Supported Employment for Justice-Involved People with Mental Illness

February 18, 2014

Gary R. Bond, PhD, Dartmouth Psychiatric Research Center
Sarah Swanson, Dartmouth Psychiatric Research Center

http://gainscenter.samhsa.gov
Supported Employment for Justice-Involved People with Severe Mental Illness

GAINS Center Webinar Series on EBPs

February 18, 2014

Gary R. Bond & Sarah J. Swanson

Dartmouth Psychiatric Research Center
Core Principles of the Individual Placement and Support (IPS) Model
IPS Principles

1. Open to anyone who wants to work
2. Focus on competitive employment
3. Rapid job search
4. Systematic job development
5. Client preferences guide decisions
6. Individualized long-term supports
7. Integrated with treatment
8. Benefits counseling included
Research Evidence for Effectiveness
20 Randomized Controlled Trials (RCTs) of Individual Placement and Support (IPS)

- Best evidence available on effectiveness
- RCTs are gold standard in medical research:
  
  Random assignment = Participants assigned by a flip of a coin
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Investigator/Year Pub</th>
<th>Study Site Location</th>
<th>Control Condition</th>
<th>Months Follow-up</th>
<th>N (IPS)</th>
<th>N (Ctl)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drake 1996</td>
<td>Manchester &amp; Concord, NH</td>
<td>Skills training, nonintegrated</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drake 1999</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>Sheltered workshop</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lehman 2002</td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>PSR</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mueser 2004</td>
<td>Hartford, CT</td>
<td>(1) Brokered SE; (2) PSR</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold 2006</td>
<td>Rural SC</td>
<td>Sheltered workshop</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latimer 2006</td>
<td>Montréal, Québec</td>
<td>Traditional vocational services</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond 2007</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>Diversified placement approach</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burns 2007</td>
<td>6 cities in Europe</td>
<td>Traditional vocational services</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong 2008</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>VR referral</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killackey 2008</td>
<td>Melbourne, Australia</td>
<td>Traditional vocational services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuechterlein 2010</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>VR referral</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heslin 2011</td>
<td>London, UK</td>
<td>Usual Care</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twamley 2012</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>VR referral</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffmann 2012</td>
<td>Bern, Switzerland</td>
<td>Traditional Vocational Rehab</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis 2012</td>
<td>Tuscaloosa, Alabama</td>
<td>Standard VA vocational rehab</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killackey 2012</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Traditional vocational services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drake 2013</td>
<td>23 sites in US</td>
<td>No additional services</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>1051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshima 2014</td>
<td>Tokyo, Japan</td>
<td>Usual care</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michon 2014</td>
<td>4 cities in the Netherlands</td>
<td>Traditional vocational services</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond 2014</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>Job club adaptation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Competitive Employment Rates in 20 Randomized Controlled Trials of Individual Placement and Support
Overall Findings for 20 RCTs

- All 20 studies showed a significant advantage for IPS
- Mean competitive employment rates for the 20 studies:
  - 57% for IPS (Median = 60%)
  - 24% for controls (Median = 26%)

(Each study weighted equally in calculating mean rates)
# 18-Month Competitive Employment Outcomes in 4 Controlled Trials of IPS

(Bond, Campbell, & Drake, 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IPS</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N = 307</td>
<td>N = 374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job acquisition</td>
<td>216 (70.4%)</td>
<td>91 (24.3%)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work ≥20 hrs/wk</td>
<td>128 (41.7%)</td>
<td>50 (13.4%)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days to first job</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total hours</td>
<td>417.0</td>
<td>105.8</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total wage</td>
<td>$3,704</td>
<td>$1,001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Competitive Employment Duration

2-Year Follow-up After IPS Job Start

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total months worked</strong></td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Months worked at 1st job</strong></td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of jobs</strong></td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Bond & Kukla, 2011)*
## 2 Long-Term IPS Follow-up Studies
(Salyers 2004; Becker, 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steady Workers (&gt; 50% Follow-up)</th>
<th>52%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of Follow-up</td>
<td>10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clients also reported: Greater self-confidence and hopefulness, more energy, less loneliness and boredom.
Benefits of Steady Competitive Employment

- Improved self esteem
- Improved social networks
- Increased quality of life
- Reduced psychiatric symptoms
- Reduced substance use
- Less use of disability system

IPS Shown Effective in a Wide Range of Target Populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Early psychosis</th>
<th>ACT clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Older adults</td>
<td>Homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSDI beneficiaries</td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSD diagnosis</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual disorder (SA +MI)</td>
<td>Spinal cord injury</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chicago IPS Justice Study: One-Year Outcomes

