

Study details	Results and risk of bias assessment using ROB 2/ ROBINS-I/ EPOC Risk of bias for interrupted time series studies
<p>Full citation Carter, E. W., Trainor, A. A., Ditchman, N., Swedeen, B., Owens, L., Evaluation of a Multicomponent Intervention Package to Increase Summer Work Experiences for Transition-Age Youth With Severe Disabilities, Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities, 34, 1-12, 2009</p> <p>Ref Id 1170659</p> <p>Country where the study was carried out USA</p> <p>Study type RCT</p> <p>Study dates Not reported</p> <p>Inclusion criteria Youth with severe disabilities Inclusion criteria: Youth receiving special education services under the primary or secondary disability category of cognitive disability, autism, or multiple disabilities; attending one of the participating high schools; and providing parent consent and individual consent or assent to</p>	<p>Results n=67 youth with severe disabilities; n=38 intervention group, n=27 control group</p> <p>Participation in a paid or unpaid community-based work intervention group (n = 25, 65.8%) comparison group (n = 5, 18.5%)</p> <p>Held paid competitive jobs intervention group, n=17 (44.7%) comparison group, n=3 (11.1%)</p> <p>Held unpaid jobs intervention group, n=8 (21.1%) comparison group, n=2 (7.4%)</p> <p>Exclusively held sheltered jobs intervention group, n=3 (7.9%) comparison group, n=3 (11.1%)</p> <p>Did not work at any point during the summer. intervention group, n=10 (26.3%) comparison group, n=19 (70.4%)</p> <p>Held community-based jobs, Pre versus post summer</p>

Study details	Results and risk of bias assessment using ROB 2/ ROBINS-I/ EPOC Risk of bias for interrupted time series studies
<p>participate.</p> <p>Exclusion criteria Students who had mild disabilities (e.g., mild intellectual disabilities, Asperger’s syndrome)</p> <p>Patient characteristics n=67 youth with severe disabilities n=38 intervention group, n=27 control group Age, Mean (SD): Intervention=18.4 (1.5), Control=17.6 (1.9) Gender, Frequency (%): Female, Intervention=21 (55.3%), Control=17 (58.6%) Male, Intervention=17 (44.7%), Control=12 (41.4%) Disability, Frequency (%): Note that Special education disability category youth is served under more than one category could be coded, resulting in totals exceeding 100%. Autism, Intervention=4 (13.8%), Control=5 (13.2%) Cognitive disability, Intervention=25 (86.2%), Control=32 (84.2%) Orthopaedic impairment, Intervention=1 (3.4%), Control=1 (2.6%) Other health impairment, Intervention=2 (6.9%), Control=5 (13.2%) Speech and language disability, Intervention=4 (13.8%), Control=9 (23.7%) Visual impairment, Intervention=1 (3.4%), Control=2 (5.3%) Race/ethnicity, Frequency (%): African American, Intervention=1 (2.6%), Control=2 (6.9%) Asian/Pacific Islander, Intervention=0 (0%), Control=2 (6.9%) European American, Intervention=34 (89.5%), Control=25 (86.2%) Latino, Intervention=2 (5.3%), Control=0 (0%) Native American, Intervention=1 (2.6%), Control=0 (0%)</p> <p>Interventions Multicomponent Intervention Package versus typical transition education in the participating high schools</p> <p>Multicomponent Intervention Package: Consisted of five strategies.</p>	<p>intervention, n=21 (pre) versus n=16 (76.2% post)</p> <p>Not working at the beginning of the summer versus post intervention, n=13 (pre) versus n=11 (84.6% post) [n=1 worked briefly between our two interviews]. comparison, n=21 (pre) versus n=19 (90.5% post) [n=2 (9.5%) could not be reached]</p> <p>Working sheltered jobs, pre versus post summer intervention, n=4 (pre) versus n=3(not working) and n=1 (switched to an unpaid, community based job)</p> <p>Working toward the beginning of the summer versus post summer comparison, n=5 (pre) versus n=5 (post)</p> <p>1. Bias arising from the randomisation process (Low/High/Some concerns) High risk: The allocation sequence was not adequately concealed (alternation used). There were no significant differences between intervention and comparison groups on the variables of gender, race/ethnicity, free/reduced lunch status, age, or adaptive behaviour composite scores.</p> <p>2. Bias arising due to deviations from intended interventions (Low/High/Some concerns) Some concerns: There is no information on blinding but it is likely that the participants and/or people delivering the intervention were aware of intervention groups during the trial. It was not specified which services, supports, experiences, or connections that participants should receive and schools were not required to follow through on summer plans in a specified way. Therefore, the extent to which each of the intervention components was used varied among the participants. An appropriate analysis was used.</p> <p>3. Bias due to missing outcome data (Low/High/Some concerns) Some concerns: Outcome data was available for nearly all participants. There is no evidence that the result was not biased by missing outcome data. Missingness</p>

