



# **Norwegian Project Report**

## **Quality in Practice Stakeholders' View of Supported Employment**

An evaluation project in the framework of the LEONARDO-programme of the European Commission

Øystein Spjelkavik

Arbeidsforskningsinstituttet/Work Research Institute  
January 2003

Acknowledgements and great thanks to: AB Romerike & Norasonde AS, Akershus University College, Åse Almvang (Skeidar Oslo AS), Per Brannsten (Directorate of Labour), Elisabet Røhme Sivertsen (Directorate of Labour), Tor Ove Gjersvik (AB Romerike), Einar Madsen (AB Romerike), Yngve Moxness (AB Romerike), Helen Hodø (AB Romerike), Anne Myhre (AB Romerike), Ellen Nystrøm (AB Romerike), Eivind Rivrud (Akershus University College), Grete Wangen (Akershus University College), Dorte Møller (University of Oslo), Kari Marie Helle (Work Research Institute), all interviewees and all partners in Austria, UK, Check Republic, Hungary and Spain.

## **Background & partners**

Through their practical work, two Supported Employment initiatives involved in this project (Salva Vita/Hungary and Lebenshilfe Ennstal/Austria) identified the need to analyse the principles of their work in detail, especially with respect to the views of the involved stakeholders.

Initiatives from countries with different levels of development of Supported Employment (SE) were invited to participate in the project. Two European-Union member countries (United Kingdom and Austria), two Accession-countries (Hungary and Czech Republic) as well as Norway are partners in the project.

AB Romerike has been the practical partner in the Norwegian part of the project. The SE initiative AB Romerike, with their mother organisation Norasonde AS, were chosen as partner because they early expressed an interest to participate in the Quip project. While the whole SE team participated in the project, the active members from AB Romerike in the national project team were Anne Myhre (first part) and Yngve Moxnes (last part). Other partners in the national project team were Optima with Kirsti Sørstrøm (first part only) and Grete Wangen, who in the last part of the project represented Akershus University College. Employers' representative was Åse Almvang from Skeidar Oslo AS. Per Brannsten and Elisabet Røhme Sivertsen were representatives of the Directorate of Labour. At the Work Research Institute Kari Marie Helle initiated the project, while Øystein Spjelkavik has been responsible for carrying it through.

## **Aims**

- improving the methods of SE in different European countries
- defining relevant quality criteria in SE from the point of view of the different stakeholders (project managers, job facilitators, users, companies, public authorities etc.)
- defining criteria for success of SE-projects other than pure quantitative measures
- developing instruments for the ongoing evaluation of SE-projects
- facilitating SE-projects to present and justify their work

## **Methods**

In each country one Supported Employment project have been the focus of research carried out by a national research institute. In Norway this has been the Work Research Institute. A mix of qualitative and quantitative methods has been tailored to fit the needs of the involved stakeholders. Group discussions, interviews as well as informal conversations have been used to elicit the views of people with disabilities, staff of SE-projects, employers as well as public authorities.

The international project meetings have enabled participants to learn from each other and to analyse results from a comparative perspective.

A large conference in Budapest with stakeholders from different countries allowed

for feed-back of the results.

## **Products**

- a web-site ([www.quip.at](http://www.quip.at))
- short summaries of each research phase
- a final report describing the comparative research results
- a brochure on the most important quality criteria for SE from the perspectives of the stakeholders
- a description of the status quo in each involved Supported Employment project
- a manual with various evaluation methods for improving the quality of Supported Employment projects and guidelines how to involve different stakeholders

Background & partners.....	2
Aims.....	2
Methods .....	2
Products .....	3
1. Managers' View .....	6
1.1 Introduction .....	6
1.2 Aims and process of Supported Employment .....	6
1.3 Quality of Supported Employment.....	7
1.4 Organisational framework, skills and competencies .....	9
1.5 Evaluation and improvement of the SE initiative.....	10
2. Job coaches' View .....	11
2.1 Introduction .....	11
2.2 Job description and work process.....	11
2.3 Quality & evaluation of work.....	12
2.4 Individual background, education & training.....	12
2.5 Organisational framework and working conditions.....	13
2.6 Themes from the group discussion.....	13
Theme 1: Working with the client (job seeker).....	13
Theme 2. Work situation.....	14
Theme 3. Training and education.....	15
Theme 4. Work environment.....	15
Theme 5. Quality evaluation.....	16
Theme 6. Contact with employer.....	17
Theme 7. Family.....	17
2.7 Comments.....	17
3. Job seekers' view.....	18
3.1 Introduction .....	18
3.2 Individual backgrounds .....	19
3.3 Process and quality of SE.....	20
3.4 Description of current job.....	24
4. Employers' view.....	29
4.1 Introduction .....	29
4.2 Sector and organisation .....	29
4.3 Process and quality of supported employment.....	30
4.5 Description of the current job.....	35
4.5 General Employer Awareness .....	39
5. Policy makers' and funding bodies' views.....	43
5.1 Introduction .....	43
5.2 Quality of the co-operation with AB Romerike .....	43
Evaluation of the co-operation with AB Romerike .....	44
Improvements of the co-operation.....	44
5.3 Quality of SE service and process .....	44
General aims of Supported Employment.....	44
Knowledge of the SE service's process in detail.....	44
Essential skills and characteristics of a job coach .....	45
Strengths and weaknesses of SE in general.....	45
5.4 What is successful SE?.....	46
5.5 How could SE in general be improved?.....	46
5.6 Evaluating the SE-initiative.....	47

5.7 Evaluation methods and quality indicators.....	47
Evaluation.....	47
Quality indicators .....	48
5.8 Financing of SE .....	49
Financial sources and conditions of the financial supporting.....	49
Time limit .....	49
Opportunities for further development within the present funding system.....	50
Alternative future developments in the funding of SE.....	50
6 Preliminary conclusions .....	50
6.1 Introduction .....	50
6.2 Preliminary results.....	51
6.3 Quality indicators and quality criteria .....	54
7. Conclusion: “Bringing stakeholders’ quality perspectives together” .....	56

Tabell 1 Job seekers – gender, age, previous work experience, present job situation, obstacles to work, and official disability.....	20
Tabell 2 The SE process; contact frequency .....	21
Tabell 3 Job seekers’ goals; reached goals? if no – why not? gender .....	22
Tabell 4 Type of support; satisfaction or dissatisfaction; improvements .....	23
Tabell 5 Recommend to others; why? who can benefit from SO? gender .....	24
Tabell 6 Size of job; payment; length of job .....	26
Tabell 7 Support at work; type of support; anything to change? gender.....	27
Tabell 8 Dislikes and likes about job; happiness; gender.....	28
Tabell 9 Sector.....	29
Tabell 10 Activity; number of employees; employees with disability .....	30
Tabell 11 First contact with SE .....	30
Tabell 12 Expected support from SE.....	31
Tabell 13 Actual support; support needs met; meeting frequency .....	31
Tabell 14 Adequacy of contact frequency .....	31
Tabell 15 Contacted job coach? what happens?.....	32
Tabell 16 Decision of induction .....	32
Tabell 17 Cooperation with other support organisations? how do they compare?.....	35
Tabell 18 Why was job seeker from SE employed?.....	35
Tabell 19 Paid employee? type of payment? contract and future possibilities?.....	36
Tabell 20 Employee’s support needs adequately met? type of support? problems? .....	37
Tabell 21 Positive/negative experiences.....	39
Tabell 22 Awareness of disability and equal opportunities issues? .....	40
Tabell 23 Awareness of the potential of people with a disability through... ..	40
Tabell 24 Legal obligations; problems? .....	40
Tabell 25 Impact on staff and staff’s response .....	42
Tabell 26 Motivation factors .....	42
Tabell 27 Interviewees policy makers and funding bodies .....	43
Tabell 28 Strengths and weaknesses of SE in general.....	46
Tabell 29 Quality indicators .....	49
Tabell 30 Quality indicators and quality criteria for jobs provided by SE.....	54
Tabell 31 Quality indicators and quality criteria for methods in SE .....	55
Tabell 32 Quality indicators and quality criteria job coaches in SE .....	55
Tabell 33 Quality indicators and quality criteria for professional network of SE.....	56

## **1. Managers' View**

### **1.1 Introduction**

Norasonde AS is a Labour Market Enterprise (Norw: attføringsbedrift), which consists of 4 units; the SE initiative, Arbeid med bistand Romerike, is one of these units.

Two persons from Norasonde were interviewed together. Interviewee 1 is personnel & rehabilitation manager and interviewee 2 is head of "Norasonde formidling", of which AB Romerike (AB) is part.

Their main tasks with regard to the SE initiative is as follows: Interviewee 1 handles personnel issues, including also to contribute to facilitate the operating of AB, mentoring, guidance and counselling the SE initiative. Interviewee 2 is responsible for the daily operating of the SE initiative.

Although the two interviewees sometimes held slightly different opinions and sometimes expressed their views differently, there were no substantial differences in their views. Their answers to these questions have therefore not been split up.

