

Services for Consumers who are Deaf-Blind:

Vocational Rehabilitation Agency Service Models Utilized and Their Effectiveness

Michele C. McDonnall, Ph.D., CRC

Jennifer L. Cmar, Ph.D., COMS

The National Research & Training Center on Blindness & Low Vision

Mississippi State University

Author Note:

Correspondence about this article should be directed to Michele McDonnall, The National Research & Training Center on Blindness & Low Vision, P.O. Box 6189, Mississippi State, MS 39762, 662-325-2001, or m.mcdonnall@msstate.edu.

The contents of this manuscript were developed under a grant from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, NIDILRR grant 90RT5040-01-00. However, these contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the Department of Health and Human Services and should not indicate endorsement by the Federal Government.

The published version of this document can be found at <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0145482X19828033>

Abstract

Introduction: Little is known about how state-federal vocational rehabilitation (VR) agencies provide services to consumers who are deaf-blind. The purpose of this study was to investigate VR service models and their effectiveness.

Methods: A mixed-methods approach was utilized with data from interviews with 51 VR agency administrators and the Rehabilitation Services Administration Case Service Report. Information about how VR agencies serve deaf-blind consumers was combined with data from 2,119 consumers served by those agencies to determine competitive employment rates based on service model type. Descriptive statistics, chi-square tests of independence, and logistic regression analysis were utilized.

Results: Four VR agency service models were identified: specialist, professional collaboration, specialist plus professional collaboration, and miscellaneous. Significant differences in competitive employment closure rates were found based on service model type, in both univariate and multivariate analyses. The specialist and professional collaboration models were superior to miscellaneous models.

Discussion: This study is the first empirical evaluation of the effectiveness of VR services for consumers who are deaf-blind. The results support two previous recommendations about providing services to consumers who are deaf-blind: establish a deaf-blind coordinator/specialist position and use a dual-case approach (collaboration between blind and general agency).

Implications for Agencies: To improve competitive employment outcomes for individuals who are deaf-blind, VR agency administrators should explore options for specialized deaf-blind positions and promote collaboration within and beyond their agency.

**Services for Consumers who are Deaf-Blind:
Vocational Rehabilitation Agency Service Models Utilized and Their Effectiveness**

Deaf-blindness, or combined hearing and vision loss, affects less than 1% of the United States population (Sui, 2017). Prevalence is low even when defined broadly to include minimal vision impairment and mild hearing loss, although prevalence increases substantially at older ages (Swenor, Ramulu, Willis, Friedman, & Lin, 2013). Working-age adults with combined hearing and vision loss are much more likely to be out of the labor force (i.e., not employed and not seeking employment – 61.7% vs. 19.0%) or unemployed (11.8% vs. 5.3%) and far less likely to be employed (33.7% vs. 76.8%) than people without disabilities (Sui, 2017; U.S. Census Bureau, 2017).

Deaf-blindness is not restricted to total blindness and total deafness but instead can involve ranges of hearing and vision loss. It is defined in the Helen Keller National Center Act as a combination of legal blindness (or progressive vision loss) and severe hearing impairment (or progressive hearing loss) that causes “extreme difficulty in attaining independence in daily life activities, achieving psychosocial adjustment, or obtaining a vocation” (29 U.S.C. § 1905 [2]). Use and interpretation of the term “deaf-blind” differs among researchers and practitioners (e.g., Wittich, Southall, Sikora, Watanabe, & Gagne; 2013), and specific criteria for identifying individuals as deaf-blind varies by state and organization. Despite meeting criteria specified in the definition of deaf-blindness, some individuals may not identify with this term: some may consider themselves deaf with a visual impairment, or blind and hard-of-hearing (38th Institute on Rehabilitation Issues [IRI], 2015); others may consider themselves dual sensory impaired.