Study details	Results and risk of bias assessment using ROB 2/ ROBINS-I/ EPOC Risk of bias for interrupted time series studies
<p>Three strategies had individualized, active components specifically for youth in the intervention group (summer-focused planning, community connectors, and employer liaisons). Two strategies (community conversations and resource mapping) were broader, indirect components with potential to benefit all youth with disabilities attending a given high school, regardless of group assignment or participation in our project.</p> <p>Summer-focused planning; Planning with the students facilitated by community connectors, focused explicitly on the upcoming summer months, and was designed to assist youth in the intervention group to connect to specific summer work and other community experiences that might further their transition education</p> <p>Community connectors; Identification of a person at each school to serve in the role of “community connector” for youth with severe disabilities. Their role was to (a) attend their local community conversation and suggest others to invite; (b) facilitate the planning process for youth; (c) collaborate with the employer liaison, as needed; (d) serve as a link between parents, school staff, employer liaison, and others to facilitate progress toward meeting youths’ summer plans; and (e) follow up with the youth, parents, or others during the summer to help problem solve any challenges.</p> <p>Employer liaison; Identification of a person to serve as an employer liaison in each of the six communities. Their role was to (a) attend their local community conversation; (b) draw upon their existing networks and relationships to help community connectors make linkages between youths’ interests and employment, internship, or volunteer opportunities in the local community; (c) collaborate with the community connector, as needed; and (d) attend the planning process for youth with disabilities, when appropriate.</p> <p>Community conversations; Events in each community to foster dialogue around ways that schools, businesses, agencies, organizations, families, youth, and others could work together to expand the employment opportunities of youth with disabilities in their local community and to identify new partners willing to collaborate with participating schools.</p> <p>Resource mapping; Identifying and compiling the informal and formal resources that might be harnessed to improve outcomes for youth with</p>	<p>in the outcome could depend on its true value, however this is unlikely.</p> <p>4. Bias in measurement of the outcome (Low/High/Some concerns) Some concerns: The method of measuring the outcome was not inappropriate and ascertainment did not differ between groups. The assessment of the outcome could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received (employment outcomes were reported from interviews with parents/guardians/family members and/or the youth themselves; social validity ratings were provided by community connectors and employer liaisons) however this is unlikely.</p> <p>5. Bias in selection of the reported result (Low/High/Some concerns) Some concerns: There is no information on whether the result being assessed is likely to have been selected, on the basis of the results, from multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain and from multiple eligible analyses of the data.</p> <p>Overall risk of bias (Low/High/Some concerns) High risk: The study is judged to be of high risk of bias in one domain</p> <p>Source of funding The research was supported by the Institute of Education Sciences</p> <p>Other information The extent to which each of the five intervention components was used with each participant varied by community and by each student’s need.</p>