### **1.2 Aims and process of Supported Employment**

The main aims of AB Romerike, according to the managers are:

- To reach the goals of SE as expressed in the public guidelines with regard to who and how many.
- Avoid long waiting lists and keep the focus on work integration.
- Help and guide job seekers that are not able to present themselves; help them to a better understanding and to get access to good working places.
- Contribute to the development of the businesses and labour market to be more inclusive.

The managers describe the SE-process like this:

Job seeker enters the initiative from The Labour Market Office.

- First step – clarification - is to get to know each other, to create a safe atmosphere and find out about the person's needs and wishes. But it is also important to avoid relationships that become so close that they create or promote dependency. We have had examples of that, where job seeker became too dependent on that particular job coach. It is important to keep the focus on work integration, and not on care for its own sake.

- Next step is to look for possibilities for employment, job or try-out – which means to always look for possible tasks/jobs in the businesses, find out what the person is good at and find possibilities to let him/her try, help them to get access. It is on one hand important to avoid unstable work places, and on the other hand to prepare the job seeker to face a changing working life. It is important to create an open atmosphere towards employers. Still, we have realised the importance of good written agreements at the work places – such agreements are more important for the job seekers than what might be the normal case.
- Negotiation with the employer, find out what is the optional solution. We have experienced cases where it is difficult to decide how much pressure to put on an employer: A job seeker might want a full-time job but the employer may not want to pay more than 40%. A combined wage and disablement benefit might be a good solution. Still, it is important to avoid situations where job seekers simply become cheap labour.
- The last contact with the job seeker must be a well-defined change end of something and that something new begins. We have experienced however, that the contact sometimes is maintained in one way or another, often for a long time

According to the managers, the most important steps in the SE-process can be described like this: For the most part, the SE-process develops in circles. What is most important will always vary according to individual considerations; although it might be a general lesson to check up the job seeker's motivation and eagerness with regard to get a job. The presentation of SE/job seeker towards employers is very important, and employers must be allowed time to think things through. The aim is to arrive at a worthy solution, "the moment of truth".

According to the managers, the most difficult task in the SE-process can be described like this: To maintain a job in a changing labour market and not do something with people that they don't want. We have experienced problems with job seekers that have not been well enough prepared for supported employment – in these cases the clarification of needs, wishes, competence and interests takes too long time; decisions are delayed, and suddenly 3 years have passed without nothing have happened and nobody really knowing why.

### **1.3 Quality of Supported Employment**

According to the managers, the main strengths of AB Romerike is the initiative's situation, with good infrastructure and great variety in job offers. The initiative is situated in a larger context, within a business that contains an internal and external network that provides a variety of offers that a job coach can utilize, e.g. possibilities for try-out, function analysis, different courses, and in general a high competence in rehabilitation.

According to the managers, the main weaknesses of the initiative is that the job coaches have been to narrow-minded, and not being able to see the multitude of possibilities in the mother

organisation's internal and external network. This created a sectarian attitude and a team-identity that caused entrenchment towards the rest of our rehabilitation system. This was at an earlier stage, and is no longer the case.

The managers describe high quality SE like this: Arriving at a worthy solution, which means that the persons involved really want the final solution; that there is a good match between the person's own resources and the jobs we help them to find; and also that matching and coping correspond. We have seen examples where it took a total of 6 years and a lot of efforts to arrive at a solution where the person got 40% salary in a good job and 60% social benefit. Still, the worthy solution indicates high quality SE.

Low quality of SE is described like this by the managers: Lack of follow-up during the process. We had an example where there was a high level of intensity at the beginning, but waiting for a good job possibility took so long that there was no contact between job coach and job seeker for over a year. In general, we have experienced the danger of too much stagnation after the first clarification phase.

According to managers, good quality SE perceived by

- Job coaches: Help job seekers into employment.
- Job seekers: Find something worthy to do, relevant work, be part of a work environment, be accepted and belong somewhere.
- Employers: Get someone who can do a job that must be done.
- Funding agencies/government: Fulfilment of intentions – get more people from a passive to an active condition vis-à-vis the labour market; while type of job is irrelevant.

Managers suggestions for possible improvement of AB Romerike:

- Internally – improve the integration of SE in the other units of our business. We don't want a SE-initiative that has no connection to the rest of our system or our business as a whole. So we want the job coaches to a greater degree to utilize more of our offers and to see possibilities in our other units. We want all our 4 units, which are all part of a rehabilitation system, to join forces and to be more eclectic. This will give the SE initiative a broader platform of recourses.
- Externally - increase the time that job coaches actually spend out there among employers and at work places. The point of that is to always look for possibilities, possible work tasks, to be more creative in the job they do with the job seekers and to steadily educate employers. Perhaps a job coach should spend as much as 80% of their time to such external activities, while normally 50% of their time is spent externally.

## 1.4 Organisational framework, skills and competencies

According to managers, an organisational framework that is important for high quality SE can be described like this: Equality of status – meaning that the organisation acknowledges that everybody is as important as everybody else; everybody shall have an interesting job and carry out interesting tasks that are relevant and important for the business.

The managers describe the decision making process at Norasonde from their own individual position:

- Interviewee 1: Makes decisions in matters that have to do with the personnel, employment, and wages.
- Interviewee 2: Makes decisions within the SE initiatives and on behalf of the initiative vis-à-vis the rest of the business. These are decisions that have to do with the daily operating of the initiative, the serving of the labour Market Office, the maintenance of the guidelines and their own quality handbook – these are all professional matters of the supported employment process.
- The job coaches, according to managers' views: Responsible for their own reporting, and for carrying out the supported employment process.

The managers describe the most important skills and characteristics in their own jobs (vis-à-vis the SE initiative) like this: Arrange in order to create the best possible work environment; treat employees on equal terms; follow-up employees by giving compliments and also to tell when things are not as they should be; arrange for inclusion and a good social life within our own working environment; give signals to employees to be independent in their job performance and to trust their own competence – but also to provide possibilities for employees' development of self and competence. Such performance demands first of all elementary pedagogic skills.

Important skills and characteristics for a job coach, according to managers' views: A job coach must be humble and have a good deal of empathy – but should take care not to become a therapist. A job coach must be able to speak and present things in a very clear language. A job coach shall mainly concentrate on a) the job seeker and b) the business life/labour market, something that certainly means that there is a lot that must match. Preferably a job coach has a varied background – featuring formal social education as well as experience from practical guiding and communication. What we try to avoid, is to employ somebody as a job coach that has only experiences from some institution, or somebody that only wants to talk and discuss. As a main principle though, the SE initiative consists of several job coaches, and it is therefore important to get employees that give a good composition of skills and characteristics within the team.

AB Romerike has produced a Handbook that describes the job of a job coach, and which works as a practical tool and for updating. There is also the SE specification from the government.

### **1.5 Evaluation and improvement of the SE initiative**

The managers describe the present evaluation system of the SE initiative/AB Romerike like this: The labour market authorities through their guidelines and specifications define goals of SE. Evaluation is therefore based on reports directly to the local Employment Service, from where the job seekers are coming.

Evaluation of the Se initiative within the Norasonde enterprise is based on information and interaction.

The Advisory Committee of the Norasonde enterprise establishes goals for the rehabilitation work in the enterprise and is also responsible for following up the different rehabilitation units. Their work is based on information and reporting from the SE initiative. The head of the SE initiative is responsible for the daily operations of the initiative, the individual cases, and for reporting activities in the Se initiative to the Advisory Committee. Additionally, each job coach reports on a regularly basis each individual case to the local Employment Service.

When asked which suitable indicators exist in the present system and which do not, the managers answered:

One should be careful with quantitative measures as the only measures. It is important to acknowledge that the SE process will vary according to the individual job seeker's needs. Therefore qualitative judgements must also be part of the evaluation. On the other hand – if we establish only qualitative measures, there is a danger that the SE process will be too much coloured by care and problematic aspects. The focus must always be kept on the individual's resources. The 3-year duration limit of SE works all right as an evaluation place, but there should be good possibilities for continued follow-up. With regard to evaluation in general, factors like time and money will always be important.

What ideas for new evaluation methods and quality indicators do the managers have?

According to managers, it is very important to get established evaluation tools and quality indicator schemes for employers that use our SE service. This could include measures on how much time our job coaches have spent at the work places; and it could check if employers are satisfied with the service from our job coaches. This would give us important and useful feedback that would help to improve our service. We must be careful not to develop anything that will cause much paperwork or that is time-consuming.

## **2. Job coaches' View**

### **2.1 Introduction**

All job coaches were interviewed. Results of the interviews are presented in 2.1 – 2.4 below. Four members of the SE team took part in a group discussion. Results from the group discussion are reported in chapter 2.6 below.

### **2.2 Job description and work process**

The job coaches present the aims of their work like this: To improve job seekers' life quality, provide jobs and integration in the open labour market. This is a main difference between SE and other labour market services. A problem is that these aims are the same as the statements in the National Guidelines for SE, so it is difficult to know if job coaches simply refer to these or if they refer to what they think themselves. Still, it is surprising that the aim of improving life quality seem to be mentioned more often or stressed more strongly than the aim of providing jobs.

