluation reports, which suggests that little relationship exists between vocational evaluation recommendations made and eventual rehabilitation outcomes. Based on these results, the authors proposed that one avenue for increasing the congruence levels between vocational evaluation and other phases of the rehabilitation employment outcomes, is the presence of community-based vocational evaluations geared towards realistic training and jobs for persons with disabilities. These results were complementary to those found by Beveridge and Fabian (2007). Findings from this study indicated that vocational rehabilitation clients not only obtained employment congruent with their IPE rehabilitation goals (84.6% for males and 72.5% for females), but also earned significantly higher wages as a result of obtaining a congruent employment outcome.

Consumers who received vocational training were more likely to obtain competitive employment (Hayward & Schmidt-Davis, 2003; Oswald, 2016). Vocational training and miscellaneous training (general education development) were found to be significant predictors of employment success for people with mental impairments as well (Rosenthal et al., 2006). When considering employment outcomes for deaf or hard of hearing consumers of vocational rehabilitation programs, Moore (2002) found that vocational training was predictive of higher income levels of these consumers.

Assistive Technology and support services.

The significant value of assistive technologies is that it has the potential to enhance the quality of life and independence of persons with disabilities by facilitating management of basic needs, participation in community activities and engagement in employment (Loggins, S., Alston, R., & Lewis, A., 2014). Consumers who received rehabilitation technology services were more likely to attain a positive outcome in competitive employment (Pack & Szirony, 2009). A study with visually impaired participants showed that receipt of rehabilitation technology services was predictive of employment at higher-level positions (Leonard, D’Allura, & Horowitz, 1999). Chan, Cheing, Chan, Rosenthal, and Chronister (2006) found similar results in individuals with orthopedic disabilities, reporting that provision of rehabilitation technology services contributed to positive employment outcomes.

The likelihood of job retention increases with the intensity of support provided, which includes internal and integrated social support (Becker, D., Xie, H., McHugo, G.J., Halliday, J., & Martinez, R.A., 2006). Pack and Szirony (2009) found that on-the-job support services were found to increase a recipient’s likelihood of attaining competitive employment. Socialization and acceptance in the workplace is another factor that suggests positive employment outcomes with disabled persons. This includes feeling of belonging, and praise from employers (Freedman, 1996). Opportunities to interact and socialize at work with co-workers, customers, and employers contributes heavily to job satisfaction. Reinforcement from staff facilitates encouragement, which leaves workers feeling praised, and thus more satisfied with their jobs. This adds an element of security and perceived support from the employee. Also, public support for disabled per-
Vocational satisfaction

The interrelationship among disability-related functional limitations, performance of work tasks, and work satisfaction are cited as important elements according to the Minnesota Theory of Work Adjustment (Rumrill, Roessler, Vierstra, Hennessey, & Staples, 2004). Work satisfaction and the nature of workplace barriers were found to be major components to job retention and successful employment outcomes. In a qualitative research study by Freedman (1996), vocational rehabilitation participants indicated that feeling productive and keeping busy were essential aspects of work satisfaction. This involves doing meaningful work, having a routine and structure, assuming responsibility, doing a variety of tasks, and completing work on time. Meaningful work can be difficult for persons with disabilities to obtain, due to limited functioning. As Freedman (1996) cites, many consumers express pride in knowing that they had the ability to do their jobs and they could do the work as well as anyone else, regardless of what the job was. Employees with multiple sclerosis who are satisfied with their jobs were found to be less likely to leave the workforce voluntarily or involuntarily (Roessler, Fitzgerald, Rumrill, & Koch, 2001). The satisfaction with a particular job is also partially a function of one’s capacity to do the job. Unsatisfactory employees eventually become dissatisfied with their employment because they receive less positive reinforcement through work as they continue to perform at a subpar level. Akkerman et al. (2016) found that job satisfaction was an indicator of well-being related to work among people with intellectual disability. The authors identified the importance of previous experiences and skills, interactions with nondisabled workers, the development of a sense of belonging, and the proximity of support as indicators of job satisfaction.

Background

The purpose of this longitudinal research was to examine the relationship between IPE goals and vocational rehabilitation employment outcomes to determine whether obtaining a job congruent to the IPE goal increased vocational satisfaction, wages and job retention. Congruence, as defined above, would be determined by an examination of IPE goals and Holland codes for employment outcomes (Gottfredson & Holland, 1990). Holland codes are arranged into a three-letter hierarchy (e.g., RIE) to describe patterns of values, attitudes, and behaviors that represent distinctive ways people think and act. Although federal mandates have emphasized client choice in establishing a rehabilitation goal, very little research has been conducted to determine whether the job achieved through vocational rehabilitation services is congruent or consistent with the employment goal as stated on the IPE. Research on variables influencing successful vocational rehabilitation outcomes has been extensive (Hayward, 1998; Bolton, Bellini, & Broekings, 2000; Yonghong & Martz, 2010; Oswald, 2016, Choe, C., & Baldwin, M., 2017; Tucker & Degenneffe, 2017; Lindsay, S., Cagliostro, E., Albarico, M., Srikanthan, D., & Mortaji, N., 2018); however, client vocational rehabilitation goals have been largely ignored. One exception was a study by Kosciulek, Prozonic, and Bell (1995), who examined 78 state VR consumers’ vocational evaluations and employment outcomes using the first three digits of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT) codes. Employment outcomes were classified as congruent or incongruent; all three codes were required to be the same to meet their definition of congruence. Results of the study indicated that fewer than half of the participants obtained jobs that were congruent with the jobs that were recommended in their vocational evaluation reports. Another exception was the study by Beveridge and Fabian (2007), who examined 171 state VR consumers’ IPE goals and employment outcomes utilizing the DOT and Holland codes. Results of the study found obtaining an employment outcome that was congruent to the IPE goal had a significant effect on participants’ wages. Educational attainment and disability category were also found to affect vocational rehabilitation employment outcomes for these state VR participants.

The key question regarding vocational rehabilitation programs is the extent to which receipt of vocational rehabilitation services improves the labor force participation, vocational satisfaction, and economic prospects of persons with disabilities. What makes this study unique is the longitudinal examination of the relationship between the client (IPE) rehabilitation goals and vocational rehabilitation (Status 26) employment outcomes. Thus, this research will investigate which variables affect obtaining a vocational rehabilitation employment outcome congruent with the client’s vocational rehabilitation goal as stated on the IPE and the longitudinal effects of a congruent employment outcome.

Research Questions

This study addressed the following specific research questions:

1. For those clients who obtained a successful voca-
tional rehabilitation employment outcome and continue working, was there a relationship between disability, demographic variables and an outcome congruent with the vocational rehabilitation goal?

2. For those clients who obtained a successful employment outcome congruent with the vocational rehabilitation goals and continue working, were these clients more satisfied with their job than those clients who did not obtain their goal?

3. For those clients who obtained a successful employment outcome congruent with their vocational rehabilitation goal and continue working, did their weekly wages differ significantly from those of clients who did not obtain an outcome congruent with the vocational goal?

Method

Sample

The population used for this study was 2,972 persons with disabilities who received vocational rehabilitation services through the Maryland State Department of Education’s Division of Rehabilitation Services (DORS) and obtained employment. The participants were randomly selected across all five regions in Maryland from the total number of individuals who were successfully rehabilitated by DORS and achieved an employment outcome (Status 26) in 2002. The Maryland Division of Rehabilitation Services (DORS), the state VR program that provided the study sample for this investigation, has a slightly higher success rate than the federal program and was 70.6% successful closures when this sample was obtained (DORS, 2003).

Table 1 presents the demographic and disability characteristics of the original 2002 DORS Status 26 population, the 2012 longitudinal pilot study, and compares them with the current longitudinal sample that was obtained in 2018.

Participants

The sample for this 15 year longitudinal study consisted of 18 participants that were available via telephone contact. All participants were VR clients from Maryland DORS who were rehabilitated and returned to work in 2002 (Status 26). These participants were randomly selected out of the pilot study sample of 30 participants conducted in 2012. Investigators recruited participants via phone and verbal consent was obtained. Participants completed a client satisfaction survey, “How did we do?”, that was sent at case closure 15-16 years previously. The survey also included questions regarding current employment, weekly wages, job satisfaction, and occupation(s) since completing rehabilitation services.

The final sample included 10 males (55.6 %), 8 females (44.4%). Mean age for the sample was 53.4 years, ranging from 36 to 71 years of age. The majority of the sample reported their ethnicity as Caucasian (14, 78%), followed by African-American (4, 22%). No participants identified as Asian American, Hispanic/Latino, American Indian, Arab/Middle Eastern, multiracial or other. A majority of the participants (9, 50%) indicated that they were diagnosed with a physical disability, followed by cognitive disabilities (5, 28%) and (4, 22%) reported a sensory disability. The majority of the participants (10, 55.60%) indicated a high school diploma, (4, 22.0%) completed post-secondary schooling, (2, 11.10%) held a bachelor’s degree, (1, 5.55%) completed an associate’s degree or vocational certificate, and (1, 5.55%) completed special education courses.

Measures

Permission to conduct the study was obtained from the director of the Maryland Division of Rehabilitation Ser-
services, Ms. Suzanne Page, who directed the Technical Assistance Branch to forward computerized data files to the author without any client-identifying information. Data included disability/impairment category, gender, race, age, years of education attained at referral, weekly wages at closure, job satisfaction, and occupation at closure. The client’s IPE vocational rehabilitation goals were also obtained. The data were obtained from the DORS database via a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet and were coded into an SPSS 25.0 format.

**Procedures**

Investigators conducted a review of the participant’s IPE vocational rehabilitation plan goal, the job obtained after completing a program of vocational rehabilitation and the current job 15 years after the initial job placement and case closure to determine the congruency between a participant’s vocational rehabilitation goal and vocational rehabilitation (Status 26) employment outcome. The DORS vocational rehabilitation employment outcomes were coded according to the DOT (e.g., 033.362-010) in the DORS database and were translated into Holland codes (e.g., ESR) using the Dictionary of Holland Occupational Codes (Gottfredson & Holland, 1996). Each participant’s IPE rehabilitation goal was also assigned DOT code numbers and translated into Dictionary of Holland Occupational Codes (e.g., ESI). Congruency was determined by the author via an examination of the VR IPE employment goal and employment outcome Holland codes. An employment outcome was coded as congruent if the first two letters of the Holland codes matched for the IPE vocational rehabilitation goal and the VR employment outcome. Since the determination of congruency did not involve any rating or evaluation of an individual’s behavior by different observers or raters, interrater reliability was not an issue (Bellini & Rumrill, 1999).

