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Goals of the Study

- Identify policies and programs of 10 OECD countries that promote the transition of youth with disabilities and could potentially be applied in the United States
- Assess the transferability of promising policies and programs to the United States based on the policies in two countries
Limitations of the U.S. System

- Youth with disabilities face numerous challenges (poor health, social isolation)
- Policy barriers include:
  - Insufficient employment supports, few services for youth, poor access to adult services, and poor coordination between youth and adult services
Study Approach

● Selected countries with well-developed benefit and rehabilitation programs
  – Income support
  – Vocational rehabilitation

● For each country, reviewed
  – Published literature in peer-reviewed journals
  – OECD cross-country studies
  – Government publications and websites
  – Suggestions from international and local experts

● Conducted in-depth case studies of promising programs and policies in two countries
OECD Countries Included in the Study

- Overview countries
  - Australia
  - Canada
  - Denmark
  - France
  - Ireland
  - Norway
  - Sweden
  - United Kingdom

- In-depth case studies
  - Germany
  - The Netherlands

- Contrasted with United States
Types of Policies Examined

- Promoting employment for people with disabilities
- Targeting youth and young adults with disabilities
- Providing access to adult services
- Coordinating the transition from youth to adult services
## Programs Promoting Employment for People with Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Country Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion of supported employment over sheltered employment</td>
<td>Access to job coaches: <em>Ireland, Netherlands</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentives offered to employers</td>
<td>Wage subsidies: <em>Denmark, Ireland</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentives offered to workers with disabilities</td>
<td>Wage supplement: <em>Netherlands, United Kingdom</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentives and mandates for vocational training</td>
<td>Vocational training requirements: <em>Australia, United Kingdom</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative policies to promote employment</td>
<td>Employer quota: <em>Germany</em> Vouchers: <em>Germany and Netherlands</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Policies Promoting Coordination of Transition from Youth to Adult Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policies</th>
<th>Country Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved transition planning efforts</td>
<td>Self-development of transition plans, access to guidance counselors: <em>Denmark, France</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Increased supports to postsecondary education | Educational allowances: *Ireland, United Kingdom*  
In-school supports: *Norway*                  |
| Increased vocational supports                | Transition program to connect youth to employment: *Australia, United Kingdom*     |
Case Study Countries

- Germany and the Netherlands
- Policies for supporting the transition of youth with disabilities to adulthood that
  - Were more closely aligned with U.S. programs
  - Seemed the most promising for transferability to the United States
- Assessed policies on efficiency, adaptability, and applicability for United States
## System Contrasts for Program Transfer Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>The Netherlands</th>
<th>United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guides all youth through transition</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leaves youth to their own path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarantees income support while in vocational training</td>
<td></td>
<td>Does not offer income support while in vocational training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guarantees services and opportunities, and coordinates delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td>Neither guarantees nor coordinates targeted services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasizes employment support for youth and employers within a broader set of supports</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ambiguous about integrating employment supports with other supports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potentially Transferable German Programs

- Specialist Integration Services
  - Federal-state program
  - Resource for employers and individuals with disabilities on vocational supports for workers

- National goals and policies
  - *Job4000* and *Initiative Inklusion* set national goals (such as 4,000 new jobs for people with disabilities) and provided resources to attain goals
Potentially Transferable Dutch Programs

- Private-sector reintegration companies
  - Market-based approach for private vendors to deliver services for beneficiaries
- Improved, long-term employment supports and program rules on earnings for disability beneficiaries
  - *Wajong* is disability program for young adults
  - Employment supports include work expectations, participation plans, access to job coaches, and trial work placements
Discussion

● Nearly all countries have instituted policies that address the barriers faced by U.S. youth with disabilities
  – Insufficient information on effectiveness

● Germany and the Netherlands have a number of comprehensive, coordinated, efficient, and inclusive programs with high transferability to the United States

● U.S. policymakers could consider these programs as part of the evidence-building process
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APPENDIX: SUPPLEMENTAL SLIDE
# Case Study Programs, by Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>The Netherlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Transitional vocational income supports</td>
<td>1. Wajong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Vocational training centers</td>
<td>2. Reintegration companies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supported employment</td>
<td>3. Targeted vocational supports for Wajong participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Job4000</td>
<td>4. Special financing for education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Specialists Integration Services (IFD)</td>
<td>5. Centralized agency for income and work supports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Act on Promoting Vocational Training</td>
<td>6. Local transition collaborative agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Personal budget</td>
<td>7. Wage subsidies and dispensations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employer quota system</td>
<td>8. Expanding program rules on earnings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>