The service needs of this population have received limited research attention; however, vocational training and vocational services have consistently been identified as important needs for youth and adults who are deaf-blind in the available literature (Authors, in press; Ehn,

Möller, Danermark, & Möller, 2016; Petroff, 2001, 2010; Watters, Owen, & Munroe, 2004; Wolf, Delk, & Schein, 1982). Accordingly, many people who are deaf-blind could benefit from the assistance of state-federal vocational rehabilitation (VR) agencies to obtain employment. The 38th IRI (2015) identified individuals who are deaf-blind as an underserved population, indicating the Rehabilitation Services Administration's belief that the population has been inadequately served by VR agencies. In addition to being underserved, low expectations by professionals, including VR counselors, has been identified as a problem for people who are deaf-blind (38th IRI, 2015; Watters-Miles, 2014; Wolf et al., 1982).

One challenge regarding VR service provision for consumers who are deaf-blind is that each agency potentially takes a different approach to service delivery, as evidence-based practices for service provision have not been established for this population. The 38th IRI provided recommendations for VR agencies when serving this population, including (a) establish a statewide coordinator for deaf-blind services, (b) open cases for deaf-blind consumers in both the general and blind agency (dual cases), (c) attend trainings and workshops to enhance skills to work with deaf-blind consumers, (d) develop customized employment opportunities and include deaf-blind consumers under supported employment policies, and (e) provide consumers with support service providers (SSPs).

The model state plan for VR services for persons who are deaf, deaf-blind, hard of hearing or late deafened also provided information about and recommendations for service provision to this population (Watson, Jennings, Tomlinson, Boone, & Anderson, 2008), which coincide with IRI recommendations. Suggestions included (a) have a statewide coordinator of deaf-blind services whose singular responsibility is to plan and create rehabilitation services programming for deaf-blind consumers, (b) have two professionals provide services – a

counselor for the deaf and a counselor for the blind, and (c) have a rehabilitation counselor for the deaf-blind position. Likewise, Ingraham and Carey (1994) suggested the need for a statewide coordinator for services for deaf-blind consumers. Although not within the context of VR services, the importance of service providers who are able to communicate effectively with consumers who are deaf-blind has been discussed (Everson & Goodall, 1991; Vernon & Duncan, 1990).

The Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (2016) places renewed emphasis on high quality, competitive employment for all consumers, and instructs VR agencies to provide the necessary services and supports to enable those with the most significant disabilities to achieve competitive integrated employment. Most VR consumers who are deaf-blind are categorized as having a most significant disability, and VR agencies must be prepared to effectively serve these consumers to assist them in obtaining quality competitive employment. Low expectations for this population in terms of employment due to the severity of disability are unacceptable. VR consumers who are deaf-blind have received little research attention, and no attention in terms of identifying factors that are important to help them achieve competitive employment.

Although recommendations have been made about service provision for consumers who are deaf-blind, little information is available about how VR agencies currently provide services to this population. Data is lacking regarding models VR agencies use to provide services and the effectiveness of those service models. The purpose of this study is to provide current information in this area, answering the following research questions:

1. How are VR agencies providing services to consumers who are deaf-blind?
2. What service models do VR agencies use to serve consumers who are deaf-blind?

3. Which service models are most effective in terms of competitive employment outcomes for consumers who are deaf-blind?
4. Do service models utilized and effectiveness of service models differ by agency type?

Method

This study utilized a mixed-methods approach, incorporating qualitative data analyses and integrating qualitative with quantitative data for analyses (Creswell, 2009). Data came from two sources: interviews with state VR agency administrators of combined and separate, or blind, agencies and Rehabilitation Services Administration Case Service Report (RSA-911) data. The interview and RSA-911 data were combined to investigate consumer outcomes based on agency service models.

Survey of Agency Administrators

Participants

Directors of combined and blind VR agencies in the United States were invited via email to participate in a semi-structured interview that addressed multiple topics, including service provision for consumers who are deaf-blind. If the agency director was not available to participate in the interview, he or she was asked to appoint a designee. Telephone interviews which lasted approximately one hour were conducted by two researchers (not the study authors) between October 2016 and June 2017. Administrators from all 51 VR agencies participated, representing 27 combined agencies and 24 blind agencies in the 50 states and District of Columbia. Twenty-seven agency respondents were agency directors and 24 respondents had another type of administrative position (e.g., deputy director, director of field service, bureau chief for blind services).