For example, a client trained to become a Computer Programmer (DOT # 030.162-010/Holland code IRE) who obtained employment as a Microsoft Certified Networking Engineer (DOT # 033.362-010/Holland code IRE) would be counted as employment in an occupation congruent with the vocational rehabilitation goal, as the first two Holland code letters are in agreement (e.g., “I” indicates employment in one of the “Investigative” occupations and “R” is a realistic occupation). However, if the same client obtained employment as an Insurance Claims Adjuster (DOT # 241.217-010/Holland code ESR), the outcome would be counted as employment in an occupation not congruent with the vocational rehabilitation goal.

---

Table 1. Comparison of Research Sample Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>DORS Status 26 Population Number %</th>
<th>2003 Number %</th>
<th>2011-2012 Number %</th>
<th>2019 Number %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,618 54.44</td>
<td>91 53.2</td>
<td>91 53.2</td>
<td>10 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,354 45.56</td>
<td>80 46.8</td>
<td>16 55.2</td>
<td>8 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>1,514 50.94</td>
<td>106 62.0</td>
<td>20 69.0</td>
<td>14 78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>1,349 45.39</td>
<td>65 38.0</td>
<td>9 31.0</td>
<td>4 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>109 3.66</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>1,859 62.34</td>
<td>79 46.2</td>
<td>2 7.2</td>
<td>5 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>712 23.97</td>
<td>66 38.6</td>
<td>20 71.4</td>
<td>9 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensory</td>
<td>407 13.69</td>
<td>26 15.2</td>
<td>6 21.4</td>
<td>4 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
as there is no agreement in the sequence of Holland code letters (IRE vs. ESR).

Data on the participant’s employment status and vocational satisfaction was obtained via the aforementioned client satisfaction survey. This survey is provided to every DORS client who has been successfully rehabilitated and closed (Status 26). The survey solicits participant feedback on five questions. This study used the question on the survey that asks, “Are you satisfied with your job?” The response is indicated on a 6-point Likert scale (6 = extremely satisfied, 1 = extremely dissatisfied). For SPSS analysis, the six levels of job satisfaction were recoded into a dichotomous variable (1 = satisfied, 2 = not satisfied). To obtain the longitudinal data, the same DORS client satisfaction survey was utilized with participants via phone 15 years following case closure.

Results

The results of the study are presented according to the three research questions.

Research Question 1

The first research question was, “For those clients who obtained a successful vocational rehabilitation employment outcome and continued working, was there a relationship between disability, demographic variables and an outcome congruent with the vocational rehabilitation goal?” A regression analysis was run to determine how the relationship between disability, demographic variables and outcome congruence with the vocational rehabilitation goal. The dependent variable in this model was congruence; the predictor variables were gender, age, race, education, type of disability, and job satisfaction.

The sample consisted of 18 participants with 11 (61%) currently working 15 years after case closure (Status 26). It is also important to note that 2 (11%) of the participants were retired. Out of the 11 participants who were currently working 5 (46%) obtained a congruent employment outcome to the client’s IPE goal, (4, 36%) obtained a related employment outcome and (2, 18%) obtained an employment outcome that was not congruent to the client’s IPE goal.

Disability, Demographic Variables and Outcome Congruence: Results found no statistically significant relationship (p = .299) between client demographic variables and outcome congruence with the vocational rehabilitation goal. However, when the disability category was run independently of the other predictor variables (gender, age, race, education, and job satisfaction) the regression model was statically significant (p = .026). Additionally, the education variable also significantly predicted outcome congruence when run independently (p = .041).

Research Question 2

The second research question was, “For those clients who obtained a successful employment outcome congruent with the vocational rehabilitation goal and continue working, were these clients more satisfied with their job than those clients who did not obtain their goal?”

Outcome Congruence and Job Satisfaction: Descriptive statistics revealed that the participants with both congruent (N=9) and incongruent (N=2) employment outcomes and vocational rehabilitation goals were satisfied with their job. None of the participants indicated feeling unsatisfied with their job. Thus there were no significant findings with this research question.

Research Question 3

The third research question was “For those clients who obtained a successful employment outcome congruent with their vocational rehabilitation goal and continue working, did their weekly wages differ significantly from those of clients who did not obtain an outcome congruent with the vocational goal?”

Outcome Congruence and Economic Variance: An analysis of variance showed that the effect of congruence was not significant, F (1,9) = .210, p = .657. Results indicated no differences between the congruent and incongruent participants and wages.

Disability and Economic Variance: Investigators further examined economic variance through disability variables using cross-tabulations. Participants within the cognitive disability category (5, 45.5%) earned a mean weekly wage of $769.80. However the standard deviation among these participants was $595.64. A mean hours worked per week of 32, a mean of job tenure of 7.4 years and a mean vocational satisfaction score of 5.4 on a Likert scale of 1-6. Participants within the physical disability category (5, 45.5%) earned a mean weekly wage of $256.40 (SD = $196.79), a mean hours worked per week of 20.90, a mean of job tenure of 6.10 years and a mean vocational satisfaction score of 5.2 on a Likert scale of 1-6. Participants within the sensory disability category (1, 10.0%) earned a mean hourly wage of $25, a mean hours worked per week of 2.5, a mean of job tenure of 11.0 years and a mean vocational satisfaction score of 6.0 on a Likert scale of 1-6.
Discussion

The purpose of this research was to examine the relationship between IPE goals and vocational rehabilitation employment outcomes to determine whether obtaining a job congruent to the IPE goal increased the participants’ vocational satisfaction, wages and job retention. Findings indicate no statistically significant results due to the small sample size. However, the study did yield a number of interesting findings.

The first research question asked whether disability and demographic variables are related to congruent VR employment outcomes for persons with disabilities. Although the demographic and disability variables were not significantly related to congruency and job retention in the regression analysis, when the disability category and education were each run independently the regression models were statically significant. Further analysis showed that participant’s disability category affected the client’s vocational profile. Participants within the cognitive disability category earned the highest mean wages, worked the most hours each week and had the second highest job tenure. Participants within the physical disability category were in the middle of the group for wages, hours worked and had the lowest job tenure. Participants with the sensory disability category had the lowest wages and hours worked, however, this group had the highest reported vocational satisfaction and job tenure. Interestingly the disability category variable did not behave as prior research indicated, as cognitive disabilities often have poorer long term outcomes whereas physical disabilities tend to have better VR outcomes and (Beveridge & Fabian, 2007; Young, Tokar, & Subich, 1998). However the standard deviation for this group was quite high and could have been skewed by two participants that indicated significantly higher wages than the rest in this category. The standard deviation among those in the physical disability category was much smaller.

The second research question investigated whether Holland’s person-environment congruence was related to vocational satisfaction. The data revealed that the participants with both congruent and incongruent employment outcomes and vocational rehabilitation goals were satisfied with their job. None of the participants indicated feeling unsatisfied with their job. Previous research, using primarily college student samples, has found weak, but positive support for a correlation between job satisfaction and congruence (Young, Tokar, & Subich, 1998; Gottfredson & Holland, 1990), with fewer studies reporting no relationship (Beveridge & Fabian, 2007; Tranberg, Slane, & Ekeberg, 1992). It may be that the considerable effort that VR clients invest in achieving a successful employment outcome tends to cast this goal achievement in a positive light, whether or not it is congruent with their stated goal. Moreover, people with disabilities, who may be working for the first time or working after a lengthy period of unemployment, may experience considerably more benefit from any type of employment compared with non-disabled individuals, such as college students.

The third research question sought to determine whether obtaining a vocational rehabilitation employment outcome congruent to the vocational rehabilitation goal increased the participant’s weekly wages. Findings showed that the effect of congruence on weekly wages was not statistically significant. As noted above, participants disability category did effect wages just not at the (.05) level of significance. The analysis showed that participants in the cognitive disability category earned considerably higher weekly wages ($769.80) than those in the physical disability category ($256.40) and cognitive sensory category ($25.00). This finding on the significant effect of an individual’s type of disability on wages is consistent with prior research on vocational rehabilitation employment outcomes (Moore, 2002; Bolton, Bellini, & Brookings, 2000).

Limitations

Findings should be considered in light of this study’s limitations. One significant limitation relates to the research sample size and narrow geographic scope. The sample size of (N=18) was inadequate to complete the statistical analyses and find statistical significance. In addition, this sample included participants from only one state vocational rehabilitation agency and is applicable only to the DORS public vocational rehabilitation population. This raises concerns regarding the study’s external validity for other populations; thus, the results may not be generalized to other populations with disabilities (e.g., workers’ compensation clients).

A second limitation relates to selection bias. Although efforts were made to select a random sample of participants, only those participants whose files were complete on the majority of the predictor variables were included. This criterion limited the sample with regard to the vocational satisfaction predictor in the “How did we do?” satisfaction survey. Therefore, it is possible that the study sample was biased toward individuals who were both satisfied with Maryland DORS services and more satisfied with their jobs.

Another limitation relates to the instrumentation and measurement of the participants’ vocational satisfaction.
The data on the participants’ vocational satisfaction were obtained via the DORS “How did we do?” satisfaction survey. As indicated, this survey only had one question measuring vocational satisfaction and may not have adequately captured this domain. This is consistent with prior research utilizing this instrument that did not find a relationship between congruence and vocational satisfaction (Beveridge & Fabian, 2007). This instrument did not have any psychometric data available for review and has only been used a few times for research. Other studies utilizing established instruments have found that person-environment congruence predicts vocational satisfaction (Hoeglund & Hansen, 1999; Gottfredson & Holland, 1990). Thus, failure to find significance in this study may have been related to the vocational satisfaction measure as well as the sample size.

A final limitation, related to the research design, is the fact that DORS client files were not available for review. DORS collected and provided electronic data but not the physical files for review and data analyses. It would have been beneficial to have the participant case records available to determine whether participants who did not achieve a congruent vocational rehabilitation employment outcome had other factors in common (e.g., frequently changing IPE goals). However, since authorization from DORS was obtained only for a review of electronic data on closed cases, this was impossible.

**Conclusion**

Although these findings are only correlational, they still hold important implications for rehabilitation counselors and vocational experts. One implication relates to job development and the importance of assisting clients to obtain jobs that are consistent with their articulated vocational goals and interests. This need is further emphasized in that job-goal consistency contributes to long term job retention. The majority of the participants in this study obtained jobs consistent with their IPE goals, indicating that VR counselors were investing efforts in assisting clients in carefully exploring and identifying their vocational goals. Prior research in vocational psychology has supported a strong relationship between choice goals and subsequent vocational performance (Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 1994).

Another implication this study highlights is the importance of rehabilitation counselors efforts in collaborating effectively with VR clients to identify appropriate rehabilitation goals and to assist them to maintain long term employment improving job retention. When selecting their individualized plan for employment (IPE) goals, rehabilitation counselors need to assist all clients with a disability in making realistic vocational choices and supporting consumer choice, as this collaboration creates success in the VR process.
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Over the past 10 years, there has been an emergence of programs for individuals with mild to moderate intellectual disabilities (Kelty & Prohn, 2014). However, many colleges and universities now offer programs to include those individuals in the whole college experience (Newman et al., 2011). Historically, higher education has devoted some resources to individuals with mild intellectual disabilities, compared to the student population with severe intellectual disabilities (Boucke, 2016). Students with learning disabilities were able to get into vocational programs that were more prestigious and known for the success of their graduates as compared to those with mild to moderate intellectual disabilities (Suazo, 2014).