Study details	Results and risk of bias assessment using ROB 2/ ROBINS-I/ EPOC Risk of bias for interrupted time series studies
<p>disabilities</p> <p>Typical transition education in the participating high schools: Not described</p> <p>Follow-up Information was gathered during the summer (beginning mid-June) with follow-up at the beginning of early August</p>	
<p>Full citation Izzo, Margo Vreeburg, Cartledge, Gwendolyn, Miller, Larry, Growick, Bruce, Rutkowski, Susan, Increasing Employment Earnings: Extended Transition Services that Make a Difference, Career Development for Exceptional Individuals, 23, 139-156, 2000</p> <p>Ref Id 1282086</p> <p>Country where the study was carried out USA</p> <p>Study type Quasi-RCT</p> <p>Study dates 1990-1992</p> <p>Inclusion criteria Students with disabilities enrolled in vocational training programs across Ohio</p> <p>Exclusion criteria Not reported</p>	<p>Results n=122 (n=86 in 1990-1991, and n=36 in 1991-1992) n=24 dropouts; n=17 experimental group and n=7 control group N=98 final sample; n=62 experimental group, and n=36 control group</p> <p>Independent Living Experiences (n=30 experimental, n=17 control) Registered to vote: N (%); experimental= 18 (60), control= 9 (56.3) [Note from 16 participants in the control group] Married: N (%); experimental= 6 (20), control= 3 (17.6) Active in social groups: N (%); experimental= 17 (56.7), control= 3 (17.6) Has savings account: N (%); experimental= 20 (69), control= 3 (37.5) [Note from 29 participants in experimental group, and 16 participants in the control group] Has checkings (current) account: N (%); experimental= 15 (51.7), control= 5 (31.3) [Note from 29 participants in experimental group, and 16 participants in the control group] Has credit cards: N (%); experimental= 7 (24.1), control= 1 (6.3) [Note from 29 participants in experimental group, and 16 participants in the control group] Has driver's license: N (%); experimental= 18 (62.1), control= 14 (87.5) [Note from 29 participants in experimental group, and 16 participants in the control group]</p> <p>1. Bias arising from the randomisation process (Low/High/Some concerns) High risk: The allocation sequence was not adequately concealed. There were no significant differences between the two groups on gender, race, disability, and IQ variables. However, approximately 20% more of the experimental group was</p>

Study details	Results and risk of bias assessment using ROB 2/ ROBINS-I/ EPOC Risk of bias for interrupted time series studies
<p>Patient characteristics</p> <p>Gender: n (%) Male; intervention=40 (64.5), control=23 (63.9) Female; intervention=22 (35.5), control=13 (36.1)</p> <p>Race: n (%) White; intervention=53 (85.5), control=27 (75.0) Non-white; intervention=9 (14.5), control=9 (25.0)</p> <p>Disability: n (%) Learning disability; intervention=17 (27.4), control=27 (75.0) Intellectual disabilities; intervention=40 (64.5), control=9 (25.0) Other; intervention=5 (8.0), control=0 (0)</p> <p>Full Scale IQ: Mean (SD); intervention=75.70 (12.1), control=80.5 (10.58) [Note that IQ scores were not available for 16 experimental participants, and 6 control participants]</p> <p>Interventions</p> <p>Extension of transition services beyond graduation versus Transition Services ceasing at graduation</p> <p>Extension of transition services: A coordinated set of extended transition services to assist the student with entering and maintaining employment. Services were based on the young adult's needs and included vocational assessment, agency contacts, Individualized Educational Program meetings, extended vocational training, employability counselling, job club, job interview assistance, job development, and job coaching. The intervention was delivered by a job training coordinator.</p> <p>Vocational assessment; Community-based assessment process which included job try-outs to determine if the participant's skills met specific job requirements.</p>	<p>made up of youth with intellectual disabilities and the control group had approximately 10% more of students who were learning disabled.</p> <p>2. Bias arising due to deviations from intended interventions (Low/High/Some concerns)</p> <p>High risk: There is no information on blinding but it is likely that the participants and/or people delivering the intervention were aware of intervention groups during the trial. Participants received specific transition services on an as-needed basis, therefore it was likely there were variations in the intervention received across participants (the study reports that when examining the total hours of transition services delivered, huge standard deviations resulted). An appropriate analysis was not used to estimate the effect of adhering to intervention.</p> <p>3. Bias due to missing outcome data (Low/High/Some concerns)</p> <p>High risk: Outcome data was not available for all, or nearly all randomised participants. Possible that the results were biased by missing outcome data; the research team randomly assigned other participants to experimental and control groups to maintain enough power to conduct analyses.</p> <p>4. Bias in measurement of the outcome (Low/High/Some concerns)</p> <p>Some concerns: The method of measuring outcomes was not inappropriate and did not differ by group. No information on the blinding of outcome; assessment could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention however this is unlikely.</p> <p>5. Bias in selection of the reported result (Low/High/Some concerns)</p> <p>Some concerns: There is no information on whether the data has been analysed according to a pre-specified plan (no protocol available). The results may have been selected on the basis of multiple eligible outcome measurements within the outcome domain, however this is unlikely</p> <p>Overall risk of bias (Low/High/Some concerns)</p> <p>High risk: The study is judged to be of high risk of bias in three domains</p>