Based on job coaches' job description, the following steps of the SE process can be identified:

1. Introductory conversation at the Labour Office, presentation of SE and the job seeker, get to know each other
2. Mapping resources and limitation concerning job possibilities and jobmatch, conversations, establish confidence, collecting references,
3. Job seeking, contact with relevant employers, interview training
4. Job match found, mapping out needs of support at the work site, facilitation, work environment
5. Facilitation and follow-up at work, support at work site
6. Follow-up/evaluation, confirmation of appointment through contract, gradual reduction, state of readiness

How job coaches perceive what are the most difficult tasks of their work:

- A mixture of problems. As SE is an individual approach, the problem is never the same
- To handle mental illnesses, how to deal with them
- The problem of becoming a scapegoat due to rigidity of rules and clients' economy

How job coaches perceive the role of other actors in the SE process:

- Family: Not so relevant, but we give them information

- Clients: Main actor
- Employer: To provide jobs and wages
- Funding agency: The government, they provide funding and guidelines
- Job coaches' employer organisation: To provide infra structure

### **2.3 Quality & evaluation of work**

The job coaches' priority list on success factors of their work was set up as follows:

1. Job seeker satisfaction
2. Finding employment
3. Professional recognition and development.
4. Satisfaction by Labour Office
5. Satisfaction by job seekers family (this factor cannot be split from factor 1. In some cases the family is important, in some cases it is irrelevant)

In addition: Economic factors could give a better quality situation. With higher wages more people/job coaches would start and stay in SE work.

Failure in work would then be the opposite of these factors.

Job coaches' perception of their and other actors' view on high and/or low quality of job seekers' job:

- Job coaches: Social integration, individual development and job seeker satisfaction.
- Funding bodies: As many people with disabilities into ordinary jobs at lowest possible costs, and that they are able to retain their jobs. Reduction of national disability pension costs.
- Client/job seeker: Better life quality, but also a job that gives satisfaction. Wage is probably less important than social integration. Participation – that is social integration – is probably the most important.
- Employers: That necessary work is done without trouble with the client. It is ok to pay wage, but it is not ok to waste wage on work not done.

### **2.4 Individual background, education & training.**

What job coaches consider being the most important skills in their job: Most important is that the job coach is solution-oriented and that he/she has patience. It is also important to have the ability to understand people (empathy) and to be able to build relations based on confidence.

The ideal job coach, according to job coaches: Cannot be described. Most important is the composition of the job coach team; it is necessary to have different/complementary

competences and capacities. Still, it is an advantage to have experience from private business & industry.

What is, according to job coaches, the ideal education of a job coach: It's not rational to seek for any ideal education because what is needed is variation and diversity of competences in a SE team. Still, proper level of education seems to be college level and additional specific vocational rehabilitation education/training. Relevant educational themes are pedagogic; psychology; and sales and marketing. In sum we might say that the ideal job coach can be described as an educated team-worker with experience from private business and industry.

## **2.5 Organisational framework and working conditions.**

When asked what are the most important working conditions for job coaches, the job coaches answer:

- wage
- good leadership (in the team)
- the social contact among members of the team
- professional autonomy

Further education and improved technical support (e.g. computer tech.) is seen as less important.

Proper educational level and experience from private business and industry are factors that constitute a background to do a good job. When asked what could improve their work, the job coaches answer:

- a better understanding among employers
- job coaches get counselling on mental problems among clients

Better qualifications and higher wages will also help, while improved working tools and infrastructure is less important.

## **2.6 Themes from the group discussion**

Theme 1: Working with the client (job seeker)

In Norway a discussion has been going on about the client concept, and it is accepted that for occupational rehabilitation the concept job seeker should be used. The reason why the client concept is rejected is that client often is associated with passive treatment. The role of a job seeker should be a more active role where co-operation between job seeker and the SE group towards an occupational goal is the important process that is going on. So the discussion group decided to use the concept job seeker also in this international project.

The job seeker comes to the SE group from the Labour Office. There are 6 job coach positions in the group. One of these is for the time being vacant. It is supposed that a 6-person group works with 30 job seekers.

The problems of the job seekers vary very much. Physical problems, learning problems (mental retardation) psychiatric problems and social problems are most common. It is not very important to put the job seekers into separate problem- categories. Most of them show a mixture of this problem picture. In the clarifying phase the most important task is to get insight in the individual mixture of problems, remaining abilities, interests and strong sides of the job seeker. It is however evident that 'psychiatric problems' is an increasing category.

Factors that may prevent employment for a job seeker are again a mixture of psychological, emotional and social problems. The work with psychological/psychiatric problems is judged to be the most difficult task for the SE workers. The SE group shall not and do not wish to give psychological treatment. But they ask for parallel or supportive treatment opportunities that go on during the first steps or in critical phases in the occupational rehabilitation process.

The SE group works in team. The team discusses the job seekers' cases and a coach is appointed. Then each of the SE coach works together with the job seeker on an autonomous way. However counselling from the team is always available. Today on S E coach follows the job seeker through the whole process. Time used for each job seeker is mostly from 1 to 1 and a half-year, but some cases may be in the system for 3 years.

There is a discussion going on as to more specialisation of work. There could be a possibility of division of work between direct job seeker contact and follow up on the one hand and more market oriented job seeking on the other hand. But the near personal contact and confidence between job coach and job seeker must not get lost. Division of work is still a discussion theme for the group.

## Theme 2. Work situation.

The ability to understand people, to feel empathy with the situation of the job seeker and ability to build a relation of confidence are the outstanding features of the job situation. Also an attitude of finding solution and great patience are mentioned as a typical feature of the job.

Satisfaction in the job situation relates to satisfaction of the job seeker. It may be important to point out that not only the overall end- result is important. The smaller steps during the process give job satisfaction. When one succeed in making like better for the job seeker, when he/she gets more self confidence this may be experienced as small but significant job victories.

The reasons to choose and to stay in this kind of work also relate to job seeker satisfaction. It is a meaningful task to help people to achieve better life quality. But the social ideal of

integration as such is also an important personal motivating factor. Work that can prepare and assist society in development of tolerance and integration is seen as very meaningful. The ideas behind SE work are very much in accordance with the SE workers' personal beliefs. This is a necessity for job satisfaction in this kind of work.

The ideal SE worker cannot be described. When working on team it is the ideal capacity of the team that counts not so much each of the members. It is advisable to build teams where different competences and capacities are represented. This is more important than to seek for the ideal type of SE worker. However, experience from working life is mentioned as an important factor.

### Theme 3. Training and education.

The members of this SE team have no direct training for this kind of work before they started. The team gives counselling and feedback. However, there is a need for counselling, follow up or educational support on psychiatric problems that become more and more relevant in the work situation. There is more a need for parallel follow up than for more formal education. There is also a wish to learn more from other SE teams in the region or at greater arranged professional meetings of SE workers.

Problems in the work that one was not quite prepared for are again the psychiatric/psychological problems of the job seekers. But it is also mentioned that the role of scapegoat can be difficult. When the job seekers blame their SE coaches for their difficulties, and for not having done a good job for them – this becomes an emotionally difficult situation. Another difficult situation, not easy to prepare for is the frustrations by time consuming rigidity of the rules and measures that are to be followed to obtain legal (economic) rights for the job seekers.

As in the discussion about ideal type of SE worker, this group firmly holds the views that it is not rational to seek for the ideal education. It is variation and diversity of competence that counts in SE work.

The ideal would be some kind of educational follow up on psychiatric problems. Education that is organised as modules with different learning content, would be a good offer to SE. By module learning each coach can fill up upon what he/she finds is needed in his/her job. And modules that give different kinds of competences will also be good in the teamwork. Education that gives variation of competences should not be avoided but rather searched for. It is the flexibility of the SE work situation that must be the principle also in education.

### Theme 4. Work environment.

The group has been working with work environment problems (handbook available). They find the situation today satisfactory.

There is good professional relationship between the team members. They see it as important to be a professional unity. When they attend to seminars or conferences they try to do it so that more than one member can attend. Social events are also marked to keep the group together.

There is however, a need for better professional contact with the Labour Office. In special it is desirable for selection of job seekers to the SE system that there is a good professional contact between the SE team and the consultant at the Labour Office. The most deeply felt need is however, a need for better professional co-operation and meeting places with the outside treatment system. Contacts and information into the professional psychiatric system are asked for. Information must go both ways. There is an evident lack of information on SE contributions inside psychiatric institutions.

There exist written method material, handbooks on SE etc. The standard procedure is mostly followed at the start of the process by clarifying the situation and start seeking for jobs. Later on in the process the directions and methods must follow the development of the case. The host organisation – a labour market company - is sometimes used in the clarifying and trying-out phase.

One source of environmental and work condition problems lies in the relationship to the host organisation. There may be a struggle from the SE group to obtain necessary professional and economic autonomy. This struggle may become time consuming and emotionally stressing. For the time being there are good relations to the host organisation, but the SE group has experienced serious problems by their former host, and they see that these problems may turn up.