Ryan (2014) noted that transitioning students with mild to moderate intellectual disabilities to post-secondary life from high school is a required responsibility for public schools, as transition is a required piece of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA, 2004) legislation. The federal definitions of mild, moderate, and severe intellectual disabilities are based on IQ scores ranging from the low 70s as mild to the low 40s being classified as severe, and moderate falling in the middle. The definition also dictates a manifest deficit in adaptive behavior with both deficits originating before age 18 (IDEA, 2004). Unfortunately, students with mild to moderate intellectual disabilities have historically been relinquished to vocational programs, day schools, and sheltered workshops that provided minimal educational opportunity or social engagement (Rogan, Updike, Chesterfield, & Savage, 2014). May (2012) pointed out that for people with disabilities in the United States, there are post-secondary collegiate programs that have the potential to provide access to the mainstream community and the opportunity to go to college. These programs are at two- and four-year institutions including community colleges, technical schools, and universities, and offer classes that are specific to each student as well as access to regular college classes (Izzo & Schuman, 2014). The college experience included social activities and students with intellectual disabilities who attended college participated in social activities common to the non-disabled college student (Izzo & Schuman, 2014). After the passage of the 2008 Higher Education Act, high school graduates with mild to moderate intellectual disabilities were also able to experience college just like their same-age counterparts (Prohn, Kelley, & Westling, 2017).

This case study was undertaken as an effort to report the stories of graduates of a post-secondary program for people with intellectual disabilities at a Mid-Southern University within the United States. Despite the increase in the number of Post-Secondary Education (PSE) programs, relatively little is known about how the partici-
pants feel about their time in the program (Papay et al., 2018). To acquire knowledge about how participants, feel about their experiences in such a program, I interviewed two participants who attend a Mid-south urban university. In this article, I will first situate the literature supporting the study. Then, I will provide a road map through the two descriptions of success by the graduates that I interviewed.

Literature Review

The exclusion of children with disabilities in schools became unlawful and publicly viewed as discrimination with the passage of the Education of All Handicapped Children Act or PL 94-142 in 1975. It has been reauthorized and is now known as the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA, 2004) which guarantees a free and appropriate public education to all students with disabilities ages 3-21 in public schools in the United States. IDEA (2004) requires an extensive individualized transition plan for students when they are graduating from high school. This plan should contain years of interest inventories, visits to different post-secondary placement options, and evidence of years of pertinent educational and vocational training relevant to the desired post-secondary plan for each student (Thomasello & Brand, 2018).

The opportunities for students to transition from high school to PSEs are critical to maintain their existence as continued options for people with mild to moderate intellectual disabilities and supported by the current literature (Prohn, Kelley, & Westling, 2017).

Importance of the Programs

Unfortunately, students with intellectual disabilities are least likely to participate in post-secondary education without specialized programs. Some feel left out, and experience some of the most dismal adult outcomes (Kelty & Prohn, 2014). Compared with their same aged peers, people with intellectual disabilities typically earn less, engage in lower skilled jobs, experience higher rates of poverty, and have limited access to employee benefits (Thoma, 2013). Ensuring that students with disabilities have opportunities to participate in post-secondary education has been recognized as one of the keys to a successful transition to adulthood (May, 2012). Postsecondary education has been linked to increased earning potential for young adults who continue their education after high school, even for those who have not earned a degree (Sanford et al., 2011). The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) (2015) and the Individuals with Disabilities Improvement Act (2004) were both supposed to ensure that when students with disabilities leave school, they will be prepared for an enriched life, able to participate in community activities, be employed, and have their own residences after finishing school because of their access to the general curriculum (Thomasello & Brand, 2018).

The National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (Newman et al., 2011) provided a unique source of information to help in developing an understanding of the experiences of secondary school students with mild to moderate intellectual disabilities nationally as they go through their early adult years. Sanford et al. (2011) addressed questions about youth with mild to moderate intellectual disabilities in transition by providing information over a 10-year period about a nationally representative sample of secondary school students with disabilities who were receiving special education services under IDEA in the 2000–2001 school year.

Researchers have discovered a growing trend towards the inception and creation of collegiate programs for students with mild to moderate intellectual disabilities at institutions of higher learning throughout the United States and is overwhelmingly comprehensive concerning the creation and components of the programs (Griffin & Papay, 2017; McEathron, Beuhring, Maynard, & Mavis, 2013; Newman et al., 2011). Based on the limited research concerning PSE from the graduate’s perspective, there is a call for qualitative research to investigate viewpoints from the graduates about program effectiveness and success (Cimera, et al., 2018). Existing research investigating PSE’s impact on employment outcomes consist of studies of small sample sizes. However, due to the types of programs in existence, these studies suggest that participants in PSE have better occupational and social outcomes than their counterparts who did not receive access to a collegiate program (Scheef et al., 2018).

What is success?

The success of the program at a college or university is not only dependent on the administration but also the programs and the mentor staff in place to support individuals with disabilities (Shephard, 2014). The primary research on the topic of PSE’s has been programmatic, and the success defined by clinical parameters. This research allows the participants to define success in their own words. Components that are crucial and lead to the successes of the participants are faculty and staff members who have a stakeholder mentality (Boucke, 2012). They are crucial to the actual teaching of the students, which is ultimately the goal, so that skills are acquired, and students become functional parts of society (McEathron et al., 2013).

Snyder (2018) observed that programs are generally divided into two categories: inclusive and exclusive. Inclu-
sive programs offer extensive immersion into the normal college experience, including residing in dorms or apartments with other non-disabled college students (Suazo, 2014). Glatter (2017) stressed that the primary aim of the program was training with the entire college experience being highlighted alongside employment and independent living. The general belief by the THINK college and the advocates of the program is that the more inclusive the program, the more successful the program (Squires, Burnell, McCarty, & Schnackenberg, 2018).

Other programs are more exclusive (Izzo & Shuman, 2014). In exclusive programs, the students attend college but go to specialized classes stressing the individual needs of each student; such programs do not always have a residential component (Shepherd, 2014). One type of program is not considered better than another, just different, continuing the ideology of individualization that was initiated by federal law in 1975 with the passing of the previously called All Handicapped Children Education Act, now referred to as IDEA (2004). The purpose of this study is to ascertain the definition of success by graduates of collegiate programs for people with intellectual disabilities.

**Situating the Study**

Drawing on Cimera et. al’s (2018) for more qualitative research about the success of PSE’s, this research used a qualitative case study to better understand the college experiences of two former students with mild to moderate intellectual disabilities who attended college like their same age counterparts. The case studies focus on how the students defined success in their programs.

The current study explores the complex social acceptance of individuals with disabilities and synthesized elements of critical disability theory. Pothier and Devlin (2006) examined the components of the philosophy and considers society’s responses to a person’s set of circumstances, higher education being the circumstances in this study. They emphasized context and social organization that we use to assess performance tasks (Pothier & Devlin, 2006).

Critical disability theory contains two key political insights: powerlessness and context (Pothier & Devlin, 2006). It is more than just who has or gets power (in this case who gets to go to college or not). The value or context is based on the politics of how a person fits into society, or on a basic level, if they fit into society at all. It is a hope that an individual’s conception of his or her disability story and the struggles of those who have gone before will serve as the foundation for a version of “we” in society instead of “us and them”. College has traditionally been a prime example of “us” and “them” paradigm, only a few of “us” are able to attend, leaving “them” powerless and without inclusion, until the rapidly changing environment on college campuses including “them” that have mild to moderate intellectual disabilities into the society (Wehman et al., 2018). Having the “us and them” mentality of disability undermines the advocacy that serves the field of special populations in achieving the current level of regulations that those with disabilities enjoy (Pugach, 2001). Advocacy groups recognize the need for the support of those with mild to moderate intellectual disabilities for everyone to be included in society (Hunt & Marshall, 2012).

Stories of those who have been marginalized by our society readily connect us to individuals whose life situations represent ethical or moral political struggles about which we are enjoined to take a stand (Pugach, 2001). Barone (2001) posited that good stories, when told well, stay with the reader and cause the reader to commit to action. Such stories are often conveyed in qualitative methodology. The stories told in this case study are meant to inspire others with disabilities to believe they too can attend college and have access to and full participation in postsecondary education, which has been identified as one of the key challenges in the future of secondary education and transition thus ending the marginalization of this population (Sanford et al., 2011). Postsecondary education has been linked to increased earning potential for young adults who continue their education after high school, even for those who have not earned a degree (McEathron et al., 2013). This study explores the definition of success of a post-secondary program from the program participant perspective.

**Research Methods**

This study explored the experiences of two individuals with disabilities who attended a collegiate program at a four-year urban university in the Mid-South. The Post-Secondary Education Program is a 60-hour program culminating in a completion award in Career and Community Studies. Participation in the program provides students with an option for continuing their education beyond high school to increase employment opportunities. The program provides individualized programs of study in the areas of academic, social, vocational and independence for students ages 18-29 with intellectual disabilities. At the heart of this program is a person-centered planning model that uses the Systems Approach to Placement. The goal of the program is independence and gainful employment. The research question that framed this study was: How do each of the graduates of the program...
define successful completion of the program for people with intellectual disabilities? To answer this question, I engaged in a single case-design qualitative research project. In this case study, I interviewed two successful graduates from a collegiate program for individuals with intellectual disabilities at a mid-southern, urban university to better understand each graduate’s success story.

Methodology: Case Study

I chose to use a case study for this research project because of its methodological eclecticism that allows for flexibility of the researcher (Marshall & Rossman, 2016). Case studies incorporate many data collection tools and interpretation strategies and allow the researcher to use his or her own judgment as to which one is most suitable for the type of case study being generated. Often it is necessary to clarify the selection process; for instance, one may be interested in a case and wish to explore it as an illustration of a larger phenomenon (Marshall & Rossman, 2016). This defines the methodology used to construct this study perfectly. Another reason case study works so well for this type of research is that once the case has been carefully selected and defined, researchers may draw on data collection and analytical strategies according to the unique opportunities and challenges the case study presents (Marshall & Rossman, 2016).

Sample Selection

The sample selection criteria included: completion of a university program for individuals with intellectual disabilities and the participants’ willingness to meet with the researcher and the desire to share each individual story. The director of the program made initial contact with chosen participants so that I could meet the individuals at a location that was comfortable and convenient for them. This contact helped me to have a list of individuals that the officials from the university program believed would be willing to participate in the study.