Study details	Results and risk of bias assessment using ROB 2/ ROBINS-I/ EPOC Risk of bias for interrupted time series studies
<p>Agency contacts; Interagency coordination services from rehabilitation agencies or local boards of intellectual disabilities/developmental disabilities</p> <p>Individualized Educational Program (IEP) meetings; Since the youth were graduates, it was decided that an IEP was not required however if the coordinator felt that an IEP meeting was needed to coordinate numerous services, they would facilitate an IEP meeting including the participant, the parents, school personnel, and other service providers. A behavioural contract was incorporated into the IEP meeting for participants who had behavioural issues. The responsibilities and expectations of the youth would be clearly outlined.</p> <p>Extended vocational training; Spending time in a vocational program after the two-year high school program was completed. Experimental participants returned to their original vocational program for the purpose of remediating specific skills or enrolling in a different vocational program.</p> <p>Employability counselling; One-to-one meetings with the job training coordinator including instruction and counselling that focused on the skills critical to gaining employment including social skill instruction, job maintenance, and work-related interpersonal skills. The sessions would focus on specific issues related to improving the youth's employability such as hygiene, grooming, and social skills.</p> <p>Job club; Weekly sessions on an as-needed basis in small group settings consisting of 3 to 5 students. The job training coordinator assisted students in real-life job search activities such as identifying potential job openings, completing applications, and scheduling interviews.</p> <p>Job interview assistance; Each job training coordinator prepared students to meet with an employer to determine if there was a job match between the student's skills and interests and the employer's job demands. This assistance was delivered one-to-one prior to an actual interview. The coordinator would review how to dress for the interview, arrange transportation to the interview, if necessary, and rehearse specific answers to potential interview questions.</p> <p>Job development; Activities that led to job placement for students. Job training coordinators helped participants identify employers located</p>	<p>Source of funding Not reported</p> <p>Other information The disabilities of the participants were reported as learning disabilities, mental retardation, and other. The study reports that a full spectrum of disabilities participated in the secondary vocational education program. Since the terminology 'mental retardation' is not commonly used in the UK, the term 'intellectual disabilities' was utilised to describe the population.</p>

Study details	Results and risk of bias assessment using ROB 2/ ROBINS-I/ EPOC Risk of bias for interrupted time series studies
<p>within close proximity of their residence.</p> <p>Job coaching; On-the-job training to participants who needed additional instruction to learn specific job tasks or social skills at the job. Job coaches provided non-verbal and verbal prompts to assure that the job was completed to the employer's satisfaction. The job coach would fade their support and transfer needed supports to co-workers to assure that the participant completed the job at an acceptable level.</p> <p>Ceasing of Transition Services: Transition services provided as part of a secondary vocational program before graduation, which subsequently ceased following graduation. Instead participants received a small stipend to share their employment and independent living status</p> <p>Follow-up 5 years after study completion</p>	
<p>Full citation McVeigh, T., Reighard, A., Day, A., Willis, D., Reynolds, M., Jenson, R., John, J., Gee, R., Show-Me-Careers: Missouri's transition to employment collaborative, Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 47, 337-350, 2017</p> <p>Ref Id 1105295</p> <p>Country where the study was carried out USA</p> <p>Study type Non RCT (evaluation)</p> <p>Study dates Not reported</p>	<p>Results n=429 students</p> <p>Students who held part-time jobs (%) Baseline=12%, post=33%</p> <p>Students who had paid work experiences (%) Baseline=7%, post=20%</p> <p>Number of employers hiring students with I/DD Baseline=22, post=40</p> <p>Number of employers providing paid work experiences Baseline=4, post=32</p> <p>EPOC Risk of bias for interrupted time series studies</p> <p>1. Intervention independent of other changes (Low/High/Unclear)</p>