#### Theme 5. Quality evaluation.

The job coaches' priority list on success factors was set up as follows:

1. Job seeker satisfaction
2. Finding employment
3. Professional recognition and development.
4. Satisfaction by Labour Office
5. Satisfaction by job seekers family (this factor cannot be split from factor 1. In some cases the family is important, in some cases it is irrelevant - see theme 7).

Economic factors could give a better quality situation. With higher wages more people would start and stay in SE work. However, it is the social criteria of integration that are most important for evaluation of quality. Individual development that is positive for the job seeker is also important for quality evaluation.

This SE group is working out plans for quality control (documentation available).

Theme 6. Contact with employer.

Here the local offer of jobs is used. The SE group searches for jobs in the local press, at the labour office, on Internet and through the personal network of the job seeker. The interest preferences of the job seeker determines who, how and when an employer is contacted. In greater work places it is the department of personnel management that is contacted. But mostly in smaller and middle great enterprises it is the daily leader that is the contact person.

Information on the case and the conditions of the SE work is given to the colleges at the workplace in co-operation with the job seeker.

The problems as seen by the employers lie in avoiding trouble and extra work with the SE job seeker. But the most serious problems that have to be solved concern wages.

A vital method of the SE work is to follow the job seeker into the job situation and work side to side with him/her as well as to assist in getting good social relations at the job, eat lunch together etc. The follow up programme is adjusted in accordance with the needs of the job seeker and is trapped down over time.

Observations at the work place and suggestions on how to adapt the work tasks to the capacities of the job seeker is going on when the coach is out at the work place.

A very interesting observation is the differences in attitudes and norms between the social service system and working life. The transition from social service attitude into understanding and accepting the attitudes and claims of working life is a very challenging development for the job seeker.

Theme 7. Family.

Sometimes it may be relevant to bring the family into the development, but not often. It is up to the job seeker to decide if, when and how contact to family shall be performed.

Information to near family on the job and training situation may however be important. For that purpose a brochure and some written material about SE is handed out to the job seeker. This may help the job seeker in his/her own information to the family.

## **2.7 Comments.**

The group discussion was interesting and the members of the group seemed eager to express their views. They seemed to appreciate the opportunity to reflect on their own work situation in a research setting.

The themes for discussion functioned well, but we miss better opportunity to go deeper into the special dynamics of SE.

In particular we would find it very interesting to go deeper into the transition from social service attitudes to working life attitudes. This transition calls for further studies as it may be seen as the core of occupational rehabilitation.

As to research methods, we want to add:

1. Introduction, information on the project and clarifying the role of the SE group in the research proceedings.
2. Questionnaires
3. Group discussion
4. Feed back to the SE group on how their information is presented and how it will contribute in the total project.

Point 1 and 4 must be taken seriously. If not the informants may feel exploited by the researchers. Their contribution will be the foundation of the Quip project.

### **3. Job seekers' view**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

We interviewed persons that were or had been participating in the SE Organisation (AB Romerike). Those persons live and/or work in a region that covers a very wide geographical area. As such, they were difficult to reach. It would have taken me several days to visit them individually. Therefore we made the agreement with the job coaches that they took responsibility to arrange a gathering of job seekers/ex job seekers at a particular time in their office building. We agreed to use one whole day for the individual interviews and that we would be 4 interviewers. In that way respondents could arrive at the time that suited best for themselves, and they wouldn't have to wait to be interviewed. Arrangements also had to be done vis-à-vis employers, respondents' travel route, their travel expenses and food/drink for all. The job coaches took care of all practical arrangements while I took care of finding suitable fellow-researchers for interviewing. It all worked out very well, thanks are the job coaches' efforts and great will to cooperate in the project.

We originally intended to interview some 20 persons, and we wanted respondents that could tell us as much as possible about the whole SE process, from the first contact to leaving the SE organisation (SEO). We wanted persons that had got a steady job, that had not got a steady job, that were not yet in a job position. Further more, we wanted both old and young persons

and a good share concerning gender. At the end 16 persons showed up, the rest called and said they either didn't have the nerves to come or there were practical hindrances.

We did not look at disability/diagnosis as a condition, mainly because the job coaches refused to take that into account. The job coaches also refused to answer questions on diagnosis, but they agreed to give me "the official diagnosis" as given them from the Labour Market Service (LMS). In Norway, all participants of SE must be registered at the LMS and as such sent from LMS to the SEO. They also agreed that we could ask the respondents themselves about what they saw as their own obstacles to get a job, and the job coaches would provide me with information on what in their opinion were obstacles on each respondent. In that way, it's fair to say that also the job coaches became respondents, and it gives a good opportunity to compare views on obstacles.

Respondents were informed to bring along a trusted person if they wanted to, but none did. The job coaches were present in the first part of the interviews (individual background) where there were questions that were difficult to remember. After that the job coach left the interviewing setting, unless the respondent wanted him/her to stay. It turned out the job coach was present in 2 of the 16 interviews. Interviewers reported that it was not a good thing they were present, not because the respondent didn't dare to be critical, but because they tended to help the respondent too much in talking in general. Each interview lasted about 1 hour (questions for the Norwegian project were added to the QuiP questionnaire).

The 16 respondents were asked individually to come back one week later for a group interview. Most of them didn't want to, but 6 persons agreed to come. We ended up with 5 persons; one just didn't show up. The researcher alone in one group setting interviewed them all (no job coaches present). That turned out to be an interesting experiment. No new information was added from the individual interviews, but the group participants obviously had a great time reflecting together. It was agreed that the group interview should last 1 hour. It turned out that it lasted half an hour longer, mainly because the group members wanted to talk to each other. None of them had met participants of the SEO earlier for talking together like this.

### **3.2 Individual backgrounds**

We seen from the table below that 12 respondents were in a job setting, while 4 were not (placement, Norw: hospitering). "Obstacles to job" are the respondents' own views, while "official disability" is a combination of job coaches' view and that of the LMS. This one is easy to compare. It should be added that the respondents tended to focus more on external aspects (e.g. much sick leave, too long in the rehabilitation system) than the job coaches did. Those that have multiple diagnosis, actually most of the respondents, focuses mostly physical obstacles, while those with mental problems focuses problems with anxiety. Where job seeker focuses physical obstacles, the job coach also focuses uncertainty and low self-esteem.

Tabell 1 Job seekers – gender, age, previous work experience, present job situation, obstacles to work, and official disability

	Gend	Age	Prev. work	Job	Obstacles to job	“Off. Disability”
1	F	48	Account	Yes	bad shoulder	Diabetes/ Phys.retard
2	F	53	Since the age of 18	Yes	bad hand	Fibrom/neck-shoulder
3	F	26	Sheltered only	Yes	tempo and time	Learning diff
5	F	45	Factory, cleaning, children	Yes	don't learn quick	Mental/read & write
6	F	50	Storing, cleaning, industry	Yes	afraid	Phys.retard /Mental
8	F	54	Hospital	Placem	rejected, not needed	Mental
9	F	44	Factory	Yes	Whiplash, depressed	Mental/fibrom
13	F	29	Catering	Yes	depressed, not needed	Reading & writing
17	F	30	No	Yes	problems to write	Brain dam/ learning diff
4	M	47	No	Placem	bad arm/hand	Social mis/ Phys.retard
7	M	28	Work during summer	Yes	unsafe with others	Mental
10	M	30	Cleaning, catering	Yes	nervous,	Learning diff
11	M	40	Storing, packing	Placem	asthma, allergies, muscles	Phys.retard
12	M	37	Sorting, clearing	Yes	not reading and writing	Brain dam/reading & writing
15	M	25	Sheltered only	Placem	problems with theory	Learning diff
16	M	30	Bakery (placement)	Yes	health problems	Reading & writing, asthma/eczema
<b>16</b>	<b>9F, 7M</b>			<b>12 job, 4pl</b>		

### 3.3 Process and quality of SE

All job seekers come to the SEO from the LMS. We checked how they initially came to know about SE:

- Via Labour Office: 8
- Via Sheltered Workshop: 5
- Via Social Security Office: 1
- Via family: 1
- Via local community Activity Centre: 1

#### *Why did they choose SE?*

- No choice given: 3 (recommended by LMS),
- Support/help to get a job: 11,
- Help in a difficult life situation/some work: 1,
- Easy access: 1

**Cooperation with job coach. How often do they meet?**

*Tabell 2 The SE process; contact frequency*

1. Information: Formal meeting	
2. Conversations: Get to know each other, trust, questions, questionnaire, “get a picture”, much writing	Several times a week
3. Mapping possibilities: making plans, discussing job alternatives, job match, CV	Less than once a week
4. Job search: apply for jobs, telephoning employers, adds, Labour Office, personal network,	
5. Job contact: visit employers, job interviews	Every 2 <sup>nd</sup> week
6. Job/placement: adjustments at work, negotiations about payment, length of working time	
7. Follow up: working together, learning the work, formal meetings, moral support, negotiations	Several times a week
8. Steady job/no job	Once a month

The process is not so linear as this, so the frequency of times that the job seeker and job coach meet varies a great deal.