Alli

The first interview was conducted with a young woman named Alli (a pseudonym). Alli was a happy, outgoing, young woman in her late 20s with an infectious personality who was ready to recount all of her experiences that brought her to where she is today. She had a beautiful smile, used a walker that she pulled behind her, but it did not seem to slow her down a bit. She was dressed in hip, trendy clothing and worked hard to look like everyone else, but she explained, she looks professional when she goes to work.

Toni

The second participant’s pseudonym is Toni. He was a tall, lanky man in his early 20s. When I met him on campus after work, he was in his work uniform. He wore large dark glasses that seemed to engulf his face, and he pushed them up on his nose quite often and fidgeted with them.

The University Program

The program I studied is a Postsecondary Education Program consisting of 60 hours culminating in a completion award in Career and Community Studies. Participation in the program provides students with an option for continuing their education beyond high school to increase employment opportunities. The program provides individualized programs of study in the areas of academic, social, vocational, and independence for students ages 18-29 with intellectual disabilities.

Data Collection

The data collection included one semi-interview lasting about an hour with each of the students who graduated from the program. IRB approval was obtained. The semi-structured interview allowed me to actively listen to what was being said and modify or change questions, or even ask different ones that were relevant to the individual experiences of the participant (O’Reilly & Dogra, 2017). During each of the two interviews, I kept Kim’s (2015) concept of Interview Logistics in mind. Why is this important? I reminded myself that what I claim to know about each participant’s beliefs, values, and feeling in particular, their social contexts were based on the responses to questions that I asked each one of them (Kim, 2015). I attempted to remain “flexible and open-minded during the process, since that will let unexpected data emerge and could also contribute to developing good rapport and trust” (Kim, 2015, p. 164). I took to heart the advice given concerning the achievement of trust, rapport, and the dependence on my genuine caring, interest, and respect for each participant’s human dignity.

Interview Guide

The questions that were used in the semi-structured interviews are listed in Table 1.1.

Data Analysis

To make sure that my data was in fact the voice of each of my participants, I employed the use of different lenses of the narrative process. McCormack (2000) outlined different lenses with which to analyze data to make sure that the story and the voice are authentic to each interviewee. These lenses are the lens of language, context,
moments, and pauses. I considered the lens of language after my data was coded and looked to see words that were used most often and what particular words were not used. I also looked at the pauses in the language and the mannerisms used during the interview (McCormack, 2000). I next looked at the context of each interview. I considered how the situational context lent to further support my developing understanding of each interviewee’s view of “working it out” (Robinson & Hawpe, 1986). I considered the lens of moments and looked at the times the participant seemed unsure about how to answer and what I responded with to make the participant feel sure of his or her current positions on the idea presented by my questions about each of their experiences (McCormack, 2000). My greatest concern was making sure that each of my interviews were what was expressed to me, not my interpretation of what was expressed to me. Certainly, the idea of these programs being successful to the participants is important to those who run the programs as well as those who learn in the programs. The definition of success is different depending on who is asked, participants may value one aspect of the program over another or feel that one part of the program helped them more than another part of the program (Squires, Burnell, McCarty, & Schnackenberg, 2018).

Robinson and Hawpe (1986) argued that storytelling involves narrative thinking in which we reflect upon our experiences to construct stories. I read each interview transcript and identified the stories that were told, deciding what did and did not constitute a story of success (O’Reilly & Dogra, 2017). Each of the participants told his or her stories in a different way. It allowed me to make sense of their experiences, construct them for my readers, and communicate their individual meaning, creating a story unique to each individual. I then attempted to reduce the stories to a set of elements that revealed important issues or events in the individual’s experiences in college. I identified the common elements to develop cross-case comparisons (Garaway, 1996; O’Reilly & Dogra, 2017). I looked for specific patterns or themes, as well as contrasts, and let that data drive where the participants’ stories of success emerged. Story maps were created, and I recounted the success story the participant relayed to me. The story maps were then enhanced by artistic collages I made of the artifacts provided by the participants. I appreciated the idea of the “Cabinets of Curiosities or Wonder” that began in the Baroque period by well-do European travelers who amassed objects that were important to their travels (Kim, 2015). I looked at my data after I coded it initially, emotionally, and structurally and found a cabinet of items that would create a sense of curiosity within my readers. That cabinet or collage was constructed, and these themes emerged in a similarities and differences construct: the importance of regular college classes, funding collegiate endeavors, independence in college and in the future, the importance of a job, and lastly, social interactions with other college students. Each participant shared their own experiences and painted a word picture for me so that through them, I could see their experiences while they were in college. Figure 1: Themes that define success and relevant literature. This graphic will help the reader organize the pertinent experts as they relate to the themes that emerged during the story telling.

Results: Emergent Themes

Importance of Regular College Classes

Obviously, in a collegiate program for people with disabilities, going to class is very important (Scheef et al., 2018). Both talked about skills they learned in the classes designed especially for them. They talked about learning to cook, clean, shop, get around town, pay bills, and take care of themselves, what to do if they need help and how to stay safe. Both participants took regular classes at the university they attended which is recommended by the THINK college standards (Thomasello & Brand, 2018). Toni took a dance class, a jogging class, and a class called, Weather and Climate. He said, “I did the work in the class but didn’t take any tests, I could have if I wanted to I guess, but I didn’t want to.” When asked about how the other students interacted and treated him in class, he remembered, “Most everyone was very nice, some people talked more to me and I liked that.” Weather and Climate was his favorite class because he likes to watch the weather and regularly watches the Weather Channel. His favorite professor was the jogging class professor. He stated, “She was very smart and made me feel very comfortable and welcome in the class, and I liked that.”

Alli took a Women’s Studies class, and a Criminal Justice class. She said that she really liked the Women’s Studies class because she got to talk a lot and share her opinions and shared that she believed that the women in the class listened to her. By being listened to, she felt a part of the whole experience (Glatter, 2017). She explained, “Sometimes, people think I don’t know when they are pretending to listen when I talk, but I do. I am smarter, especially about people, than they think I am.” She continued, “It is sad that some people don’t give people with disabilities enough credit. I hope I taught them some things. I would like to speak to big groups across the United States and tell them to give people with disabilities a chance with jobs, and with life. We have a lot to offer.” Alli’s desire
to share her story is an example of self-advocacy that is defined by Kelty and Prohn (2014) as the ability to tell others what type of disability an individual has, and what they need to be included in the community.

Funding their College Endeavors

A commonality of the two participants was a discussion about how they paid for their attendance in the collegiate program. Alli reports a long, convoluted journey that led her from being an orphan, after burying both of her parents and a grandparent, becoming emancipated, homeless for a while, and in her words, “being led by the Lord to a family that took me in and helped me find out that I could go to college,” she says gratefully. She clarifies, “I hope that doesn’t sound silly to you, but I believe it with all of my heart.” She talks about needing a job to make ends meet, not wanting to take hand-outs, and learning about financial aid. She continues in this by saying that the people in the program worked with her to enable her to pay as she went, so that she could attend the program. They also helped her get some scholarships that were available for the program. These scholarships were not readily available in the past (Izzo & Shuman, 2014). She says proudly, “I am so blessed, now I have a job, a house, a vehicle, and people who help me, and I live as independently as everyone else! At times, I didn’t know if I was going to be able to stay in the program, and I had to quit for a while to make some money, but then I came back, and I graduated.” Pursuing secondary education is expensive for most families, however, financial planning should be part of the transition program for students who are going to attend PSE to prevent the trend of attending college for a while, and then not being able to finish because an individual runs out of vocational rehabilitation funding and does not qualify for traditional funding, and are never able to return to college (Cimera, Thoma, Whittenburg, & Ruhl, 2018).

Toni’s financial experience was altogether different. His access to post-secondary education was very different than the typical student with a mild or moderate intellectual disability (May, 2012). He had no idea how much the program cost his parents, and he never had to worry about money as his parents took care of all his financial concerns. He said, “They wanted me to go to college, and they paid for it, and I lived at home while I did. I didn’t have to worry about money, but I am learning how to budget my money, so I can live by myself one day.” Newman et al. (2011) describes all the funding sources available for program participants: Pell Grants, Vocational Rehabilitation Grants, Scholarships, and traditional student loans which help more individuals participate without worrying about having a job while attending college.

Independence in College and in the Future

There were unique differences about the participants that helped answer the questions about their personal definitions of success. Toni said that he is learning to drive and wants to get a car so that he can go work at Graceland. The juxtaposition of the employment that he currently has versus his dream of employment in the future is something to consider, but he is glad to have a job now that he likes. He knows that to have his dream job, he needs to be able to get around independently, and he wants to do that in a car that he owns. Alli owns a van and has drivers hired through the Medicaid Waiver program that take her where she needs or wants to go, thus providing her with the independence that she craves. Medicaid Waiver is a federally funded program that helps provide services to people who would otherwise be in an institution, nursing home, or hospital to receive long-term care in the community (Prohn, Kelley, & Westling, 2017). The approval of Federal Medicaid Waiver programs allowed states to provide services to consumers in their homes and in their communities. Programs like the collegiate classes for people with intellectual disabilities help teach self-advocacy skills and independence and support the hopes and dreams of everyone (Griffin & Papay, 2017).

Another big difference between the two is that Toni lives at home with his parents. He said that he took classes in the collegiate program that taught him to cook and clean and live independently, but he reported, “I am still practicing those things, before I get out on my own.” Alli owns a small, starter home that she lives in with the help of her Waiver employees and a roommate. Independent living is a key component to post-secondary programs for individuals with mild to moderate intellectual disabilities (Suazo, 2014). She loves her home and said she got to decorate it, just like she wanted, except for her roommate’s room.

Importance of a Job

Having a job when they left the program was very important to each participant. Both participants talked about internships they completed through the program that followed classes that taught them to create a resume and how to act during different classes. Toni told me that the vocational class was his favorite class in the program because the teacher treated them like adults and focused on what they could each do well. Toni and Alli both completed an internship at a local retirement home. Alli laughed and recounted this story:

They told me to polish the nails of the ladies that lived there. Now, I loved to talk to them, but since
I have CP (cerebral palsy) my hands shake a lot when I am trying to do things like painting nails. Heck, I don’t even polish my own nails. (Laughing) I gave it a try, and polished some nails of the ladies, but after I did a few ladies, when I would come to see them they would tell me, honey, I don’t need my nails done, why don’t you just come sit and visit with me. (Grinning) I didn’t blame them a bit, but I wish someone would have thought of that before they made that my job. I didn’t do very well with that job, but the people were nice.