Study details	Results and risk of bias assessment using ROB 2/ ROBINS-I/ EPOC Risk of bias for interrupted time series studies
<p>Inclusion criteria Youth with intellectual and developmental disabilities</p> <p>Exclusion criteria Not reported</p> <p>Patient characteristics Not reported</p> <p>Interventions Evaluation of the Show-Me-Careers initiative</p> <p>The initiative supported seamless transitions to integrated employment through a “Practice Informing Policy-Policy Enabling Practice” framework (whereby Practice described the pilot community teams, and Policy described the state consortium and stakeholder groups). The policies and strategies related to the Guiding Principles, were implemented by the pilot communities, and would inform and support state level policy change related to transition. Likewise, state level policies and strategies related to the Guiding Principles would enable the implementation of effective community level practice. Efforts at both the community and state level would lead to the overall outcome of seamless transition to employment for youth with IDD.</p> <p>The Guiding Principles were;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Career planning and early work experience: All students should have paid work experiences and participate in high-quality, person-centred career planning 2. Employer engagement and business partnerships: School-to-career initiatives should engage employers as active partners and should focus on the needs of both businesses and youth. 3. Family involvement: Families should be encouraged and equipped to have high expectations for their child’s future and to participate actively in all parts of transition planning. 	<p>High risk: Intervention was not independent of other changes in time and the important confounding factors (dominant provision, definitions of eligibility and socioeconomic status) are not adequately adjusted for.</p> <p>2. Shape of the intervention effect pre-specified (Low/High/Unclear) High risk: It is unclear if the point of analysis is the point of intervention; follow-up occurred over a period of 3 and a half years.</p> <p>3. Intervention unlikely to affect data collection (Low/High/Unclear) High risk: It is unclear if the sources and methods of data collection were the same before and after the intervention; data was collected from a sample of students from each of the pilot communities that were followed through the project.</p> <p>4. Knowledge of the allocated interventions adequately prevented during the study (Low/High/Unclear) Unclear risk: This is not specified in the paper</p> <p>5. Incomplete outcome data (Low/High/Unclear) Unclear risk: This is not specified in the paper</p> <p>6. Selective outcome reporting (Low/High/Unclear) Unclear risk: This is not specified in the paper</p> <p>7. Other risks of bias (Low/High/Unclear) Low risk: No evidence of other biases</p> <p>Overall risk of bias (Low/High/Some concerns) High risk: The study is judged to be at high risk of bias in three domains</p> <p>Source of funding Show-Me-Careers was funded through a grant by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Community Living, Administration on</p>

Study details	Results and risk of bias assessment using ROB 2/ ROBINS-I/ EPOC Risk of bias for interrupted time series studies
<p>4. Integration of systems: School-based and post-school service systems should coordinate efforts to make sure students can move seamlessly from school to career.</p> <p>5. Post-secondary education and training: Students with IDD should get the support they need to aim for, apply to, enter, and succeed in post-secondary education/training.</p> <p>6. Youth development: Students should have the opportunity to build self-determination skills and community connections.</p> <p>A Leadership Consortium of state agencies and organizations, was formed to provide the overall management and direction for the project. These included: UMKC Institute for Human Development (UCEDD, lead organization); Missouri Developmental Disabilities Council; Missouri Division of Developmental Disabilities; Missouri Division of Workforce Development; Missouri Office of Adult Learning and Rehabilitation (Vocational Rehabilitation); Missouri Office of Special Education; and Missouri Governor's Council on Disability People First of Missouri.</p> <p>In addition to these core partners, representatives from other agencies, organizations, or stakeholder groups were brought to the table as needed.</p> <p>The project sought to pilot and/or scale-up cross-systems approaches to transition within local communities across the state. The intent of these pilot demonstrations was to facilitate and increase collaboration between systems and organizations working in transition in local communities (i.e. school districts, Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) Counsellors, Developmental Disabilities Support Coordinators, Centers for Independent Living).</p> <p>Eight pilot communities were selected and received funding and support over a period of 3 and half years to scale-up practices related to transition to employment within their communities. Pilot communities were to develop a core team of cross-agency partners to plan, implement, and evaluate activities aimed to support relevant outcomes. The pilot communities used the project's Guiding Principles as a framework to guide their efforts and were able to focus more attention on those Principles most relevant to their community needs and goals. The selected pilot sites consisted of cross-agency partnerships that included school district personnel, district VR counsellors, Division</p>	<p>Intellectual and developmental Disabilities (AIDD), grant no. 90DN0288.</p> <p>Other information The type of disability, and age of the participants are not reported</p>