***Do they have a written plan? Aspects of contribution, how often they discuss the plan and do they know the next step?***

Most job seekers say that there has been some sort of written plan, but this seem to be produced during the first part of the process, as part of what the job seekers call “the mapping out phase” (part 1 – 3 above). This plan is referred to as an “agreement scheme” or as a half year report to the Labour Office. 6 of the respondents say that there was no such plan or that they don’t remember.

All job seekers say that they had an influence and that they contributed, both to the written plan/scheme/report, or to the process in general. They contributed by talking and taking joint decisions as concerning the next step. Most job seekers feel that the job coach listened to them and took care about their wishes. However, 6 of the respondents say that they had no influence, and two of them had experienced a dominating job coach.

All but 1 of the respondents knew an answer as to what the next step is, but they did not link their answers to any written plan. Rather, they answered in general terms, such as: “Stay in this job”, “Get a contract for a steady job”. It should be noted that 6 of the respondents were not participating in the SE organisation any more, and that another one at the time of the interview was not active. These obviously had no “next step” within the frames of the SE organisation.

***What did they hope to achieve in SE, have they reached those goals, and if not – why?***

*Tabell 3 Job seekers' goals; reached goals? if no – why not? gender*

<b>Goals? Reached? Why not?</b>		
Job, yes, but won't stay in this job	1	F
Steady job, no, public employment	2	F
Job, yes	3	F
50% job not reached, they don't need me	5	F
Job, no, age, new goal: job+benefit	6	F
A small job not reached, can't concentrate	8	F
Job, yes, love it	9	F
Job, yes	13	F
Job, no, but will soon	17	F
Job, no, not yet	4	M
Job, yes	7	M
A well paid job, no, too little wages, am not independent	10	M
Job + benefit, not reached	11	M
Job, yes	12	M
Steady job, no, something happened	15	M
Job, yes, would like more education	16	M

(job seekers' quotes)

It was difficult for job seekers to give any answer as to why not goals were not reached.

- 5 report satisfaction,
- 2 report satisfaction and possibly new goals,
- 1 reports expected satisfaction soon,
- 1 reports problems with steady employment in public sector,
- 7 report not to have reached goals, 3 of those possibly on the way to full fill goals.

***Type of support; what do they/don't they like about the cooperation? When was the co-operation successful and when not? Improvements?***

(see next page)

Tabell 4 Type of support; satisfaction or dissatisfaction; improvements

What kind of support do you get/need?	Satisfaction? Dissatisfaction? Improvements?
Support to get started, help to sell myself, a lot of pushing, good talks, building my self-esteem, always accessible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That I got a job, that the JC was there for me, support on my own premises</li> <li>• A bit too much contact in the beginning</li> </ul>
Find a job, help to write applications, make appointments, participation in job interviews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The open atmosphere, easy to talk, good contact.</li> <li>• Didn't like to have to list up friends and acquaintances to investigate job possibilities.</li> </ul>
Help to apply for a job, adjustments on the job, disposal of time, learn the job, help to travel, make agreement on wage, nice atmosphere when JC visits me at work.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That I got help to get myself a job.</li> <li>• I'm not dissatisfied with anything.</li> </ul>
Help to apply for a job, learn the job, get to know the work place, practical, social and moral support, know that I can make contact with JC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I liked it when we worked together, good contact.</li> <li>• Nothing.</li> </ul>
A door-opener to working life, pushing me, finds the right job, helps reduce my anxiety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• My JC is not the person that I had hoped for, could just as well fixed things by myself via the Labour Office, the JC is not very active or enthusiastic, won't find me a job.</li> </ul>
A guarantee to the employer, feel that we are even, get suggestions, looking for jobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good at finding alternatives for me, gives good support when things are bad, good personal qualities.</li> <li>• The SE organisation is not good profiled – people at my work place didn't know it.</li> </ul>
One that talks better Norwegian than I do, have meetings with the boss, good to know that the JC is there	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I'm happy that I got a white JC who is a foreigner at the same time, in that way we have a lot in common, easy to talk to, I had no chance without SE, I might have committed suicide.</li> <li>• I know of nothing that's negative</li> </ul>
Looking for job possibilities, help to write job applications.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Got a course on dyslexia, good follow-up at the job, learned one thing at the time, worked with me until I felt safe, became safe through the follow-up both before and after the job.</li> <li>• A JC that was too prevailing, couldn't cooperate, too much pressure to get a job quickly, did not feel secure</li> </ul>
Access to work places, learning the job, help to behave, help to be patient, improving my personal hygiene.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The personal guidance.</li> <li>• Took too much time before I got a job, didn't like to lose 2 JCs, but that also gave me more experience.</li> </ul>
A person that can raise my chances on the labour market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trust, openness, nice atmosphere, I'm asked what I want.</li> <li>• Too little contact with the JC, which I got more follow-up at my work place, had a lot of questions. I was told the JC wouldn't disturb me, that I needed to concentrate on my job and not talk so much and ask questions</li> </ul>
A person that I trust joins me to work, one that can talk with the employer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I liked to have a JC at my own age, feel that the JC understands me very well.</li> <li>• Didn't like the conversations between my boss and my JC about my progress.</li> </ul>
Finds jobs, comes with me to work, talks with colleagues and boss	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have received a lot of help, I'm explained things, I get answers to questions.</li> <li>• All right with a try-out-phase, but my JC didn't do enough to check possibilities for a steady job after the try-out phase.</li> </ul>
Access to work places, help to find a job that suits me, call employers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clever to obtain jobs, JC explains employers what SE is all about and finds possibilities for me to try myself out.</li> <li>• JC didn't quite understand my problems, thought they were mental problems, but my main problem comes from earlier strains. I got proof on that when experts checked me – after the check the JC understood me better.</li> </ul>
Adjustments and help at work, technical training, help to find a job, help to search around	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good contact with the JC.</li> <li>• Could have participated more in the adjustments at work.</li> </ul>
Find a job that suits me, help to try myself in a job, a person with me in case of problems gives more security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I like the JC's efforts, the cooperation.</li> <li>• I don't like it that SE is called rehabilitation, I think it should be an offer to any pupil after school, I don't like that SE appears to be something special, that makes me special.</li> </ul>
Find a job, support at job interviews, support at the work place, see my positive and negative sides	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I like JC's attitudes, to get a good job done.</li> <li>• The Info at the Labour Office was just diffuse nonsense; my first JC was not very eager and not very updated. My second JC took more responsibility; saw both my positive and negative sides.</li> </ul>

(JC=Job coach) (Job seekers' quotes)

**Professional background, skills & characteristics of a JC:** No answers indicated viewpoints on what professional background of a job coach is the best. It is nevertheless easy to see on

the list above what characteristics they prefer: A supporter, one that gives me a push, one that can find a suitable job for me, one who can talk with employers, one that can raise my self-esteem, who creates a safe atmosphere and improves my chances on the labour market.

There were not many suggestions for **improvements**, and those critical aspects given cannot be understood in any general terms, but in relation to each individual situation.

### ***Would they recommend SE to others?***

Comment: In some of the interviews we added to this question: To whom is SEO a good solution?

*Tabell 5 Recommend to others; why? who can benefit from SO? gender*

<b>Recommend to others? Why? Who can benefit from SE?</b>		
Yes, because I benefited very much myself, SE arranges everything, provides easier access to jobs, good to know that the JC is present	1	F
Yes, also others can get help, but they need not necessarily have so many obstacles/handicaps, this I think may a misinformation from the Labour Office?	2	F
Yes, SE helps us to apply for jobs and to get a job, a good thing to get help	3	F
The JCs are kind and helpful	5	F
No I can't see why I should do that, they didn't succeed in finding me a job	6	F
Yes, you get help, and it's appropriate to those with a low self-esteem because SE arranges everything and get you started	8	F
Yes, it's appropriate for those that have had a lot of problems, pains, whom is not believed, foreigners, those that speak bad Norwegian, those that are very modest, weak persons, those that are low, those that need help	9	F
Yes, it's appropriate to everybody that has a problem, both disabled and those in good health	13	F
Yes, SE can provide support and make sure you get a job	17	F
Yes, but although it's nice to participate in the SE organisation, it must improve	4	M
Yes, it obviously helps	7	M
Yes, especially to those that have a problem to find a job by themselves	10	M
Yes, you get guidance and help to search for a job, and you are much better followed up than by the Labour Office	11	M
Yes, to those that want a job	12	M
Yes, and it's especially suitable to pupils from high school that have problems to find or hold on to an apprenticeship	15	M
Yes, but I don't quite know why	16	M

(job seekers' quotes)

## **3.4 Description of current job**

### ***Where do job seekers work and what do they do?***

- Hair dresser – washing hair, clean dust, odd jobs, answer telephone, have the cash
- Office – general office, switchboard, answer questions, some filing

- Shop – assistant, clean baskets, put out bread and cakes, check date on milk, eggs and yoghurt, fill up products, take the garbage, press paper, cleaning, bottle automat
- Shop – assistant, put out bakery and dairy produce, take away old products, maintenance of bottle automat, various tidying like paper
- ? – packing
- Shop – take orders, register orders on computer, some responsibility for sale
- Factory – production work, solder, mounting
- Cantina – arrange meat and cheese, bread, lay table, some food making
- Cantina – arrange warm or cold lunch, shopping, lay table, wash dishes, cleaning. Also doing some work in another part of the work place: Odd job – Filing, some kitchen work, water plants, cook coffee, keep the money account
- Department store - odd job, warehouse
- Warehouse - Put products into shelves, receive customers, deliver products
- Catering - Serve food, do the dishes, fill up products
- Warehouse – had to stop due to allergies
- Shop – assistant, responsible for yoghurt, milk, catch products and fill up freezer
- Factory – odd job
- Factory – production, mounting, welding plastics, odd job

This seems to be the rather traditional jobs that SE provides, the odd jobs, while also some very defines jobs. In all cases, the JC was the most important person to find the job. In 1 case, the job seeker found the job, in another case a family member played the most important role, and in a third case the most important was the employer. JC was involved in all cases. They all speak to colleagues, in brakes. Only in one case does the job seeker meet colleagues outside the work place.