Toni also worked at the same retirement home, but he worked in the kitchen, so he did not have as much interaction with the residents as Alli did. He said, “All of the people in the kitchen were very nice to me and helped me learn my job, so that I could do it independently. When I made a mistake, they didn’t get mad, they just told me what to do next time.” A survey of PSE programs described a major barrier to sustained employment was the facilitation of paid work experiences that had on the job training to support the student as he or she learned the skills necessary to be successful (Scheef et al., 2018). Alli talked about an internship with Walgreens that was short-lived. She said she really enjoyed working there putting things on the shelves and building relationships with other employees, and everything was great until they put her on the cash register. She recalled, “There I didn’t do so well. Math wasn’t one of my favorite classes in high school, and it took me a long time to count change and customers were always in a hurry. I don’t know what happened, but suddenly, none of us could go to work there anymore, that was sad.” Vocational opportunities that are long-lasting are key to the future success of participants (Cimera et al., 2018).

She continued later saying, “I always wanted to be a receptionist because I am good at talking to people… I kept asking people in the program to help me find a job as a receptionist.” Instead, she recounted, that she was placed at a local Pizza Hut, where she worked with a job coach who basically did the job for her. She said, rather exasperatedly, “It’s not like I could go get the boxes myself, because I can’t carry a box and use my walker, and I am so short, I couldn’t reach where they kept the boxes. So pretty much, my job coach did my job and that isn’t the way things are supposed to work.” She used the skills she learned in the vocational/occupational classes to get a job as a receptionist at a local dentist office through people she went to church with on a regular basis. She recalled proudly, with a big smile, “They knew I had a disability, obviously, but they gave me a chance, and I have been there seven years. Sometimes when people with disabilities go looking for jobs, they don’t get a chance to get one because all people see is what they can’t do, people should look at what we can do, not just look at us and see the things we can’t do.” Later, she stated, “I love my job, and I make mistakes, but everyone does, and they understand that. This is what all companies should know about hiring people with disabilities, we can do things!” Knowing the skills of those with mild to moderate intellectual disabilities is a selling point for many programs, after businesses give students an opportunity (Shephard, 2014).

Alli discussed the need to match skills of the participants with jobs they are able to do and match participants with jobs that they will be successful in. She explained that she was not given job opportunities that worked for her and that she could be successful at independently. She was also concerned that internship opportunities, “started out great, and then just went away.” She believes that if people with disabilities were able to go into the workplace and let employers know that they are able, then the opportunities would flourish. She was quick to tell me, “When you start your program, you match abilities with jobs, not just put people somewhere to say they have a job that makes everyone look bad.” She offered to, “… go on the road and tell people everywhere to give people with disabilities a chance at a job. That is my dream job,” she explained with great zeal. According to Rogan et al. (2014) the SITE program at IUPUI learning job skills is making the dream of a great job a reality. Employment rates for graduates of their program are as high as 65% some years. Administrators of the program report that their staff sees those dreams come true and sees more self-reliance, and skills that translate into a more independent life for their graduates (Shephard, 2014).

Toni has a job that he has had for the last three years that he did obtain through the collegiate program. He works at a food service company on campus. He describes his job as “cleaning up where people eat and talking to people.” He remarked, “I pick up and clean the trays, and the tables and I sweep. There is always work to do, and most of the time everyone is nice to me.” When asked if he liked his job, he said he did, but he dreams of working at Graceland one day, but he does not know if that will ever happen. He hopes that he is learning enough in his job on campus to be hirable at Graceland. If fully inclusive campus work internships are part of the college experience and have illustrated preliminary success, then community policies and funding streams should promote competitive employment opportunities and not segregated work settings with limited wages and experiences (Kelley & Westling, 2013). The thought process being that the internship ideally would have been established where Toni
dreamed of working, so that he learned that job and had ultimate choice in where he works, like his non-disabled peers. Lack of choice by participants of these programs as to where they work is also another barrier to the success of the individual (Squires, Burnell, McCarty, & Schnackenberg, 2018).

Social Interactions with Other College Students

Devine (2016) explains in her research that participants in her study discussed the importance of the social aspect of leisure time and social activities for enjoyment, sustaining friendships, meeting new people, and opportunities to connect with others who have common recreation interests. Story duplication between participants about the love of the social aspects of the program was probably the most surprising to me, as I did not anticipate the participants mentioning so many of the same aspects of the program as the other one. The commonalities are very interesting. Both participants said that the very best part of the program they completed was the participation in the Best Buddies program. Best Buddies International is a nonprofit 501(c)(3) organization dedicated to establishing a global volunteer movement that creates opportunities for one-to-one friendships, integrated employment, and leadership development for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. The campus has a very active chapter of Best Buddies. A concerted effort is made to match buddies with others who have similar interests and hobbies. Both participants described lasting friendships between the buddies they made upon entering the program. These relationships are crucial to the whole college experience (Glatter, 2017).

A common memory to both participants is that yearly, the program participants elected a “Mr. and Ms. Top Dog”—a pseudonym. The Mr. and Ms. Top Dog competition is part of the PSE program and students are chosen via election of their peers in the program. Unbeknownst to me when I was given the names of these participants, both were selected as “Mr. and Ms. Top Dog.” Their fondest memories are getting to ride in a float that members of the program helped to create and winning the float competition that year beating all other entries in this huge homecoming tradition across all campus social organizations. The social organizations that are available to the typical college student are available to everyone (Griffin & Papay, 2017). Alli remembered that it was “so cool to win and get to ride in the float. We were just like everyone else in college.” The tradition of tailgating was also fondly reported as one of their favorite activities. At the tailgates, they mingled with their friends they made in regular classes and friends made through the program. Toni said, “Everyone treated me very nice. I never thought in high school that I would get to do this stuff.”

Integration into the college community is essential for students with mild to moderate disabilities to truly experience college in the same way other students enjoy the experience (Ryan, 2014).

The last commonality between the interviews was graduation. With great pride both reported that they did graduate from the University that they attended. All programs report graduation results (Sanford et al., 2011). When asked if they attended graduation with all the other students on campus, both participants reported that they did not. The program had a private graduation ceremony apart from the other students. Alli stated, “It would have been cool to graduate with the others, but we didn’t get to do that.” Toni said the graduation ceremony for the program was “good.” Both regularly tell people that they graduated from college. Alli said, “Sometimes people look at me like I am crazy when I tell them I went to college, but I tell them I did. I wish people understood that I can do lots of things like them.” Programs are changing the views of people across the United States and showing others that people with mild to moderate intellectual disabilities can go to college and graduate (Thomasello & Brand, 2018).

Conclusions and Recommendations

Suggestions by the Participants

Alli and Toni pointed out areas that concerned each of them or things they want me to do differently or change if I am ever involved in the creation of a program. Toni said that he enjoyed his independence on campus but did not care for everyone having to return to the program classroom if someone left the group and was not accounted for. It seemed to him that everyone else should go about his or her business while the staff located the missing person. He explained, “None of the other college students had to stop what they were doing and all go back to a classroom because someone was lost. It made us stand out and look different.” Independence is crucial to the success of the collegiate student with mild to moderate intellectual disabilities (Kelty & Prohn, 2014). Alli described having job internships come to an abrupt stop without any notice, she said that “one day we would have a job, and the next day we would think we were going to work, and we would find out there was no place to work, it made us feel useless”, she explained. Employment is a hallmark of PSE programs in the United States (Kelty & Prohn, 2014).
The Definition of Success by the Participants

- Social Interaction.

It is clear after talking to both graduates of the collegiate program at a university that the component of the program that defined success in their minds was overwhelmingly the social aspect. Both participants spent more time discussing the social activities and experiences far more than any of the other activities or events that they participated in.

- Active on Campus

When specifically asked what they liked best about the program, it was being out on campus, with the other students and not being different than anyone else. Being on campus was being treated just like everyone else, which is what college represented to both Alli and Toni.

- Meeting new People.

They both enjoyed meeting new people and having the same opportunities that people their age without disabilities often take for granted. They learned new social skills and were given opportunities for interaction and participation in the college community that as children they never dreamed they would have.

- Lasting Friendships

Both are pleased to have lasting meaningful friendships, acquaintances, and experiences that would never have been given to them if there were not programs for them in local universities. Alli told me that she thinks that every school should have one of these programs, especially because, “They can’t have lots of people at a time in the programs, lots of people are not getting help, and that is sad.” Programs such as these are key to fully inclusive communities and allow many individuals with disabilities the opportunity to achieve their own personal dreams and goals and have an improved quality of life because of their attendance at college (Kelley & Westling, 2013).

Going Forward

People with disabilities are faced with the ongoing concerns of what will happen to them after they graduate from high school and if they will have the same opportunities to attend college as others. Going to college represents the natural progression for students who have had access to an inclusive education from elementary through high school graduation, and just as it represents a path to success for their non-disabled peers, it allows for more vocational and social opportunities for those with mild to moderate intellectual disabilities (Papay et al., 2018). People with disabilities are often left out of the college experience because of the belief that they “aren’t college material.” They have few advocates who believe in their abilities instead of looking at the disability or label assigned to them. Many people take their job opportunities and their collegiate opportunities for granted, but people with intellectual disabilities still remain overlooked as candidates for college and ultimately gainful employment (Scheef et al, 2018).

The development of these programs requires research into the practical areas of program standards, funding, staffing, and the day to day procedures. They also need to hear from other people who have completed these programs to hear what worked for them and what did not. For the graduates of the program it is the ultimate form of acceptance for them, having people listen to them, and hear their opinions about their individual definitions of success of the program they attended. Keeping in mind that Post-Secondary Education is an umbrella term that describes many options for attaining skills and training, it just requires finding the right fit for everyone to be successful (Cimera, Thoma, Whittenburg & Ruhl, 2018). This opinion enables those who have been labeled disabled and therefore, historically marginalized to be heard and that is a step towards acceptance and in Alli’s words, “We just want to be treated like everyone else.”
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Insert: Table 1.1 Interview Questions

• Explain the services or resources you used to help with your classes.
  ○ Tell me how those helped you get a job.
  ○ Tell me about your current job.
  ○ Describe how you obtained this job.

• Describe the services or resources you used to help you learn to live independently.
  ○ Where are currently living?
  ○ Do you have a roommate?
  ○ Do you live with your family?

• Tell me about the social activities you participated in.
  ○ Talk to me about the services or resources did you use to help you meet other students.
  ○ Tell me about the services or resources were the most helpful to you.
  ○ Which of the services or resources you described helped you feel the most successful in the program?
  ○ What friends have you stayed in contact with since you left school?
  ○ How do you stay in contact with them?
  ○ Who made the biggest impact on you while you were in college?

• Describe some of the challenges you faced.
  ○ How did you overcome these challenges?
  ○ Who helped you overcome these challenges? Describe what this person did to help you.
  ○ How can the program directors make the program better for new students?
  ○ If you were in charge of the program, what would you change to make the program better?
  ○ What could people and organizations on campus do differently to help you?

• Describe how attending college change the way you saw your future before college.

• What traditional college classes did you take?
  ○ What was your favorite traditional college class?