NIDRR Field Initiated Research: A Randomized Controlled Trial of Two Vocational Models for Individuals with Psychiatric Disabilities and Criminal Justice Involvement (Gary Bond, PI)
### Self-Reported Justice Involvement for Thresholds Clients in FY2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past events disclosed at admission</th>
<th>Receiving IPS Services</th>
<th>Admitted During 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrests</td>
<td>345  38%</td>
<td>546  50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges</td>
<td>255  28%</td>
<td>389  36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convictions</td>
<td>203  22%</td>
<td>338  31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarcerations</td>
<td>156  17%</td>
<td>273  25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>913</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,085</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypotheses

- Clients with justice involvement receiving IPS will have better employment outcomes than those receiving usual vocational services

- Employment will be associated with lower rates of justice involvement
Study Design

- Randomized controlled trial
- 2-group comparison
  - IPS (existing services)
  - Work Choice (job club)
- One-year follow-up
## Comparison of Two Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IPS</th>
<th>Work Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Origins of Model</strong></td>
<td>Community Mental Health</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staffing</strong></td>
<td>Team of full-time employment specialists</td>
<td>Part-time instructor and part-time peer specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caseload Ratio</strong></td>
<td>20-1 per 1.0 FTE</td>
<td>40-1 per 0.8 FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Locus of Services</strong></td>
<td>Mostly in community</td>
<td>Office-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identifying Jobs</strong></td>
<td>Individualized job search based on client preferences</td>
<td>Internet search and word of mouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation for Job Search</strong></td>
<td>Brief vocational assessment followed by rapid job search</td>
<td>Job club: resume preparation, practice role-playing interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Search Approach</strong></td>
<td>Employment specialist contacts employers and accompanies clients on interviews (if client's preference)</td>
<td>Self-directed job search</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eligibility Criteria

- Current Thresholds client
- Self-reported involvement with law: at least one “substantive” arrest
- Not competitively employed
- Minimal exposure to IPS
- No legal obligations or health issues precluding employment
- Attend two information groups
- Consent to study
Preliminary Findings
One-Year Employment Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IPS  (N=42)</th>
<th>Work Choice  (N=43)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Started a competitive job</td>
<td>13 (31%)</td>
<td>3 (7%)</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean days employed</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## One-Year Negative Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IPS (N=41)</th>
<th>Work Choice (N=43)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrested</td>
<td>10 (24%)</td>
<td>8 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitalized</td>
<td>21 (49%)</td>
<td>17 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for hospitalization:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Psychiatric</td>
<td>11 (27%)</td>
<td>12 (28%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Substance use</td>
<td>5 (12%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--Physical condition</td>
<td>9 (22%)</td>
<td>7 (16%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

- IPS is a proven approach for helping people get and keep jobs
- IPS effective for a wide range of populations
- Only one study to date of IPS for people with justice involvement
- More IPS research needed to see if adaptations can improve outcomes
Helping People Find Jobs in Spite of Legal Histories

Johnson & Johnson-Dartmouth Community Mental Health Program
2010
The project

In 2009, 12 employment specialists from the Johnson & Johnson-Dartmouth Community Mental Health Program were nominated to participate in a project to learn more about how to help job seekers with legal histories.
Employer Interviews

- Employment specialists conducted in-person interviews with employers in a wide range of businesses. Interviews focused on hiring people with criminal histories.

- 128 employers were interviewed.
Employer Interviews

- 62% of employers reported that they had knowingly hired at least one person with a felony.

- 38% said they had not ever hired a person with a felony or were not sure (no background checks).
Employer Surveys

- 60% of employers interviewed were independently owned businesses or nonprofits.

- Independently owned businesses were only slightly more likely to hire people with felonies.
Employer Surveys: Types of Convictions for People Hired

- Drug related (15)
- Driving under influence (11)
- Theft (10)
- Assault (8)
- Sex offenses (7)
- Domestic violence (4)
- Armed robbery (2)
- Murder (2)
- Reckless driving (1)
- Criminal trespassing (1)
- Manslaughter (1)
- Gun-related offense (1)
Employer Surveys: Reasons for Hiring Person(s) with Felonies

1. Person had the qualifications to do the job (experience, skills or training).
2. Person interviewed well (expressed enthusiasm, dressed well, followed-up with employer).
3. Recommendation from someone whom the employer knew (employee, parole officer, employment specialist).
Employer Surveys: Reasons for Hiring Person(s) with Felonies

4. Belief that the person had changed.
5. Length of time since conviction.
6. Person demonstrated sincerity and honesty when explaining criminal record.
Lessons Learned: We cannot change what happened, but we can help people prepare to talk to employers