Tabell 6 Size of job; payment; length of job<sup>1</sup>

Size of job, how long	Wage, hours, days
1-10, 5 mth hosp->11 mth permanent	87Nkr/h , 20h/week, 4 days
>100, 3mth hosp->20mth temp. job	Ltr 23 (50%), >21h/week, 4 days
21-50, 3 mth hosp->1 year permanent	45 Nkr/h, 7,5-8h full time, 5 days
11-20, 6 mth hosp->3 mth permanent	109,83 Nkr/h, 9h/week, 3 days
21-50, 1 year, temp. job	13 Nkr/h, 6 h/day, 4 days
1-10, 4 mth hosp	No wage, full time, 3 days
51-100, 7 mth permanent	850 kr/mth, 3,5 h/day, 5 days
1-10, 4 mth hosp-> 1,5 year permanent	96,5 Nkr/h, 6 h/day, 5 days
21-50, 9 mth hosp-> 1 mth permanent	100 Nkr/h, 4 h/day, 5 days
1-10, hosp, full time	5500 Nkr/mth (50%), full time
21-50, 12 mth SE -> permanent	100 Nkr/h, full time, 5 days
1-10, 3 year, permanent	87 Nkr/h, 37 h/week, 6 days
>100, Hosp. 1 year 3 mth	No wage, full time
51-100, 11 mth hosp-> 1 year permanent	45 Nkr, 4 h/day, 5 days
>100, 3 mth hosp-> 1 year hosp	87000 Nkr/year, 7,5 h/day, 5 days (50% wage)
21-50, 6 mth hosp-> 1 year permanent	18000 Nkr/mth, full time, 5 days

10 of the 16 interviewees has a permanent job, most of them work half time. 2 of the jobs are in the public sector. None of these have got a permanent job.

***Does anybody support you at work, and what kind of support? Anything you'd like to change?***

**(see next page)**

---

<sup>1</sup> Comment: Hosp = temporary placement, assessment, unpaid, job seeker paid by LMS

*Tabell 7 Support at work; type of support; anything to change? gender*

No, I'm independent and want to take care of myself. My colleagues can see if I'm getting bad (diabetes) and will tell me to eat	1	F
I was told that the JC had made an agreement with somebody at the staff office, but that has not been necessary. We solve things among ourselves (the colleagues)	2	F
No, nothing	3	F
The boss gives me messages, advise and training on new tasks	5	F
No, nothing	6	F
JC took part in the job interview and followed me up the first days. A colleague did the training. Whish the JC would have supported me more when the boss was unfair to me.	8	F
I get social support from a colleague and the boss; they show that they need me. Did not feel welcome among the rest of the colleagues	9	F
No, but I'm told that it's possible to get a career development talk, but I that has not been necessary. I feel that SE is still there for me although I'm not part of the organisation anymore. JC was more clever than the firm – here they thought I could learn all things in 3 days; the JC got things slowed down.	13	F
I get support from a colleague and the boss, the kind of social and professional help everybody needs now and then	17	F
The employer did the training in this job; JC did the training in an earlier job	4	M
JC took part in the job interview, worked together with me in the beginning, talked with my employer. That's not necessary anymore, no need anymore.	7	M
No	10	M
-	11	M
A colleague and my boss help to adjust my work. I miss more follow up from my JC, especially with physical adjustments, technical things, writing letters, and I wish I had a computer with a correction program	12	M
JC worked with me the first 14 days and had meetings with me and my boss together. My boss finds things to do for me, gives me a lot of help. I always look forward to go to work.	15	M
No	16	M

(JC = job coach) (job seekers' quotes)

***What do/don't you like about the job – are you happy?***

(see next page)

Tabell 8 Dislikes and likes about job; happiness; gender

Don't like	Like/happy?		
The wages	I like to work 5 hours each day, time passes quickly, nice colleagues and customers, meet new people all the time	1	F
Long way to travel, some communication problems, should have learned more computer work	Nice environment, just what I need today, something's happening all the time, contact with people, I walk, sit, stand nothing one-sided, good to finish off at 2 o'clock, no responsibility after work	2	F
Don't like to clean floor and dishes	I like to fill up products, like to make it nice	3	F
I don't like to come to late, don't like to throw away old food, don't like to be told to do other things	I like to do my tasks, work with my boss and my colleagues	5	F
The wages	I like my colleagues and the environment, that they miss me when I'm not there	6	F
The boss didn't treat me well, would have preferred to work with people my own age, more grown ups	Contact with customers, working with people	8	F
Didn't feel welcome among the colleagues in the beginning	I like to do a good job, I love my job	9	F
Nothing	Get along with everybody, like the cooperation, good colleagues, no quarrels, I'm never nervous to go to work	13	F
It doesn't always work well with my boss, it's always me who must adjust, that's no good	I like the sociality, to mix with colleagues, and the challenges in making food	17	F
Feel that I work for free for the employer They're happy with me socially but they claim that I'm not 100% effective. JC says it's not exploitation	-	4	M
Didn't like some of the customers	Good environment, lot's of different things to do, need not do the same all the time	7	M
Boring to clean floors	I like to work with food, no one ever argues with me, I enjoy myself, there are nice people	10	M
-	-	11	M
-	-	12	M
Don't like the odd jobs, gives too low status	I like the social environment and some parts of the work I'm doing	15	M
Don't like to get up early	I like that it's well paid, that it's easy to do the work, and that I need no education	16	M

(job seekers' quotes)

During the group discussion, a main topic was wage and social life. It was a general agreement that to get a job was more important than the wage itself. It's better to have a job, than not having a job. With a job you have something to do; you meet people. One said that it's nice to have a job because you can go home afterwards! 2 participants obviously were very dissatisfied both with the wage and that they didn't get a steady job. One of them (no 4 above) said that he had decided to drop the idea of work, as he would only be exploited. Another one had decided to find a better-paid job.

In general, it is an interesting result that the job seekers/ex job seekers enjoyed to talk & discuss those aspects in a group setting. They had never done that before. It is not common in

SE in Norway to use group-based methods, while it has become increasingly more into use in other parts of the rehabilitation system, with good results.

## 4. Employers' view

### 4.1 Introduction

We interviewed 6 managers and 1 co-worker, in a total of 7 companies where they had employees from AB AB Romerike, the SE organisation.

We did not experience many difficulties. AB Romerike contacted the company first, then the researchers phoned and agreed on a time for the interview. The interview lasted app. 45 minutes, but then we had added some few extra questions for the Norwegian research project. All interviewees were eager to talk, and were very open. One problem was to find the time for the interview. Another problem, once again, was the geography – the long distances to travel to each company.

We found that some of the questions were overlapping, and we were not satisfied with all reformulations in the Norwegian translation. Also, some of the questions did not suit the Norwegian situation. But the general lesson is that the interviews ran quite smoothly.