Study details	Results and risk of bias assessment using ROB 2/ ROBINS-I/ EPOC Risk of bias for interrupted time series studies
<p>of DD youth transition/employment coordinators, Centers for Independent Living staff, Career Center staff, employment providers, local Chambers of Commerce representatives, family members, and individuals with IDD.</p> <p>Follow-up Over a period of 3 and a half years</p>	
<p>Full citation Winsor, Jean E., Butterworth, John, Boone, Jane, Jobs by 21 Partnership Project: Impact of Cross-System Collaboration on Employment Outcomes of Young Adults with Developmental Disabilities, Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, 49, 274-284, 2011</p> <p>Ref Id 1140383</p> <p>Country where the study was carried out USA</p> <p>Study type Non RCT</p> <p>Study dates 2008 and 2009</p> <p>Inclusion criteria Young adults with developmental disabilities Inclusion criteria: Students turning 21 years of age during their final year of high school; and eligible for the Division of Developmental Disabilities funded services</p>	<p>Results Partnership project (PP) participants: Division of Developmental Disabilities eligible students who lived in counties that received Partnership Project funds and who participated in their county's project. Nonparticipants: Division of Developmental Disabilities eligible students who lived in counties that received Partnership Project funds but did not participate in their county's project. No Partnership Project county clients: Division of Developmental Disabilities eligible students who lived in counties that did not receive Partnership Project funds.</p> <p>Number employed in the fiscal year 2008 (total participants=687) PP participants: total n=160; employed n=72 Nonparticipants in PP counties: total n=315; employed n=18 No PP county clients: total n=212; employed n=14</p> <p>Number employed in the fiscal year 2009 (total participants=765) PP participants: total n=230; employed n=26 Nonparticipants in PP counties: total n=341; employed n=2 No PP county clients: total n=194; employed n=11</p> <p>Employment setting in the fiscal year 2008 Individual employment: PP participants: n=86% Nonparticipants in PP counties: n=77% No PP county clients: n=28.5%</p>

Study details	Results and risk of bias assessment using ROB 2/ ROBINS-I/ EPOC Risk of bias for interrupted time series studies
<p>Exclusion criteria Not reported</p> <p>Patient characteristics In 2008: 9 counties received project funds and collaborated with 55 school districts. Nearly 35% of students who were eligible participated. In 2009: 11 counties received project funds and collaborated with 66 school districts. 40% of students who were eligible participated. Demographics of the participants were not reported</p> <p>Interventions Evaluation of the Jobs by 21 Partnership Project compared to Nonparticipants and No Partnership Project county clients The state legislature authorized \$2,000,000 for the Jobs by 21 Partnership Project for the 2007–2009 biennium and authorized the Division of Developmental Disabilities to identify and demonstrate best practices in sustainable partnerships among Washington State’s school districts, counties, employers, families, students with developmental disabilities, and adult service agencies. County level developmental disability offices applied for funds from the Partnership Project Counties were encouraged to develop collaborative relationships and activities between stakeholders (e.g. Division of Developmental Disabilities, county developmental disability offices, the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, school administrators and teachers, employment vendors, family members, and young adults) that best met their local needs. Counties were required to incorporate memorandums of understanding with collaborative community partners focused on young adult job seekers and to develop specific employment and career activities that incorporated both school personnel and adult supported employment vendors. The projects were also required to establish a focus on information and outreach, including (a) the provision of Social Security Benefits Training for job seekers; (b) transition fairs for young adults and their</p>	<p>Group supported employment: PP participants: n=4% Nonparticipants in PP counties: n=17% No PP county clients: n=28.5%</p> <p>Person to person services: PP participants: n=10% Nonparticipants in PP counties: n=6% No PP county clients: n=28.5%</p> <p>Prevocational services: PP participants: n=0 Nonparticipants in PP counties: n=0 No PP county clients: n=14.5%</p> <p>Employment setting in the fiscal year 2009</p> <p>Individual employment: PP participants: n=92% Nonparticipants in PP counties: n=100% No PP county clients: n=20%</p> <p>Group supported employment: PP participants: n=4% Nonparticipants in PP counties: n=0 No PP county clients: n=10%</p> <p>Person to person services: PP participants: n=4% Nonparticipants in PP counties: n=0 No PP county clients: n=20%</p> <p>Prevocational services: PP participants: n=0 Nonparticipants in PP counties: n=0 No PP county clients: n=50%</p> <p>ROBINS-I</p> <p>1. Risk of bias due to confounding (Low/Moderate/Serious/Critical)</p>