Interview Questions

Administrators were asked to “Please describe how your agency provides services to consumers who are deaf-blind.” Three prompts were used to obtain specific information of interest: “Who within the agency provides services to this population?”, “Do you have specialized personnel?” and, for blind agencies only: “Do you ever collaborate with the general VR agency in your state to provide services?” Responses were recorded and transcribed, and the transcripts were utilized as the data source.

Data Analyses

Two researchers (the study authors) analyzed the survey data using directed content analysis principles (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005). First, they reviewed all transcripts and coded data segments into categories using inductive and deductive approaches. Most categories coincided directly with the research questions; however, a few categories emerged from the data. Each researcher used a separate Excel file to code the data. Next, researchers conducted second-level coding by identifying and counting similarities and variations in responses within each category. To promote reliability and validity, the researchers independently coded all transcripts, compared their coded data, and discussed any differences in coding to come to a consensus. After coding data into categories, four general service models used by agencies were identified.

RSA-911 Data

Sample

RSA-911 data for federal fiscal years (FY) 2013, 2014, and 2015 were utilized for this study, which includes information for all consumers closed by VR agencies during each FY. Consumers included in the study had either a (a) primary or secondary disability of deaf-blindness, or (b) primary disability of deafness plus a secondary disability of any level of vision loss, or (c) primary disability of legal blindness plus a secondary disability of any level of

hearing loss. The sample was limited to consumers who received services (i.e., in closure status “exited with an employment outcome” or “exited without an employment outcome, after receiving services”) from one of the 51 agencies that participated in the interviews and were between the ages of 18 and 72 at case closure. Data from three FYs were combined to maximize the sample size ($N = 2,119$).

Variables

The outcome variable was *competitive employment*, defined as being closed in one of the following employment categories: employed with or without supports in an integrated setting (employer job), self-employment, or Business Enterprise Program, and compensated at or above the federal minimum wage. The primary independent variable was *service model* utilized by the agency, a categorical variable with four categories representing the service models identified from the interview data. The other independent variable was agency type (blind versus combined agency), which was coded 1 for blind agencies and 0 for combined agencies.

Several control variables were included in the multivariate model to account for consumer characteristics: age (in years at application), education level at case closure, female gender, Hispanic ethnicity, minority status, receipt of Supplemental Security Income (SSI), receipt of Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI), and competitive employment at application. Education was a continuous variable (range of 0 to 12), with each higher level of education assigned a higher number (0 = no formal education; 12 = any degree above a Master’s). The remaining control variables were dichotomous, coded 1 for yes/characteristic present and 0 for no/characteristic not present.

Data Analyses

Descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) were utilized to describe competitive employment outcomes by service model and agency type. Chi-square tests of independence were used to evaluate differences in competitive employment outcomes based on service model, both overall and by agency type. Logistic regression was used to determine whether service model and agency type predicted competitive employment outcomes when consumer characteristics were included in a multivariate model. Phi coefficients (for chi-square analyses) and odds ratios (for logistic regression) were utilized as effect size measures. SAS 9.4 was used to conduct all statistical analyses.

Results

Provision of VR Services to Consumers who are Deaf-blind

Specialized Personnel

Twenty-two VR administrators (43.1%) reported that their agency has one or more specialized deaf-blind positions. Job titles and roles varied; for simplicity, we used administrators' descriptions of the professionals' main roles to group the specialized positions into two categories: deaf-blind coordinator (13 agencies) and direct service provider (9 agencies). Some deaf-blind coordinators are responsible for coordinating or consulting on all deaf-blind cases in the state. The coordinators work with VR counselors and other direct service staff to serve consumers who are deaf-blind, but generally do not work directly with consumers. In one agency, deaf-blind coordinators serve as internal consultants who advise their staff (e.g., counselors, vision rehabilitation therapists, O&M specialists) on the latest and most appropriate assistive technology, training aids, and devices for deaf-blind consumers. That agency's administrator stated that the coordinators "help us to make sure that we devise a plan of services that really meet that individual's needs and that we are doing an appropriate job of

communicating with the individual and getting the right resources for that.” Another agency has three deaf-blind coordinators who primarily provide direct support to VR counselors, but who also interact with consumers who are deaf-blind by doing home visits and coordinating with VR counselors to meet consumers’ needs.