### 4.2 Sector and organisation

Tabell 9 Sector

Sector	Company number
Public	1
Private	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7

*Describe the principal activities that your organisation engages in.*

*How many employees does your organisation have?*

*How many of your employees have a disability?*

(see next page)

Tabell 10 Activity; number of employees; employees with disability

Company nr	Activities	Employees	Disability
1	Teaching, research	100 (1000)	- Muscles & skeleton
2	Industrial production	50	- Unknown, must have a lot of follow up and adjustments
3	Hair dresser	3	- Diabetes
4	Groceries	24	- Brain damage - Psoriasis
5	Industrial car production	110	- Social problems
6	Furniture sales and warehouse	50	- Mental problems - Mental problems
7	Container transport and forwarding agents	26	- Mental and physical problems

#### 4.3 Process and quality of supported employment

*What qualities are you looking for in the service you receive from AB Romerike?*

**Number below refers to company number:**

1. A professional attitude, insight in the company's needs, openness about the needs of the employee
2. Ability to create a feeling of safety
3. Follow-up
4. Ability to keep up a dialogue with the company
5. Close relationship and empathy
6. Somebody that can follow up the employee and the company
7. Accessibility, information and follow up

*How did you first make contact with AB Romerike?*

Tabell 11 First contact with SE

Company	How they made first contact
3	Responded to their general marketing
6, 4	Responded to their cold call
2	They responded to your advertisement
7	Knew the job coach
1	Through our contact with the Labour Market Service
5	Job coach came to visit the company

***What kind of support did you expect from AB Romerike?***

*Tabell 12 Expected support from SE*

<b>Company</b>	<b>What kind of support they expected</b>
1	Co-operation to manage the necessary labour
2	Labour
3	Somebody that could give us an employee as soon as possible
4	We needed follow up to avoid problems on a longer term
5	Follow up
6	Expected nothing, job coach made a good impression and the job seeker had the qualities we looked for
7	Escape from trouble in the beginning and support and adjustment over a longer time, we also wanted to help

***Describe the support you actually got from AB Romerike.***

***Are your support needs adequately met?***

***How often do you meet job coach?***

*Tabell 13 Actual support; support needs met; meeting frequency*

<b>C.</b>	<b>Actual support</b>	<b>Adequately met?</b>	<b>How often meet</b>
1	Ongoing, active and constructive contact, telephone and meetings.	Yes	Every second month
2	Information. a bit insecure in the beginning, but we didn't need much support, employee easy to deal with.	Yes	Once a week in the beginning, more seldom than once a month now
3	Invited to give them a call in case of any problems, they said that any problem would be dealt with as their problem, not ours.	Yes	Twice a month
4	Good service, follow up, responsibility.	Yes	Tlf every second week
5	We got labour, they would come here within 2 days if we called in case of problems.	Yes	When needed, less seldom than once a week
6	Job coach was here, but we preferred to use a colleague to teach the employee the work, we've had contact on telephone and meetings.	Yes	Every day in the beginning, more seldom than every month now
7	Not much contact, some contact by telephone, can call if problems occur.	Yes	Every day in the beginning, more seldom than every week now

*Tabell 14 Adequacy of contact frequency*

<b>Is this level of contact...</b>	<b>Companies</b>
Too frequent?	
About right?	7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 1
Too infrequent?	2

Comments:

7: Was too often for a while, now the frequency is based on my needs.

- 3: But it was nicer before when the job coach dropped in for a cup of coffee.  
 2: A long time since we've seen the job coach.

***What happens when a problem occurs? Have you ever needed to contact the job coach urgently?***

*Tabell 15 Contacted job coach? what happens?*

	<b>Contacted JC ?</b>	<b>What happens?</b>
1	No	
2	Yes	Employee didn't show up at work, Job coach got things settled.
3	Yes	Employee wanted to work less
4	Yes	Problems with behaviour, self hygiene and clothing - job coach taught us how to make more demands
5	Yes	Employee disappeared 3 times, meeting with job coach who was able to make things clearer/ put more pressure on employee
6	No	But we feel that we have often done the best we can to meet employee's needs
7	Yes	Employee haven't met social signals adequately, caused too much irritation among colleagues – job coach has had meetings with employee, didn't help much

***How did you decide the induction process with the job coach?***

*Tabell 16 Decision of induction*

<b>Company</b>	<b>Decision of induction</b>
1	Arranged through the Labour Market Service, process just like any other.
2	Decided by me and in co-operation with job coach, 1-month trial without pay from us, a 6-month trial period total.
3	1. Job coach promised that we would not get any problems. I was very eager to do this, but I had to convince the top boss, had to fight a little.
4	The top boss and the job coach had a conversation, and we agreed a trial period of 6 months without any pay from the company.
5	Job coach contacted the company, we thought it sounded ok, but we didn't need any employee at that time. Later we did, so we contacted the job coach.
6	Our top boss decided, he is very sympathetic to the idea that pvd shall participate in ordinary working life, we don't need only perfect human beings.
7	Me (boss) and another manager decided together to try supported employment, after information from job coach. This is our second, the first failed. The job coach presented a couple of persons that we didn't want

***Is there a written plan for the development of the work role?***

Company nr. 5: There is a written list of tasks, which is evaluated in the way that co-worker and employee frequently talk about it. This is used as motivation to improve the work, and the aim is a certificate for the job. The list is made by co-worker and employee together.

None of the other interviewees could mention any written plan.

Two of them referred to AB Romerike, arguing that they would have one.

One said that they had a kind of development plan, but not written.

***Are you satisfied that “name of agency” and “name of employment advisor” are suitably qualified and resourced to support employees with a disability in your organisation?***

All 7 companies answered yes to this question.

- Nr. 1 added: Two job coaches have overlapped each other; they both appear to be professional and quick.
- Nr. 6 added: The job coach is competent, but not with the tasks (production) in the company.

***What skills and characteristics are essential for a job coach?***

- Flexibility and professionalism.
- A particular view upon human beings and integration, but realistic.
- Communicative skills
- Ability to understand the employer’s situation.
- Service minded
- Able to create safety
- Not offer a pwd, but an employee.
- Insight into employee’s problems
- Calm
- Teach the employee the work by being present in the company in the beginning
- Experience from working life, more than any academic education
- Experience from working with the particular target group.
- Show human consideration, empathy
- Explain companies not to exploit the possibility to get free or cheap labour.

***Do you think that your partnership with AB Romerike is successful?***

All companies answered yes to this question.

- Nr. 1 added (quote): We have had frequent contact, they showed responsibility and they cared, they had understanding for our needs, and they also made demands on us.
- Nr. 3 added (quote): It’s easy because we are a small company, we’re easy to handle, and things are being dealt with at once.

***What could AB Romerike do to improve their service?***

The most frequent answer was that they had only positive experiences, and had nothing to add. When pressed a little bit, the following points came up (employers' quotes):

- Make themselves more visible to the whole working life, show who they are
- Make more adjustments
- Find the right job to the right person
- The "free time" (without pay that we had (1 month) is perhaps too short, 6 months is better, then both employer and employee can feel more safe.
- They forget sometimes that we (the company) have to be professional; they are a bit naïve.
- Should not be too soft on the edges; speak more clearly to us.
- Feel that I don't know supported employment too well; the job coach could have told me more; - are they never having failures?
- Keep up the punctuality and the responsible attitude

***Would you recommend AB Romerike to other employers? Please let us know the reasons for your answer.***

All companies answered yes to this question.

Reasons given (employers' quotes):

- AB Romerike makes it clear that pwd can work and be useful (in an economic sense)
- Such organisations should have much more support; they (the organisation) cost us nothing, not even time, and we profit from them by getting labour and support
- If I knew they had suitable work to be done, what they can do is limited, the tasks must be easy, I know it creates stress because you have to plan extra every day when the employee is a pwd.
- Have already recommended them to another part of our company concern
- Have already recommended them to two other companies, a very positive way of doing things
- I would if they have a person in the company who can follow up the employee, we have spent a lot of time ourselves to make it work
- A quick way to get labour, we like it that they take the responsibility and the follow up, also good that there is a trial period of 3 months
- Because of the follow up, there are a lot of pwd with recourses.

***Have you worked or are you working with any other organisation supporting employees with a disability?***

Tabell 17 Cooperation with other support organisations? how do they compare?

C	Other agency	How do they compare?
1	AMB (Sheltered Workshop)	SE better because they follow the person up in the working life
2	No	-
3	No	-
4	Social Security Service	They are only concerned about offering companies financial support, no follow-up, and difficult to get information
5	Apprentice through Special School	4 weeks only, can't be compared
6	Another Supported Employment Organisation	They disappeared when we couldn't find suitable work tasks here
7	No	-

#### 4.5 Description of the current job

##### *Why did you employ this person in your organisation?*

Tabell 18 Why was job seeker from SE employed?

Company	Why was this person employed?
1	Needed labour
2	Needed labour, and thought the SE organisation was a positive initiative, we wanted to participate in integrating pwd into work
3	Needed labour, and because it was free in the beginning
4	Needed another person in the shop, one that can be present, one that customers may ask questions
5	Needed labour
6	Had the right qualities
7	Needed labour

##### *Did you interview "name of supported employee"*

6 companies answered yes.

- 1 of them said they had a conversation with the job seeker and the job coach before the interview.
- 1 of them said it was "a sort of job interview", more like a career development talk.

1 company didn't know, since the interviewee was not with the company when the employee got the job.

##### *Does "supported employee" have a written contract of employment?*

All 7 companies answered yes

- 1 company added that the contract stated time limitation

- 1 company added that since the contract is written also with the SE Organisation, it differs from the standard contract

***Is “supported employee” paid?***

***If yes, how much?***

***Is this a standard pay rate for your organisation or has it been agreed for this individual only?***

***If no, why not?***

All but one companies said the employee is paid; 4 of them with standard pay rate. We did not ask how much the employee is paid in actual money – we know that standard payment is standard money per hour and the interviewee would not know the actual sums. We also know that individual payment is “pocket money”.

We also checked if there is a written contract between the company and the employee. All companies have a written contract with the employee.