• What is your favorite memory about your time in college?
Abstract. Since the establishment of the Higher Education Opportunity Act (2008), opportunities for students with Intellectual Disabilities (ID) to attend and complete post-secondary programs on the campuses of 4-year, 2-year, and technical/vocational colleges/universities have increased. Research has indicated that there is a gap in terms of access to post-secondary programs for students from marginalized backgrounds compared to their counterparts. One route option to increase access to post-secondary options is through capacity building. One of the major focus areas of the capacity component of the BRIDGE Transition and Postsecondary Programs for Students with Intellectual Disabilities (TIPSID) funded grant project is to be a partner with Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and rural universities through the development of new post-secondary programs on their campuses. Within the article, there will be a discussion in regard to the capacity building of new post-secondary programs through establishing summits as a result of collaboration between partner universities. The conceptual model in terms of establishing new summit of post-secondary programs for students with disabilities involve the components of planning, implementation, and reflections which will be addressed in this manuscript. A brief description of a pilot study involving an analysis of data from a community conversation will be included within the reflection component. Limitations of the pilot study and future research implications will be discussed.

Keywords: capacity building, community conversations, intellectual disabilities, hybrid model, post-secondary programs

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act’s (2004) definition of the category of Intellectual Disability includes limitations in general intellectual functioning and adaptive behavior, which manifests during the developmental stage. There is also the possibility that Individuals with intellectual disability (ID) are diagnosed with other developmental disorders, i.e., Autism Spectrum Disorders, etc. (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). With the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA, 2008), opportunities have increased for students with ID to enroll in post-secondary programs including community college, vocational-technical colleges, and four-year universities (Hart, 2006; Yell, 2012). The HEOA (2008) provides opportunities for grant funded model programs to oversee transitional services for students with intellectual disabilities (Farley, Gibbons, & Cihak, 2014). Stu-
dents with ID participating in post-secondary education programs are also accessing general college level courses, and have an opportunity to learn a variety of skills related to job training (Christopher-Allen, Hunter, Brown, Carter, & Schiro-Geist, 2017). Providing post-secondary programs for students with ID is essential, as the employment rate for persons with ID is among the lowest of any other disability subgroups (Butterworth, Hall, Migliore, & Winsor, 2008; Siperstein, Parker, & Drascher, 2013). Furthermore, young adults with ID who obtained a job were twice more likely to be fired or laid off compared to their counterparts without disabilities (Newman, Wagner, Cameto, & Knokey, 2009).

Table 1. Similarities and differences of the Inclusive Individual Support Mode, Substantially Separate Model, and Mixed/Hybrid Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Model</th>
<th>Diploma or Certificate upon completion</th>
<th>Class Settings</th>
<th>Support Services</th>
<th>Programming Focus</th>
<th>Coursework focus</th>
<th>Academic advisement style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusive Individual Support</td>
<td>Certificate and/or diploma</td>
<td>With typical college students</td>
<td>Educational coach, tutor, peer mentor, technology</td>
<td>Students’ career goals and individual visions; Course of study and employment experience (on or off campus)</td>
<td>Traditional university academic coursework (for credit or audit) with typical college students</td>
<td>University advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial Separate</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>With other students with ID</td>
<td>Job coach, paraeducator, behavior specialists</td>
<td>Life skills, may offer employment opportunities</td>
<td>Independent living skills, job readiness, socialization skills with other students with ID</td>
<td>Program advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed/Hybrid</td>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Some classes with typical college students and some with other students with ID</td>
<td>Educational coach, tutor, peer mentor, technology, job coach, paraeducator, behavior specialists</td>
<td>Independent living skills, university course work, may offer employment opportunities</td>
<td>With typical college students: academic classes and social skills</td>
<td>Program advisors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With other students with ID: Independent living skills, employment, personal banking
There are currently 266 post-secondary programs for students with ID, including 101 community college programs, 139 4-year college or university programs, nine technical or vocational/trade school, and 16 “other” post-secondary programs (Think College, 2019b; Ryan, Randall, Walters, & Morash-MacNeil, 2019). Post-secondary education programs offer students with ID various opportunities and options at the college level, such as enrolling in college classes for credit or not for credit (auditing a class), participating in intramural sports, student clubs and extracurricular activities, and experiencing on-campus housing. As the amount of post-secondary programs for students with ID continues to increase, there are different models used for service delivery (Farley, Gibbons, & Cihak, 2014). Grigal and colleagues (2012) identified three models of service delivery options: (a) Inclusive Individual Support Model, (b) Substantially Separate Model, and (c) Mixed/Hybrid Model. The Inclusive Individual Support Model completely integrates students with ID into all university aspects including coursework, for either credit or audit (Cook, Hayden, Wilczenski, & Poynton, 2015). These programs offer individualized services such as an educational coach, tutor, peer mentor, or assistive technology to help students with ID access all college courses (Grigal, Hart, & Weir, 2012). These intensive wrap-around services allow students with ID to have a full college experience. The coursework focus tends to be on course access to content rather than independent living or employment skills (Grigal, Hart, & Weir, 2012). There is a great deal of variability among existing programs in the inclusive individual support model (Grigal, Hart, & Weir, 2012). Depending on the program, a certificate and/or a diploma are offered (Cook, Hayden, Wilczenski, & Poynton, 2015).

In the Substantially Separate Model, students with ID are separated from the general college student population (Cook, Hayden, Wilczenski, & Poynton, 2015), and students with ID receive services in a college setting but participate only in classes with other students with ID (Grigal, Hart, & Weir, 2012). While the coursework is completely distinct, some programs offer students with ID opportunities to intermingle with university students through options such as going to the cafeteria, attending sporting events, or engaging in extracurricular activities. Coursework in these programs are designed to teach independent living and employment skills rather than increase specific content knowledge that occurs in typical university coursework. The goals of these programs focus on inclusivity as well as independent living and employment experiences (Cook, Hayden, Wilczenski, & Poynton, 2015).

The Mixed/Hybrid Model incorporates aspects from both the inclusive and separate programs. Students participate in academic classes with typical college students and other classes with other students with ID (Cook, Hayden, Wilczenski, & Poynton, 2015). The classes with typical students without disabilities tend to be remedial, health/fitness, or art classes (Grigal, Hart, & Weir, 2012). Other classes taken alongside other students with ID are related to life skills and work skills. The goals of these programs focus on inclusivity as well as independent living and employment experiences (Cook, Hayden, Wilczenski, & Poynton, 2015). Table 1 summarizes the similarities and differences of these three program models. Inclusivity for all students with disabilities is essential for transition (high school) and post-secondary programs; however, research has demonstrated that minorities from historically marginalized populations have not had equal access to special education services, including transition (Ferri & Connor, 2005).

**Diversity within Post-Secondary Programs**

National data indicates that Black students are overrepresented in the ID population and underrepresented in postsecondary programs (Wagner, Newman, Cameto, & Lavine, 2005). Analyses of data conducted by Wagner and colleagues (2005) using the National Longitudinal Transition Study (NLTS) data in 1987 and NLTS 2 data in 2005 indicated a decrease of 5% in White students with ID and an increase of 2.3% in black students with ID (Wagner et al., 2005). Conversely, the full-time employment rate of Black youth with ID was only two thirds that of White youth with ID two years post high school graduation (Wagner et al., 2005). Black youth with disabilities, including those with ID, are more likely to live in poverty and be unemployed (Hasnain & Balcazar, 2009). Students with disabilities and from low socioeconomic (marginalized) backgrounds are less likely to attend post-secondary programs (Newman et al., 2011). This is also the case for students with disabilities from rural low socioeconomic backgrounds (Kushner, Maldonado, Pack, & Hooper, 2011). Although there is an increase in the number of post-secondary programs for students with disabilities, it is evident that the development of post-secondary programs needs to consider diversity (Newman et al., 2011). One way to increase post-secondary programs for all students with disabilities is by promoting awareness through capacity building (Cook et al., 2015).

**Purpose statement**

The purpose of this study is twofold: (a) to promote awareness and opportunities of post-secondary education programs for marginalized students with ID through
hosting a summit at a rural predominantly white and predominantly black higher education institutions in Mid-South region, and (b) examine the outcomes of community conversation to drive capacity building. The authors of this article propose that capacity building is an option to increase the opportunities for students with disabilities from marginalized backgrounds through targeting strategies to provide academic supports for identified deficits. The capacity building process is a component of the BRIDGE grant project/University of Memphis Institute on Disability. The BRIDGE grant project receives funding from the US Department of Education, Transition and Postsecondary Programs for Students with Intellectual Disability (TIPSID). One of the ways that the BRIDGE program engages in capacity building is through establishing summits on post-secondary programming for students with disabilities and hosting community conversations.

A community conversation is a structured process that creates a forum for the discussion about the needs of people with intellectual disability and their communities (Carter et al., 2009). Communities include community stakeholders (business leaders/representatives, community organization representatives, etc.), families, and state educational department representatives. One of the central purposes of a summit is to promote capacity building of post-secondary programs for students with disabilities at four-year institutions, as well as vocational/technical schools. The purpose of this article is to highlight a component of the capacity-building process, establishing summits that brings awareness and encourages collaboration of professionals across disciplines that works with students with disabilities from diverse backgrounds. In order to establish an effective partnership to organize a summit on post-secondary programs for students with disabilities, the authors recommend the essential component of planning which requires communication, shared focus, and resources between institutions in partnership.

Planning the Summit
Prior to planning a summit on post-secondary programs for students with disabilities, it is essential to establish one team from each participating institution. For the two summits conducted, the Bridge/University of Memphis team collaborated with the university that hosted the summit on its campus. The authors recommend that there is an administrative representative (Department Chair, Dean, Executive Administration) on the planning team and a memorandum of understanding. Establishing a summit on disability at an HBCU or rural university requires a considerable amount of planning amongst faculty and the executive administration of a university. Planning can take place in person or using virtual means of communication (Hunter, Jasper, & Williamson, 2014) and agenda items can be shared virtually (email, dropbox, etc.) prior to the standing meeting. Each standing meeting should include an agenda, which includes establishing a summit theme, identifying venues for presentations to take place, identifying community partners, partner intuitions, state department representatives, and local organizations. A primary purpose of a summit might be to provide a forum for universities (within the state), K-12 school districts, and non-profit organizations to disseminate, exchange, and obtain information about the planning, implementation, and evaluation of programs that support students with intellectual disabilities at the post-secondary level. Once a date and venue have been established for the summit, the focus on implementation is essential.