Most deaf-blind specialists that function as direct service providers are VR counselors who only or primarily serve consumers who are deaf-blind. One administrator stated that these counselors for the deaf-blind “have particular knowledge of deaf-blind culture and communication techniques, which makes service delivery more effective.” In another agency, the direct service provider was a communications rehabilitation teacher who worked at the state rehabilitation center.

Although the remaining 29 agencies (56.9%) do not have specialized deaf-blind positions, seven agencies have counselors or other individuals on staff who have some degree of training relevant to deaf-blindness but who serve additional populations. For example, one blind agency has several VR counselors who are fluent in American Sign Language.

Who Provides Services

Administrators most commonly reported that counselors for the blind ($n=17$, 33.3%) or counselors specializing in each sensory disability (i.e., a counselor for the blind *and* a counselor for the deaf; $n=16$, 31.4%) jointly serve consumers who are deaf-blind. Nine administrators (17.7%) indicated that the primary service provider is dependent on consumer needs, communication method, or consumer choice. Other responses as to who provides services included dedicated counselors for the deaf-blind ($n=4$, 7.8%), external providers ($n=3$, 5.9%), and rehabilitation counselors for the deaf ($n=1$, 2.0%). One agency (2.0%) does not serve

consumers who are deaf-blind; the schools for the deaf and blind serve deaf-blind consumers (including adults) in that state.

Collaboration

Administrators of the 24 blind agencies were asked if their agency collaborated with the general agency in their state to provide services to consumers who are deaf-blind. Six blind agency administrators (25.0%) reported consistent use of interagency collaboration where counselors in their agencies work with counselors for the deaf in general agencies to serve consumers who are deaf-blind. An additional 10 blind agency administrators (41.7%) indicated that they collaborate with the general agency on occasion, although collaboration is not the primary way their agency serves this population. For example, several administrators reported that joint cases with the general agency are more likely when consumers are deaf-blind and have additional disabilities or complex needs. In addition, 10 of the 27 combined agency administrators (37.0%) indicated that their agency primarily serves consumers who are deaf-blind through collaboration between counselors for the blind and counselors for the deaf. Overall, 16 of the 51 agency administrators (31.4%) reported consistent collaboration between professionals as a method of providing services.

Contractors and Community Resources

Twenty administrators (39.2%) indicated that their agency uses external providers to deliver services to consumers who are deaf-blind. For example, administrators reported contracting with community rehabilitation providers and residential rehabilitation programs, including Helen Keller National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths & Adults (HKNC). Thirteen administrators (25.4%) mentioned using HKNC as a resource. The extent of collaboration/consultation with HKNC varied across agencies, with some sending consumers to

HKNC for residential training, and others consulting with HKNC regional field representatives. Three administrators (5.9%) indicated that their agency uses contractors to provide most or all services to deaf-blind consumers. Five administrators (9.8%) mentioned that they provide SSP services to consumers with deaf-blindness through contractors. A few administrators reported that they consult with or receive assistance from their state schools for the deaf or schools for the blind when serving deaf-blind consumers. Several administrators also mentioned contracting with interpreters to facilitate communication with consumers who are deaf-blind.

VR Service Models

Two prominent service models emerged from the data: a specialist model and a professional collaboration model. Eighteen agencies (35.3%) used a specialist model, in which they have specialized deaf-blind position(s), but counselors from blind and deaf disability areas do not consistently collaborate. Twelve agencies (23.5%) used a professional collaboration model, in which counselors from each disability area collaborate, but the agency does not have specialized deaf-blind positions. Four agencies (7.8%) used a specialist plus professional collaboration model, in which professionals consistently collaborate *and* the agency has one type of specialized position, a coordinator. The remaining 17 agencies (33.3%) used another type of service model in which professionals do not consistently collaborate and the agency does not have specialized positions; we grouped these service models into a miscellaneous category for the purpose of this study. Examples of these miscellaneous service models include having some staff with training specific to deaf-blindness, deciding on who provides services (either a counselor for the blind or a counselor for the deaf) based on consumer needs/preferences, and relying on contractors to provide services. The number of agencies utilizing each model by

agency type is provided in Table 1. The data indicate that service model used does differ by agency type.