1. Basic good interviewing skills help (dressing well, enthusiasm for job, following up with employer).
2. Reference from someone employer knows (use our relationships with employers).
3. People need to prepare how they will talk about background (honesty, explaining how they have changed).
Employer Surveys: Length of time since conviction

- Less than one year since conviction or prison release: 9 employers
- 1-2 years: 20 employers
- 2-7 years: 7 employers
- More than 7 years: 12 employers
Employer Advice for Employment Specialists

1. Advise the person to be upfront and honest.
2. Person should take responsibility for her actions.
3. Help person describe how he has changed.
4. Introduce the person to the employer (use your relationship with the employer to help the person get a job).
Employer Interviews: Policies Regarding Hiring People With Felonies

- 66% reported no formal policy.
- 18% reported a formal policy against hiring people with felonies.
- 9% reported a formal policy against hiring people with certain types of felonies.
- 5% reported a formal policy regarding length of time since last convictions.
Employer Interviews: Background Checks

- 73% of employers reported that they do background checks.
- 27% reported that they do not do background checks.
Lessons Learned:

- Build relationships with employers and use those relationships to help people connect with employers.
- Introduce employers to individuals, rather than asking if they hire people with felonies.
Lessons Learned:

People must have face-to-face contact with employers so they can explain how their life has changed. Do not waste time filling out applications unless there is in-person follow-up (preferably by both the specialist and the job seeker).
Lessons Learned:

Help people prepare what they will say:
1. Statement about convictions.
2. Brief expression of remorse or responsibility for actions.
3. Description of how person is changing her life.
4. Why person would be a good employee.
Step 1: Statement about conviction(s)

“In 2004, I was convicted of breaking and entering.”

“There is something I want to bring up. I have a number of offenses related to drugs and theft.”
Step 2: Take responsibility

“I made a mistake.”

“What I learned from that was…”

“I know that what I did was wrong.”
Step 3: Explain how life is changing

“I will never go back to jail again. I’ve decided that my life has to change. I’m going to treatment and getting a job is also part of getting my life back on track.”

“I’ve been volunteering as a way to give back to my community. I also want to support myself.”
Step 4: Describe reasons would be a good employee

“‘I’m a person who really wants to work. In my last job, I did not miss work.”

“I have experience as an assembler.”
Putting it all together:

“I have a sexual assault conviction on my record. I know that what I did was wrong. I’m in counseling now and I understand how to avoid making the same mistakes. I am eager to start a new job and continue down a more positive path. I have supports—I’m an active member of my church and my family is behind me. I would be a good employee because I am extremely reliable and I have experience driving a forklift.”
Putting it all together:

“I have several convictions related to drugs and burglary. I made a poor choices in the past. I am older now and I am focused on living a different kind of life. I have not committed any crimes since 2007. I am currently a volunteer at a soup kitchen and I never miss a day that I am scheduled. I have always been a person who wanted to work and I would like to work in your restaurant because....”
Help people practice:

- Many people have to overcome shame, hopelessness, or anger when talking about their histories.
- Help people remember their strengths (make lists, review strengths).
- Some people have trouble taking responsibility. Take time to help those people come up with statements that seem fair to them.
Give people hope

- Give examples of other people who have gone back to work in spite of serious criminal histories. (Observe rules about confidentiality.)

- Share information from this survey.

- Express hope: “I believe you will get a job.”
Participants in the project:

- Janet Dickerson, DC
- Tim Dunn, OH
- Crystal Ganat, CT
- Kevin Kearns, VT
- Susan Klunk, MC
- Stephanie Kruger, MN
- Tammy Mitchell, OR
- Tania Morawiec, IL
- Cathy Pennington, OR
- Kristin Tracy, OH
- Andrea Wigfield, MN
- Peggy Wolfe, KS
- Sandy Reese, Dartmouth PRC
- Sarah Swanson, Dartmouth PRC
Supported Employment Discussion Groups

“Ask the Experts” discussion sessions

- Gary R. Bond, PhD, Dartmouth Psychiatric Research Center
- Sarah Swanson, Dartmouth Psychiatric Research Center

- Wednesday, February 19, 2014 from 1:00 – 2:00 pm EST
- Thursday, February 20, 2014 from 1:00 pm – 2:00 pm EST
- Thursday, February 20, 2014 from 2:00 pm – 3:00 pm EST
- Will be archived on the GAINS Center website at:
SAMHSA's GAINS Center for
Behavioral Health and Justice Transformation

345 Delaware Avenue
Delmar, NY 12054
PH: (518) 439-7415
FAX: (518) 439-7612

http://gainscenter.samhsa.gov/