Implementation
The implementation component features information sessions within the summit/conferences. The summit provides examples of post-secondary model programs such as the hybrid model featured in Table 1. For an example of sessions featured in a summit, see Figure 1. One of the feature items in the summit is a discussion on establishing a new post-secondary program for students with disabilities at 4-year, 2-year, or vocational-technical colleges. Information from the Think College Credential Action Planning tool is a resource for institutions implementing new post-secondary programs for students with disabilities. The summits/conferences also include examples of how master level and doctoral level students from various programs, including special education programs, can provide academic and behavioral modification support for students with intellectual disabilities on a university campus. Interdisciplinary collaboration amongst departments, including through the creation of collaborative research opportunities, is a crucial topic to be discussed in the summit format. Curriculum options, including the integration of the Council of Exceptional Children’s (CEC) transitional standards within inclusive post-secondary courses (job preparation focus), is an example of content that can be featured within the summits/conferences.

Reflection
The reflection stage includes post-summit follow-up on the part of the planning committee, as well as data collection after the completion of a summit. To improve the structure of future summits, data collection through surveying the participating community stakeholders is recommended. Post-summit surveys provide an opportunity
to get information from the summit participants that may be used to enhance future summits, as well as post-secondary program implementation. Another avenue for data collection is through recording/scribing community conversations. Figure 1 provides examples from the planning, implementation, and reflection stages with the University of Memphis Institute on Disability Conceptual Capacity Building Model.

**Framework for Summit on Post-Secondary Programs for Students with Disabilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Establish a Planning Team, at the university/college level, include a representative from administration (Department Chair, Dean, Executive Administration Member) and develop a memorandum of understanding.</em></td>
<td><em>Determine the Content of Information Presented at the Summit. Have structure for Community Conversation ready to go.</em></td>
<td><em>This step involves identifying activities that families can do within the context of their unique social world that can assist them in creating rich emergent literacy environments.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items to Consider</td>
<td></td>
<td>Items to Consider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Create Standing Meetings with Agendas</td>
<td>I. Provide Examples of Programming/Presentations-</td>
<td>1. Establish/Complete a Follow-Up meeting with the Planning Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Determine the Audience (Community Stakeholders, Faculty, Students, Parents)</td>
<td>-Workforce Advocacy</td>
<td>3. Consider Data while planning for Next Summit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Consider the Curriculum/Content of the Presentations</td>
<td>-Independent Living For Community Inclusion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Plan the Community Conversation</td>
<td>2. Interdisciplinary Research doctoral students/faculty Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. College Life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II. Community Conversation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Frame for Capacity Building/Establishing Post-Secondary Summits for Students with Disabilities
Community Conversation Pilot Study

The first two authors of this article conducted a pilot study by facilitating a small-group community conversation, afterward analyzing the data from the conversation. The first two authors facilitated an informational seminar that summarized information provided during the previous two summits on post-secondary programs prior to the start of the community conversation. Prior to the community conversation, the session highlighted information—featured in the previous two summits—on post-secondary programing or students with disabilities mentioned previously within this article. The pilot study was designed to provide a frame for future research investigations. To obtain foundational needs of area HBCU’s and rural universities, a modified replication of a “community conversation” (Carter & Bumble, 2018) was conducted as a session during a post-secondary conference held at an urban university in the mid-south. The purpose of the modified community conversation was to glean foundational information from a convenience sampling of conference participants that were in attendance at a designated community conversation session. This modified replication was based on the Carter and Bumble (2018) investigation where a cross-section of citizens attended a two-hour event, comprised of three rounds of small-group discussions and one whole-group discussion. To modify this larger study, authors utilized parallel materials, methods, and questions with the goal of targeting specific capacity-building deficits, and provide support to local area HBCU’s and rural universities.

Method

Investigators used convenience sampling during a post-secondary conference held at a large urban university in the mid-south. A specific “community conversation” session was held during the conference to request direct feedback from stakeholders, faculty members, and university students that attended two previous summits on post-secondary programs for students with disabilities. The session was advertised in the conference program and website with invitation extended to all conference participants. The participants attended a two-hour conference session that included two rounds of small-group discussions followed by a whole-group discussion. Two faculty member investigators served as whole-group conversation moderators, with six university graduate students serving as “table hosts” to facilitate small group introductions, encourage active responses to the questions presented, and record reactions and responses.

Investigators adhered to a common structure outlined by Carter and Bumble (2018) to include: (a) an initial presentation explaining the context for the event, (b) two 15-20 minute rounds of small-group discussions based on posed questions, (c) a 15-30 minute whole-group discussion, and (d) recording of all ideas generated during the small-and whole-group discussions (Swedeen, Cooney, Moss, & Carter, 2011).

Participants

A total of 28 participants attended the community conversation session. On anonymous end-of-event surveys, attendees identified themselves as having one or more of the following roles: one identified as a person with a disability (n=1), one identified as other (Academic Transition Teacher; n=1), three identified as a current college student (n=3), one identified as a family member/sibling (n=1), three identified as college or university faculty/staff (n=3), and six identified as two or more roles (n=6): one college or university faculty/staff and campus administrator (n=1), one current college student and community organization or non-profit (n=1), one family member/sibling and college or university faculty/staff (n=1), one family member/sibling (n=1), one college or university faculty/staff, person with a disability, campus administrator, disability agency or service provider, and community organization or non-profit, and two college or university faculty and current college student (n=2). The remaining three participants did not identify their role (n=3).

Structure

This session followed the community conversation approach (see Carter & Bumble, 2018), which employs an adaptation of the World Café model (Brown & Isaacs, 2005), with the session being two hours in length. When attendees arrived, they sat in a grouping of 4-6 participants or community members. A faculty moderator from the local planning team welcomed everyone, discussed the relevance and importance of inclusive post-secondary programs, and shared the agenda for the session (10-30 minutes). Next, the faculty moderator posed the questions for each round, and participants exchanged ideas and responses to the questions over two rounds of small-group discussions (about 15-20 minutes each) while the table host facilitated engagement and scribed responses on a data collection sheet. Questions addressed during the session were:

- Round 1 Small Group: What would inclusion for students with intellectual disability look like on our campus?
• Round 2 Small Group: Which people, resources, or supports would be important to involve ‘within and beyond our campus’ to be successful?

• Round 3 Whole Group: What were the most promising ideas that were discussed? What should our next steps be?

At each table, a “table host” led introductions and recorded participant-generated ideas and responses. A faculty moderator from the research team provided a brief orientation (5-10 minutes) to the table hosts in which they emphasized the importance of capturing complete ideas, provided facilitation guidelines, and distributed data collection sheets. Although there were no specific criteria for table hosts, they were individuals who were part of the planning team, instructed to record comprehensive notes, who could keep the conversations solutions-focused.

The event closed with a whole-group discussion (10-20 minutes) in which attendees shared the most compelling ideas they heard, as well as suggestions on next steps. The faculty moderators had all comments and responses transcribed and projected them onto a large screen so attendees could review and reflect on all the ideas generated by the whole group. At the conclusion of the session, the participants were asked to complete a short, anonymous survey about their experience and campus perceptions.

**Data Sources**

The table host’s conversation notes, whole group responses, and end-of-event surveys served as primary data sources. Graduate students assisted with the process through serving as table hosts.

**Conversation notes**

We compiled a comprehensive list of all the ideas generated at each of the events by combining attendee notes, whole-group discussion notes, and notes taken by table hosts during the two small-group and whole group discussions rounds. Data collection sheets (notes) were collected.

**Whole group responses**

The first and second author facilitated the question and answer session. Table hosts recorded responses during the community conversation. The responses were projected on a large screen for all participants to review, reflect, and respond to with key discussion points noted.

**End-of-event surveys**

After the whole-group discussion, we invited attendees to complete an anonymous 7-item survey. Three questions addressed their perceptions of the events, one question focused on future action they might take on their campus as a result of attending the event, and three questions asked about their campus’ potential to house an inclusive higher education program. We also asked attendees to rate their agreement with the following statement—It is important to expand access to youth with intellectual and developmental disabilities in these areas—across 13 areas of campus life. Attendees used a 4-point, Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 4 = strongly agree. Further, we asked attendees which of 10 community or campus roles best identified them (e.g., family member, campus administrator, disability provider). A total of 28 surveys from all 28 participants were collected (100%).

**Brief Data Analyses of Pilot Study**

Community conversation small group and whole group responses were transcribed from the session, making note of key ideas and discussion points. The end-of-event survey data were analyzed using descriptive statistical analyses (see Tables 2 and 3). Due to a very small portion of missing data, mean imputation strategy was used. Descriptive statistical analysis was conducted using Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 25. Throughout the brief visual analysis process, an audit trail was kept that included raw data (i.e., original data sheets and transcriptions), and process notes (i.e., meeting notes, personal memos, team communications) to be included with future community conversation sessions to analyze a larger, deeper breadth of feedback and input.

**Results from the Pilot Study**

The participants worked together to identify actionable solutions that align with their community’s culture, priorities, and available resources. By design, the summit process introduces new opinions, backgrounds, and experiences, while remaining focused on local solutions, providing an efficient way to engage a large group in dialogue, and increased local awareness of the issue (Carter & Bumble, 2018). In line with the Carter and Bumble (2018) study, focus remained on higher education’s early considerations around inclusion of students with ID on their campus. The top five key ideas and responses from small group conversation notes, and whole group responses, included:

1. Sustainability of (local) Support Services for students with ID (during/after program completion) is essential.
2. More faculty members from universities need to be
involved within post-secondary programs for students with ID.

3. Involvement from the community (including local and national companies/businesses) can help the plight of students with ID in post-secondary programs at colleges/universities.

4. Inclusion within campus activities/organizations is essential for the success of post-secondary programs for students with ID.

5. Students with ID need more access to activities/organizations on college campuses.

According to the end-of-event survey results, most participants indicated that they felt their campus had the capacity to support an inclusive higher education program (Agree and Strongly Agree =100%), and the session was a good investment of their time (Agree/Strongly Agree = 96%). The majority of participants responded to the statement, “It is important to expand access to youth with intellectual and developmental disabilities in these areas” by choosing from the following options: academic classes (Agree/Strongly Agree = 96%), disability services (Agree/Strongly Agree = 96%), medical and mental health services (Agree/Strongly Agree =93%), academic supports (Agree/Strongly Agree = 100%), and intramural and sports teams (Agree/Strongly Agree =96%). Mean and standard deviations of all survey items are organized in Tables 2 and 3. This information lends itself to understanding a foundational starting point for improvement and adds to the capacity building components in providing support for HBCU’s and rural universities seeking to implement and/or improve their post-secondary programs.

### Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of the End-of-Event Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This event was a good investment of my time.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This conversation improved my understanding of what an inclusive higher education program might look like.</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I learned about resources, opportunities, or connections on campus/ in my community that I previously did not know about.</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am leaving this conversation with specific steps I plan to take toward expanding access to higher education for youth with disabilities.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong partnerships exist between faculty, administration, key campus services, local high schools, families, and disability organizations to support an inclusive higher education program on our campus.</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that our campus has the capacity to support an inclusive higher education program.</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that our campus needs further education on the benefits and importance of inclusive higher education</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**
1. n = 28.
2. 4 point Likert Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly Disagree
Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is important to expand access to youth with intellectual and developmental disabilities in these areas:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic classes (i.e., from the general course catalog)*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-campus housing*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs and student organizations*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability services*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical and mental health services*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek life*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic supports (i.e., tutoring center, writing center)*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student government*</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus events (e.g., football games, dances, concerts)*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intramural and sports teams*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine and performing arts (e.g., participating in choir or a theatrical production)*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Organizations*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service opportunities*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note-Indicates not all participants responded to item.