Agencies utilizing the specialist model served the largest proportion of consumers who are deaf-blind; almost half of consumers despite being utilized by only 35.3% of agencies (see Table 1). Approximately one-third of the agencies utilized a miscellaneous service model, but these agencies only served approximately one-quarter of the population. The percentages of consumers served by the professional collaboration and specialist plus professional collaboration service models were approximately in line with the percentage of agencies that utilized the models.

Effectiveness of VR Service Models

Relatively large differences by type of service model were noted in terms of percentage of consumers who exited with competitive employment after receiving services (see Table 1). Agencies utilizing the specialist service model had the highest percentage of competitive employment closures, and agencies utilizing a miscellaneous model had the lowest percentage. The differences in competitive employment closures by service model type were statistically significant, $\chi^2(3, N=2,119) = 35.88, p < .0001, \phi = .13$.

Competitive employment outcomes by service models within each agency type are also presented in Table 1. For combined agencies only, differences in competitive employment closures by service model type were statistically significant, $\chi^2(3, N=1,030) = 9.88, p = .02, \phi = .10$. However, for blind agencies only, differences in competitive employment closures by service model type were not statistically significant, $\chi^2(3, N=1,089) = 4.41, p = .22$. Overall, regardless of service model type, blind agencies closed a higher percentage of deaf-blind consumers with competitive employment.

Multivariate analysis was used to determine whether the significant differences exhibited in competitive employment outcomes based on service models remained when accounting for consumer characteristics. The logistic regression model significantly predicted competitive employment for deaf-blind consumers, $\chi^2(12, N=2,119) = 561.45, p < .0001$, Nagelkerke $R^2 = .31$ (see Table 2). Service model was a significant predictor, with consumers served by agencies utilizing a miscellaneous service model less likely to achieve competitive employment compared to agencies utilizing either the specialist model or the professional collaboration model. There was not a significant difference in outcomes between miscellaneous service models and the specialist plus professional collaboration model. Agency type was also a significant predictor, with consumers served by blind agencies more likely to achieve competitive employment. The interaction between service model and agency type was tested, but was not significant, and was therefore not retained in the model.

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to describe how agencies are providing services to consumers who are deaf-blind, including identifying service models that VR agencies use to serve this population, and to evaluate the effectiveness of the models in terms of competitive employment outcomes. Using interview data from administrators of 51 state VR agencies, we identified four service models: specialist, professional collaboration, specialist plus professional collaboration, and miscellaneous. Univariate analyses revealed significant differences in competitive employment by service model type for all agencies together and for combined agencies, but not for blind agencies. Regardless of service model type, blind agencies closed a higher percentage of deaf-blind consumers with competitive employment, as found in studies of

consumers with visual impairments (e.g., Cavanaugh, 1999; Cavanaugh, Giesen, & Pierce, 2000; Giesen & Cavanaugh, 2013).

Consumers served under the specialist and professional collaboration models were more likely to be competitively employed compared to those served under miscellaneous models, even when controlling for consumer characteristics. This finding supports the recommendations for specialized personnel made by Watson and colleagues (2008) and the 38th IRI (2015).

Specialized personnel understand the diverse characteristics, service needs, culture, and communication preferences of individuals who are deaf-blind; the specialized knowledge and skills of these professionals is invaluable in supporting deaf-blind consumers in achieving their employment goals. These results also provide some evidence for the effectiveness of the dual-case approach that has been recommended as a way to provide services to consumers who are deaf-blind (38th IRI, 2015; Watson et al., 2008).

Agencies with specialized personnel served a larger percentage of consumers who are deaf-blind compared to agencies utilizing other service models. We do not know whether agencies created these specialized positions due to demand, or whether the existence of the positions helped create a demand for the services. Having specialized deaf-blind personnel may not be feasible for all VR agencies, particularly in states with small populations. Although agencies that serve more consumers who are deaf-blind may perceive a greater need for specialized personnel, having specialized personnel could lead to an increase in both the number of deaf-blind consumers served and the quality of services. For agencies with specialized positions, recruiting qualified personnel with expertise in deaf-blindness to fill the positions has historically been an obstacle (Perreault, 1993; Watson et al., 2008). Multiple personnel preparation programs for educational professionals offer coursework or specializations in

working with deaf-blind children (“Teacher Preparation Programs,” 2017); however, there are currently no rehabilitation personnel preparation programs specific to deaf-blindness in the United States (S. Ruzenski, personal communication, November 28, 2017).