Study details	Results and risk of bias assessment using ROB 2/ ROBINS-I/ EPOC Risk of bias for interrupted time series studies
<p>families; (c) the dissemination of information about transition and postsecondary education opportunities for young adults; (d) technical assistance and training for teachers, employment vendors, families, students, and other stakeholders; (e) peer mentor groups or job clubs for young adults; and (f) employer-related initiatives targeting young adult job seekers.</p> <p>Goals of the Partnership Project were to (a) capitalize on the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEAIA) of 2004 requirement that students have a post school outcome plan; (b) expand and improve upon individual county's existing efforts at collaboration; (c) establish a state-wide partnership between Division of Developmental Disabilities, counties, and schools to enable students to make use of the supports available while still enrolled in school in order to achieve employment upon matriculation; and (d) ensure that counties and school districts make use of job training and job preparation opportunities, labour market guides, workforce development trends, and post-graduation outcome reports to achieve post school employment objectives for transition age students with developmental disabilities.</p> <p>Nonparticipants: Division of Developmental Disabilities eligible students who lived in counties that received Partnership Project funds but did not participate in their county's project.</p> <p>No Partnership Project county clients: Division of Developmental Disabilities eligible students who lived in counties that did not receive Partnership Project funds.</p> <p>Follow-up First 3 months after graduation</p>	<p>Serious risk: The important confounding factors (dominant provision, definitions of eligibility and socioeconomic status) are not adequately adjusted for. County developmental disability agencies who received Partnership Project funds made connections with local school districts and identified individuals who were eligible to participate in local projects.</p> <p>2. Bias in selection of participants into the study (Low/Moderate/Serious/Critical) Serious risk: The start of follow up and start of intervention do not coincide for all participants; data is reported for participants who received the intervention in fiscal years 2008 and 2009. Not all participants who would have been eligible for the target trial appear to be included in the study (Nearly 35% of students who were eligible participated in 2008 and 40% in 2009).</p> <p>3. Bias in classification of interventions (Low/Moderate/Serious/Critical) Low risk: Intervention status is well defined and based solely on information collected at the time of intervention</p> <p>4. Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (Low/Moderate/Serious/Critical) No information: Deviations from the intended intervention are not reported</p> <p>5. Bias due to missing data (Low/Moderate/Serious/Critical) No information: No information is reported about missing data or the potential for data to be missing</p> <p>6. Bias in measurement of outcomes (Low/Moderate/Serious/Critical) Serious risk: The outcome measure was subjective and assessed by assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants</p> <p>7. Bias in selection of the reported result (Low/Moderate/Serious/Critical) Serious risk: The protocol has not been published and analyses and outcomes are not clearly defined in the methods section. There is no indication of the selection of the reported analysis from among multiple analyses or the selection</p>

Study details	Results and risk of bias assessment using ROB 2/ ROBINS-I/ EPOC Risk of bias for interrupted time series studies
	<p>of the cohort or subgroups for analysis and reporting on the basis of the results however there is a risk of selective reporting.</p> <p>Overall risk of bias (Low/High/Some concerns) Serious risk: The study is judged to be at serious risk of bias in four domains, but not at critical risk of bias in any domain.</p> <p>Source of funding Supported in part by the legislative proviso contained within Substitute House Bill 1128, Section 205 (1)(f) of the 60th legislature of the State of Washington for the 2007–09 biennium effective May 15, 2007.</p> <p>Other information</p>
<p>Full citation Yamatani, Hide, Teixeira, Samantha, McDonough, Kathleen, Employing people with disabilities: a preliminary assessment of a start-up Initiative, Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment, 25, 830-842, 2015</p> <p>Ref Id 1172048</p> <p>Country where the study was carried out USA</p> <p>Study type Non RCT (mixed methods evaluation)</p> <p>Study dates Not reported</p> <p>Inclusion criteria Employees with disabilities</p>	<p>Results Work Performance Improvement Rates of improvement gains were made among the following five areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Customer service skills (by +17.5%) ● Work behaviour (by +12.1%) ● Planning and organizing (by +11.4%) ● Professionalism (by +10.6%) ● Teamwork (by +10.5%) <p>Work performance appraisals of youth employees with disabilities by supervisors. Attendance and punctuality: Baseline=4.1, Post=4.1 Work Behaviour: Baseline=3.5, Post=4.0 Professionalism: Baseline=3.5, Post=3.9 Job Performance: Baseline=3.4, Post=3.4 Teamwork: Baseline=3.2, Post=3.6 Customer Service Skills: Baseline=3.2, Post=3.7 Planning and Organizing: Baseline=2.8, Post=3.2 [Numeric rating code: 1 = Needs improvement (does not meet expectations); 2 = Developing (sometimes meets expectations, but not yet proficient); 3 = Proficient (consistently and adequately meets expectations); 4 = Strong</p>