Concluding Thoughts

Enrolling in a post-secondary education program (PSE) is an important option in establishing independence for students with intellectual disabilities (ID), as well as an important factor in terms of obtaining gainful employment. Federal funding under the HEOA (2008) has offered higher education institutions funding opportunities to develop or expand model transition and postsecondary programs for students with ID (TPSIDs) to assist with gaining employment. These 5-year TPSIDs grants seek to establish high quality model comprehensive transition and postsecondary programs to serve students with ID and focus on areas in academic enrichment, socialization, independent living skills and integrated work experiences and career skills that lead to gainful employment (Think College, 2019a). Capacity Building in terms of establishing or enhancing post-secondary programs for students with disabilities can increase access to employment opportunities.

Limitations/Implications for Research

The implementation of the summit on disability transpired at the campuses of two universities. Utilizing resources from Think College was a part of the development, however, the capacity-building process was organic and did not grow through an established framework. Another limitation is that there was a pilot study centering on community conversations conducted, whereas a comprehensive study on the impact of community conversa-
tions during the summit on post-secondary programs for students with disabilities is recommended. A qualitative study examining the experiences of the summit planning team would be potentially fruitful, considering the potential themes/outcomes associated with capacity building and working with community stakeholders. With the gaps of access for students from marginalized backgrounds, examining the capacity building process could prove to have a positive impact in the world of post-secondary transition for students with disabilities.

Summary
There has been an identified gap in post-secondary education enrollment and employment outcome rates between individuals with ID and their counterparts without disabilities. Research suggests that students with ID lack the required skills needed to obtain and maintain employment and would benefit from enrollment and additional support in PSE programs (Migliore & Butterworth, 2008). One option to increase access to post-secondary options is through capacity building process in the form of establishing summits on programs for students with disabilities. Information gathered from the summits is a resource to enhance post-secondary programming for students with disabilities from diverse backgrounds.
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Within Canada, retirement patterns have been changing over the past two decades. This article will address the changing retirement patterns of Canadians during this period of time.

In 1997, retirement age bottomed for men, at age 62, and for women, at age 60.5. Thereafter, it has been rising so that in 2007, it was at age 63 for men, and 62 for women. By 2018, the retirement age for all retirees was 63.8. For those employed in the public sector, the average retirement age was 61.7, for those in the private sector 64.4, with self-employed individuals having a retirement age of 67.7.

The question that occurs is what accounts for these altered retirement patterns. A significant driving reason has been that seniors are living longer. Although the number of years spent in retirement has not altered, with retirees living longer, there are more years during which seniors need to provide for themselves. Furthermore, due to the number eligible for defined benefits having become reduced, pension plan income has dropped. This has left more seniors dependent on other sources of income that includes consideration for employment. Another major reason was that for many seniors their financial situation altered with the Great Recession of 2008, and resultant requirement for a number of workers to postpone retirement.

There are various factors that predicate whether seniors remain working in the job market for a longer period of time. The single strongest reason for working beyond age 65 is financial. For seniors who do not have access to a pension that can adequately support them, or experience lack of savings in the form of RRSPs, or in the U.S. 401K savings, they need to remain working to a later age. Another reason is that seniors who enjoy their work, whether this is a continuation of an original job, or change of occupation to one they enjoy, remain working longer. Having a higher level of education, this provides more vocational options. For those with higher levels of education, their work is likely to be less physically demanding, is an additional positive factor to remain working longer.

In examining the above reasons, to remain working for financial reasons, Schellenberg and Ostrovsky, in their review of the 2007 General Social Survey, reported that between 1991 and 2000 the proportion of near retirees, aged 45 to 49, planning on retiring before age 60, decreased by 4%, while the share planning on retirement at age 65 or older, increased by about 7 percentage points. With respect to the correlation between certainty of planned age of retirement, for near retirees with adequate or more than adequate income means, 46.5% were certain, compared to 17.2% whose finances were barely adequate, and 14.6% for those with less than adequate retirement income. Consequently, there was a direct correlation between certainty of planned age of retirement and adequate means of retirement or better, compared to those with less than adequate retirement income.

For persons with a spouse or in common-law relationships, they were more likely to be confident in their retirement savings than non-married individuals. In fact, it was reported that non-married individuals planned on retiring almost seven months later than their married/common-law counterparts, net of other factors.

Additional interesting data was provided from a financial perspective, and this concerned immigrants who arrived since the 1990s. As a group, they had less favorable retirement outlooks than Canadian born persons. This was attributable to the employment and financial characteristics of immigrants. While 70.6% of Canadian born near retirees expected their income to be adequate, 50.1% im-
migrants who arrived since 1990 expected their retirement income to be adequate. While 35.2% of Canadian born near retirees planned to retire at 65 years or older, for immigrants who arrived since 1990, 60.3% planned to retire at age 65 or older.

Regarding the influence of health on retirement planning, for those with self-assessed excellent health, 65.3% were somewhat/very certain about their retirement plans. For those with self-assessed excellent health, 78.4% expected their retirement income to be more than adequate or adequate. By contract, for those with self-assessed fair or poor health, 49.9% expected more than adequate or adequate retirement income. While only 5.6% of those with excellent health expected adequate or very inadequate income, for those with self-assessed fair or poor health 18.9% expected inadequate or very inadequate retirement income.

Regarding, plans for retirement for self-employed persons, 47.2% expressed that they planned to retire at age 65 or older, compared to age 35.6% for paid employees. Expectations of adequate retirement income was very similar for both groups. While 26.0% of those with pension plan income planned to retire at 65 years or older, almost double, 59.1%, who did not have pension plan coverage planned to retire at 65 years or older. For pre-retirees planning to retire before 60 years, more, 38.5% vs. 13% of those with pension plan coverage compared to those without pension plan coverage planned on retiring before this age. In additional data related to a pre-retiree’s income situation, there was clear demarcation between those with pension and RRSP savings, with between 76.5% and 69.4% with one or both, being somewhat certain of their retirement, compared to 35.7% of those with no pension or RRSP savings being certain of their retirement plans.

Having their own home without a mortgage added to retirement certainty, with 67.3% in this category being somewhat or very certain about their age of retirement compared to 61.8% of those who owned a home with a mortgage, and 48.1% of those who rented. Renters were almost twice as likely compared to owners of homes to have no intentions of retiring, at 16.3%, compared home owners without or with a mortgage at 9.5% and 9.3%, respectively.

In their Statistics Canada 2011 study, Carrier and Galarneau reported that there continued to be an upward trend in the employment rate of those 55 and over, which they anticipated would continue, given that boomers were more highly educated, and there was a downward trend in the coverage rate of defined benefit pension plans. Furthermore, this trend had been amplified by the recent recession and financial crisis, as well as debt load of workers nearing retirement, prompting a number of workers to postpone their retirement. As a result, the employment rate for both men and women, particularly women in the age groups of 55 to 59, 60 to 64, and 65 to 69, all increased from 2001 to 2010. It was reported that the employment rate of those 55 and over increased from 29.8% in 1996 to 39.4% in 2010. For men aged 65 – 69, this showed the most pronounced change, with an almost doubling of the employment rate between 2000 and 2010. For women 60 to 64, the employment rate almost doubled from 21.5% to 41.4% from 1996 to 2010. Significantly, employment rate for women aged 65 to 69 increased at the fastest pace, from 6.9% in 2000 to 16.6% in 2010. Carrier and Galarneau reported that aging of the boomer generation and its transition to retirement will have a major impact in the labour market and the overall economy. They pointed out that an important trend in recent years for men and women was the growth in the employment rate of people 55 and over.

Based on recent Census data, Statistics Canada reported that in 2015, one in five Canadians, ages 65 and over, reported working during the year. This was the highest proportion reported since the 1981 census. The number of senior persons working nearly doubled from 1995 to 2015. Most were engaged in part-time / part year employment. Seniors with a Bachelor’s degree or higher, and those without private retirement income, were more likely to work. Older men were more likely to work than older women.

In 2015 25.7% of senior men were employed including 8.5% working full year/ full time. For senior women, 14.6% worked during the year including 3.3% in full time / full year work.

While age 65 was the traditional retirement age, some seniors have remained active in the labour market. As seniors age, they were likely to reduce their work hours. In fact, for senior men, in 2015 approximately 57% reported working at age 65. This dropped to 29% for senior men age 70. For 65-year-old men, while 23% reported working full time, 34% were employed part time or part year. At age 70, these numbers had dropped to 13% of working males engaged in full time work, 21% in part time / part year work. By age 80, 10% were working, with approximately one third in full time work and two thirds in part time / part year employment.
For women, in 2015, at age 65, approximately 38% were working, with approximately 13% full time and 25% part time / part year. By age 70, 17% of women were working, with approximately 5% full time and 12% part time / part year.

At age 80, approximately 10% of men were working full time / part year / part time, and 4% of women.

For those with a Bachelor’s degree of higher, in each five-year category, starting from age 65 to age 75, there was greater likelihood of this group working. For those who did not have a private income, this was a strong influencing factor to work. While 15% of seniors with private income worked at age 75, 40% of seniors without private income worked. The ratio of seniors without private income was higher when it came to working full time compared to part time / part year.

By the year 2018, more senior people were working. There was a near doubling of the labour force participation among the older population. This phenomenon was also observed in the United States. In fact, 2.7 million people age 60 plus representing approximately 1/3 of the population aged 60 plus, reported working or wanting to work. There is an almost even split between working by necessity, 49.0%, than those doing so by choice, 51%. Highly educated men were more likely to work by choice. Approximately 55% of older persons with a high school diploma or less did so out of necessity compared to 44% of older persons with a Bachelor’s degree or higher. (correct 56% to 56.5%) For those engaged in agriculture and in professional, scientific and technical service, they were most likely be working by choice. The percentage of people working by necessity fell with age, decreasing to 28.4% for those aged 70 or over, as people became eligible to public and private pension plans.

A recent study by Carriere and Galarneau dealt with the question as to how many years to retirement. Specifically, this study provided data concerning the expected working life at age 50, that is the number of years someone at that age can expect to stay employed before retiring. The study provided expected work life according to education levels in 2009. Accordingly, it reported that for those with less than a high school diploma, these workers had a working life of about 14.25 years. For those with a high school diploma, or a trade certificate or post-secondary school education it was approximately 14.5 years.
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