Some administrators described collaboration with external providers or agencies, such as HKNC, as an element of service provision for consumers who are deaf-blind. Because our interview protocol did not include specific questions or probes related to this topic, we believe our numbers do not capture all of the agencies that work with HKNC and other external providers. Service coordination and interagency collaboration across age groups and systems (e.g., state agencies, educational institutions, and private agencies) has been recommended for individuals who are deaf-blind (e.g., Watson, 1993; Watson et al., 2008; Wittich, Jarry, Groulx, Southall, & Gagné, 2016; Wolf et al., 1982). Research focusing on collaboration models and service coordination between VR agencies and external organizations could provide insight into ways in which states can optimize resources to improve services and outcomes for this population.

When accounting for consumer characteristics, consumers served under the specialist, professional collaboration, and specialist plus professional collaboration models had approximately equal odds of competitive employment (i.e., differences between these three models were not significant). However, those served under the specialist or professional collaboration models had higher odds of competitive employment than those served under miscellaneous models. Consumers served under the specialist plus professional collaboration model were not significantly more likely to achieve competitive employment than those served under miscellaneous models. Variability associated with the small number of consumers served under the specialist plus professional collaboration model may partially explain this finding, as

its estimated effect was similar to that of the specialist and professional collaboration models, but the higher standard error resulted in less certainty about the size of the effect.

Miscellaneous service models, the most commonly utilized models among combined agencies, were less effective in terms of competitive employment outcomes based on the regression analysis. Agencies utilizing these models served far fewer consumers per agency than agencies utilizing the other model types, which may at least partially explain why these agencies have limited specialized services for deaf-blind consumers. It is relevant to note that although blind agencies that utilized a miscellaneous model served few consumers who were deaf-blind, they achieved a high rate of competitive employment.

Limitations and Future Research Directions

One limitation of the study is that the interview protocol did not include a specific definition of “deaf-blind,” and administrators could have differed in their interpretations of the population in question. In addition, despite our efforts to identify distinct service models based on prominent elements of service delivery, some variation and overlap existed within and between the service models. For example, specialized deaf-blind positions could encompass varying roles and responsibilities; however, we classified them into coordinator and direct service provider positions. Some agencies using the professional collaboration and miscellaneous models have staff with deaf-blind training despite not having specialized positions. Furthermore, administrators of 10 blind agencies using the specialist and miscellaneous models reported some degree of collaboration with the general agency but did not identify collaboration as their primary method of serving consumers who are deaf-blind.

We obtained interview data from blind and combined VR agency administrators in each state, but not general agency administrators. General agencies serve a proportion of consumers

who are deaf-blind, so the absence of data from general agencies is an important limitation to consider when interpreting the results of this study. Because we did not determine service models used by general agencies, we were unable to include deaf-blind consumers who received services from general agencies in analyses of effectiveness of service models. Future research focusing on VR service delivery for this population should include information about general agency service delivery. Additionally, more in-depth qualitative analysis would be beneficial to understand how services are being provided in the agencies who achieve high employment success rates for consumer, including those blind agencies utilizing miscellaneous models.

Consumers' perceptions of service model effectiveness and communication strategies used by VR counselors were beyond the scope of this study. These topics, as well as the use and role of SSPs in VR and collaboration with HKNC, are important to consider in future research on service delivery for VR consumers who are deaf-blind.

Implications for Agencies

To improve competitive employment outcomes for individuals who are deaf-blind, VR agency administrators can explore options for specialized deaf-blind positions and promote collaboration within and beyond their agency. In agencies that serve few deaf-blind consumers, rehabilitation counselors for the deaf-blind could have an expanded role in which they also serve other populations (i.e., blind/visually impaired, deaf/hard-of-hearing), as described by Watson and colleagues (2008). Designating a statewide deaf-blind coordinator for all age groups is another option, especially in states with a small deaf-blind population. To increase the pool of qualified personnel to fill these positions, greater emphasis on personnel preparation in the area of deaf-blindness for VR counselors and other providers of adult services is essential. HKNC has a national mandate to train professionals to work with people who are deaf-blind and offers

valuable resources (e.g., seminars, online training modules, internships, community of practice) that agencies can utilize to develop deaf-blind expertise within their staff. All personnel who work with this population could benefit from training on the significance of dual sensory loss, communication methods, and professional collaboration strategies.