Study details	Results and risk of bias assessment using ROB 2/ ROBINS-I/ EPOC Risk of bias for interrupted time series studies
<p>Exclusion criteria Not reported</p> <p>Patient characteristics n=12 employees with disabilities Patient demographics are not reported</p> <p>Interventions Evaluation of the Career Transition Liaison Project</p> <p>Included a full-time career transition liaison that worked directly with the employer’s human resources personnel, trainers, supervisors, and other employees to maintain a supportive culture for workers with disabilities.</p> <p>The Career Transition Liaison also provided a number of additional support services, including coordination with school and community job coaches, trainers, and refinement of the training program for the employer’s team leaders (primarily supervisors of employees).</p> <p>Follow-up 3 months: Work performance appraisals of the employees were conducted during April for the baseline measurement and July as a 3-month post measurement</p>	<p>(often exceeds expectations); 5 = Distinctive (consistently exceeds expectations)]</p> <p>EPOC Risk of bias for interrupted time series studies</p> <p>1. Intervention independent of other changes (Low/High/Unclear) High risk: Intervention was not independent of other changes in time, and the important confounding factors (dominant provision, definitions of eligibility and socioeconomic status) are not adequately adjusted for</p> <p>2. Shape of the intervention effect pre-specified (Low/High/Unclear) Low risk: Point of analysis is the point of intervention; follow-up at 3 months</p> <p>3. Intervention unlikely to affect data collection (Low/High/Unclear) Low risk: The intervention itself was unlikely to affect data collection</p> <p>4. Knowledge of the allocated interventions adequately prevented during the study (Low/High/Unclear) High risk: Outcomes were not assessed blindly and were completed by supervisors, the participants themselves and advisory board members.</p> <p>5. Incomplete outcome data (Low/High/Unclear) Unclear risk: Not specified in the paper</p> <p>6. Selective outcome reporting (Low/High/Unclear) Low risk: All relevant outcomes specified in the methods section are reported in the results section (however the protocol has not been published).</p> <p>7. Other risks of bias (Low/High/Unclear) High risk: Funding sources are not reported. Demographics of the participants are not reported.</p> <p>Overall risk of bias (Low/High/Some concerns) High risk: The study is judged to be at high risk of bias in three domains</p>

Study details	Results and risk of bias assessment using ROB 2/ ROBINS-I/ EPOC Risk of bias for interrupted time series studies
	<p>Source of funding Not reported</p> <p>Other information Note that that the type of disability, and age of the participants are not reported. The employer previously offered job opportunities to people who are deaf or blind or have other physical or mental challenges. In the current study, the employer hired individuals identified by their high schools or vocational schools as having a disability, and participants are described as 'youth', therefore the assumption is that participants would be under 25 years of age.</p>

AIDD: administration on intellectual and developmental disabilities; DD: developmental disabilities; EPOC: Effective Practice and Organisation of Care; FY: fiscal year; IDD: intellectual and developmental disabilities; IDEAIA: individuals with disabilities education improvement act; IEP: individualized educational program; PP: partnership project; RCT: randomised controlled trial; ROB 2: Cochrane risk of bias tool version 2; SD: standard deviation; UCEDD; university center for excellence in developmental disabilities; UMKC: university of Missouri Kansas city; USA: United States of America; VR: vocational rehabilitation