Conclusion

This study is the first to provide insight into VR service provision for deaf-blind consumers in combined and blind agencies in the United States, and to provide empirical evidence that certain service models are more effective for this population. Results support the value of VR agencies having specialized deaf-blind positions or using a professional collaboration model. The specialist plus professional collaboration model, which incorporates both of these characteristics, was not superior to the other models, but was similar in terms of competitive employment outcomes. Few agencies utilized the specialist plus professional collaboration model, perhaps because the availability of specialized deaf-blind personnel may lessen the need for collaboration between professionals with expertise in each separate disability. Combined VR agencies that utilize miscellaneous service models should evaluate their current service model and consider establishing either the specialist or professional collaboration model.

References

- Cavanaugh, B. S. (1999). *Relationship of agency structure and client characteristics to rehabilitation services and outcomes for consumers who are blind*. Available from: <http://blind.msstate.edu/research/nrtc-publications/download/>
- Cavanaugh, B. S., Giesen, J. M., & Pierce, S. J. (2000). Rehabilitation of visually impaired persons in separate and general agencies. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, 94(3), 133-145.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Ehn, M., Möller, K., Danermark, B., & Möller, C. (2016). The relationship between work and health in persons with Usher Syndrome Type 2. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, 110(4), 233-244.
- Everson, J. M., & Goodall, D. (1991). School-to-work transition for youth who are both deaf and blind. *ASHA*, 33(11), 45–47.
- Giesen, J. M., & Cavanaugh, B. S. (2013). Disability insurance beneficiaries with visual impairments in vocational rehabilitation: Socio-demographic influences on employment. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, 107(6), 453-467.
- Helen Keller National Center Act. 29 U.S.C § 1905. (1992).
- Ingraham, C. L. (1994). Deaf-blind clients and vocational rehabilitation: Practical guidelines for counselors. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, 88(2), 117-127.
- Perreault, S. (1993). Adult services: Reaction. In J. W. Reiman & P. A. Johnson (Eds.), *Proceedings from the National Symposium on Children and Youth who are Deaf-Blind* (pp. 263-273). Monmouth, OR: Teaching Research Publications.

Petroff, J. G. (2001). *National transition follow-up study of youth identified as deafblind: Parent perspectives*. Monmouth, OR: The National Technical Assistance Consortium for Children and Young Adults who are Deaf-Blind.

Petroff, J. G. (2010). A national transition follow-up study of youth with deaf-blindness: Revisited. *AER Journal: Research and Practice in Visual Impairment and Blindness*, 3, 132-138.

Sui, Z. (2017). Prevalence and employment of individuals with combined hearing and vision loss, ages 18-64. Unpublished data analyses of the American Community Survey 2016 Public Use Microdata Sample.

Swenor, B. K., Ramulu, P. Y., Willis, J. R., Friedman, D., & Lin, F. R. (2013). The prevalence of concurrent hearing and vision impairment in the United States. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, 173, 312-313.

Teacher Preparation Programs: Deaf-Blindness (2017, March). Retrieved from <https://nationaldb.org/wiki/page/9/768> on November 20, 2017.

Thirty-eighth Institute on Rehabilitation Issues (2015). *Assume nothing! A monograph from the 38th Institute on Rehabilitation Issues to address underserved populations, including individuals who are deaf-blind*. Hot Springs, AR: University of Arkansas CURRENTS.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2017). *2016 American Community Survey 1-Year Estimates*, American FactFinder Table B18120, retrieved November 10, 2017.

Vernon, M., & Duncan, E. (1990). Advances in rehabilitation of deaf-blind persons. *Advances in Clinical Rehabilitation*, 3, 167–184.

- Watson, D. (1993). Adult services: Presentation. In J. W. Reiman & P. A. Johnson (Eds.), *Proceedings from the National Symposium on Children and Youth who are Deaf-Blind* (pp. 249-262). Monmouth, OR: Teaching Research Publications.
- Watson, D., Jennings, T., Tomlinson, P., Boone, S., & Anderson, G. (2008). *Model state plan for vocational rehabilitation services to persons who are deaf, deaf-blind, hard of hearing or late-deafened*. Hot Springs, AK: University of Arkansas Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Persons Who Are Deaf or Hard of Hearing and CSAVR Committee for Individuals Who Are Deaf, Deaf-Blind, Hard of Hearing or Late-Deafened.
- Watters, C., Owen, M., & Munroe, S. (2004). *A study of deaf-blind demographics and services in Canada*. North York, ON: Canadian National Society of the Deaf-Blind.
- Watters-Miles, C. (2014). Factors associated with the successful vocational rehabilitation of individuals with Usher Syndrome: A qualitative study (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/10150/338960>
- Wittich, W., Jarry, J., Groulx, G., Southall, K., & Gagné, J.-P. (2016). Rehabilitation and research priorities in deafblindness for the next decade. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, 110(4), 219-231.
- Wittich, W., Southall, K., Sikora, L., Watanabe, D. H., & Gagne, J.-P. (2013). What's in a name: Dual sensory impairment or deafblindness? *British Journal of Visual Impairment*, 31(3), 198-207.
- Wolf, E. G., Delk, M. T., Jr., & Schein, J. D. (1982). *Needs assessment of services to deaf-blind individuals: Final report*. Silver Spring, MD: Rehabilitation and Education Experts, Inc.
- Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act; State Vocational Rehabilitation Services Program, 81 Fed. Reg. 55630 (August 19, 2016) (to be codified at 34 C.F.R. pt. 361).

Table 1

Percentage of Consumers Achieving Competitive Employment Outcomes by Service Model and by Agency Type x Service Model

Agency Type and Service Model	Agencies Utilizing (<i>n</i>)	Consumers Closed (<i>n</i>)	Competitive Employment (%)
All Agencies	51	2,119	53.5
Specialist	18	1,015	59.0
Professional Collaboration	12	405	54.6
Specialist + Professional Collaboration	4	154	50.7
Miscellaneous	17	545	43.3
Blind Agencies	24	1089	61.6
Specialist	11	736	63.6
Professional Collaboration	5	215	57.7
Specialist + Professional Collaboration	1	35	51.4
Miscellaneous	7	103	59.2
Combined Agencies	27	1030	45.0
Specialist	7	279	47.0
Professional Collaboration	7	190	51.1
Specialist + Professional Collaboration	3	119	50.4
Miscellaneous	10	442	39.6

Table 2

Results of Logistic Regression Analysis Predicting Competitive Employment

Variable	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	Wald χ^2	<i>p</i>	<i>OR</i>	95% <i>CI</i>
Age	-0.01	.004	8.49	< .01	0.99	0.98, 1.00
Female	-0.32	.101	9.90	< .01	0.73	0.60, 0.89
Hispanic ethnicity	0.29	.149	3.76	.05	1.34	1.00, 1.79
Minority	-0.07	.128	0.28	.60	0.94	0.73, 1.20
Education level	0.13	.023	32.35	< .01	1.14	1.09, 1.19
SSI	-0.23	.119	3.71	.05	0.80	0.63, 1.00
SSDI	-0.13	.109	1.40	.24	0.88	0.71, 1.09
Employment at application	2.27	.135	282.30	< .01	9.65	7.41, 12.57
Agency type	0.42	.113	13.85	< .01	1.52	1.22, 1.90
Service model ^a			8.40	.04		
Specialist	0.34	.137	6.14	.01	1.40	1.07, 1.83
Professional Collaboration	0.39	.16	6.36	.01	1.48	1.09, 2.01
Specialist + Professional Collaboration	0.36	.209	2.89	.09	1.43	0.95, 2.15

Note. *N* = 2,119. *OR* = odds ratio. SSI = Supplemental Security Income. SSDI = Social Security Disability Insurance.

^aReference group is Miscellaneous.