We also checked if employee has or will get a permanent job in the company:

*Tabell 19 Paid employee? type of payment? contract and future possibilities?*

	<b>Paid ?</b>	<b>Standard or individual ?</b>	<b>Permanent or time limited contract? What possibilities in the future re permanent contract?</b>
1	yes	standard	1 has a time limited contract and will not be offered a permanent job due to budget limitations in the public sector
2	yes	standard	We agreed to give the employee standard pay rate, but the employee lost money that way because he lost the social benefits money. Employee has a contract with a permanent job
3	yes	individual	have a contract with a permanent job
4	yes	individual	have a contract with a permanent job
5	no		Employee was paid earlier, but lost it because he broke contract. Will be paid again (individually) in the future because the job done is important for the company. Employee has a time limited contract, not a permanent job, and it is not likely that the employee will be offered a contract with permanent job because the company is not satisfied with the employee
6	yes	standard	Employee has a contract with a permanent job
7	yes	standard	Employee has a time limited contract and it is quite uncertain if the employee will be offered a permanent job contract because the company feels it is too much trouble. Officially they say that they are reorganising the company and there will be no place/tasks for the employee

(extracts from employers quotes)

***Are you satisfied that “name of employee’s” support needs are being adequately met by “name of agency”***

***Are you satisfied that “name of employee’s” support needs are being adequately met by your company? – What kind of support do you offer? – Any problems for the company?***

*Tabell 20 Employee’s support needs adequately met? type of support? problems?*

<b>Company</b>	<b>Employee’s support needs met by AB Romerike?</b>	<b>Employee’s support needs met by company? Kind of support? Any problems?</b>
1	Yes, but perhaps they’re doing her a disservice since she won’t get a permanent job here. She could have done quite well also without SE	Yes. We’ve done a lot of adjustments, and we offer the employee change of tasks/rotation when needed. No problems.
2	Yes, but I don’t know if employee still have contact with the job coach.	Yes. The employee doesn’t need much extra support. But we need to make extra planning every day, and that can be stressing to us in busy times. Problems: The interviewee is disappointed about the other colleagues; he feels that he alone must take care of the employee.
3	Yes, the employee seems to be satisfied	Yes. We have contributed to raise her self-esteem, and improved her appearance. There’s a big difference between now and earlier: Hair, teeth, clothes, economy. Problems: It is important to be present with employee during the day.
4	Yes	Yes. Some few problems in the beginning before we adapted to each other’s behaviour and the cooperation was settled.
5	Yes	Yes. Planning the work so that employee appears to be satisfied, working day lasts from 7 to 3 with steady work tasks now. Problems: Needs extra support, but there are other employees that have even more support need!
6	Yes, after a while, there were some few problems between the job coach and the employee	Yes. Take care of the employee, needs extra protection on certain areas. No problems, gives me experience and joy.
7	Don’t know, haven’t really found the balance between being kind and being strict. We’ve told the job coach about our problems, but nothing really happens.	No. Problems: We lack a person who can follow employee up, problems with swinging moods, we get tired and we don’t have the time to talk as much as the employee wants to. Doesn’t understand jokes, a lot of wrong ideas

(extracts from employer quotes)

***Does “name of employee” take part in company training?***

**Number below refers to company number:**

1 – Both yes and no. Employee has been given the same offers as everybody else; she could obviously have benefited by participating!

2 – Yes, same offer as everybody else, has participated in health, environmental and safety courses.

3 – Yes, employee participates in courses relevant to her tasks, where she can improve.

4 – Yes, to a certain degree, meetings, change processes, information. Participates when needed, like everybody else, nobody participates in everything.

5 – Yes, did that earlier, but not now. But it's not a big deal, is not discriminated.

6 – Yes, like everybody else.

7 – we don't have anything suitable; all our internal company training requires professional knowledge

***Does “name of employee” have access to other company perks? (eg staff discounts, corporate clothing etc)***

***Is “name of employee” included in social activities organised through work?***

All companies give company perks also to the SE employee. In one company they do not offer employee reduction on the car's they produce.

All companies report that employee is offered to participate in the same social activities as the others:

- Christmas parties
- Seminars
- Summer parties
- Barbeques
- Private parties

Two companies report that employee, although invited, does not always want to join in, that he/she is very reserved.

(see next page)

Tabell 21 Positive/negative experiences

C	Positive	Negative
1	Employee is just as useful as anybody else	No negative experiences
2	I was very happy that the employee was happy to get the job. Employee works as everybody else	All the planning and adjustments, must find suitable tasks all the time
3	Worked out as we had hoped, our customers like the employee, she's become a part of our shop	Sudden problems, must plan to avoid stress, need follow-up. Wish that employee would want to work more hours, we may need to employ another one instead, one that can work more hours
4	Everybody feels it has been ok, employee is very correct. Ok with routine tasks, 100% loyal, can be trusted	Employee a bit too reserved, not enough outspoken, hard to communicate, we can't smile together, he doesn't make initiative. 2 colleagues follow him up, and 1 must always be present, not flexible as others may be, cannot be used for other tasks
5	The employee is recourse, does a good job which somebody else would have had to do.	Demands a lot of time, care taking, planning, lacks initiative. Must often defend the employer vis-à-vis other employees – it's not always easy to get the right understanding
6	Positive aspect is to see the development of this young person. Much less work and trouble than I had anticipated. This employee has given me a lot of joy.	There are no negative experiences with this employee. We had two other pwd's earlier, and they had no qualifications that suited us. One of them was nearly blind and had much mental problems. The other was not able to come to the job because of mental problems. But we know that from other employees as well!
7	We have learned to be more patient, more kind, more tolerant, not so demanding. Employee gives a lot of joy, smiles a lot, and always showing up at the work. Employee has had a great development, appears to have become more secure about himself	More difficult aspects than positive. Having him here has taken far too much of my time – I was not prepared for that. Too much swinging in moods, wrong ideas, colleagues get irritated; we don't have the time to talk as much as the employee wants

(Extracts from employers' quotes)

## 4.5 General Employer Awareness

*Prior to the recruitment of "name of employee" how would you describe your awareness of 'disability' and 'equal opportunities' issues?*

(see next page)

Tabell 22 Awareness of disability and equal opportunities issues?

C	Awareness
1	Have worked at Labour Market Service with pwd, so I had some knowledge which affected my awareness
2	My son is a support contact for pwd, I found that very positive and I learned from that. I realised that a lot of pwd have skills that are not used
3	I was sceptical; I thought people had to be healthy to be able to work. I know better now, I may turn to the SE organisation again next time I need an employee
4	I had no knowledge, but I thought – why no? I was irritated that society to such a small extent allows pwd to participate.
5	I was never fond of laziness. But I realised that everybody is not alike, some are strong and some are weak, various qualities – that was my own experience and knowledge
6	I had no knowledge about pwd, but I had a special interest. I'm very fond of the administrative aspects of my own work, the dealing with the employees.
7	Nothing in particular

(Extracts from employers' quotes)

Tabell 23 Awareness of the potential of people with a disability through...

C	Family	Personal friends	Previous work/school experience	Did this influence on decision?
1	no	No	Yes	Yes
2	yes	yes	no	Yes
3	no	No	yes	No
4	no	no	no	-
5	no	yes	yes	Don't know
6	no	no	no	-
7	no	no	Yes	no

Comment: We added school/education to the latter value-category. We also asked if they thought this previous awareness influenced on the decision to engage a pwd employee in this company

***Please describe your legal obligations with regard to the recruitment and employment of people with a disability.***

Tabell 24 Legal obligations; problems?

	Legal obligations/problems
1	No, but could have been if pwd supersede other employers
2	Not the company, but the employee, we paid too much so he lost his social benefit
3	Don't know
4	No, but we were worried about that in the beginning
5	Yes, insurance, everybody is covered by the same rules
6	Nothing apart from standard Norwegian law/labour act that I know of, and law concerning employer's responsibility for access
7	Yes, cannot have employees too long without offering them permanent job

Comment: We had some problems with this question, and added the word "legal".

***Please describe the additional supports and resources supplied to employers for the employment of people with a disability by your government and their agencies.***

4 companies answered that they didn't know of any, while 3 mentioned the following:

- Remedy support
- Conversation support
- Various offers from the Labour Market Service
- Various offers from the Social Security Service
- Wage support

***Describe the impact, if any, benefit payments to people with a disability have on your ability to employ people with a disability.***

We knew we wouldn't get much information on this question, so we reformulated it: Does financial support to pwd have an impact on your possibilities to engage pwd employers? Reason for this is that this is a much more acknowledged issue in the public debate in Norway. But as we have seen, one company (nr. 2) became aware of pwd employers' benefit trap through their own experience when they paid the employee too much.

3 companies answer that financial support is not important for their possibilities to engage pwd as employee. One of these 3 companies is very clear that what they wanted was labour – they did not need financial support but help to adjustment. The other two companies claim that a trial period is necessary. One of these two claims that 1 month trial period is enough.

4 companies admit that financial support is relevant, but again this is by everyone connected to the trial period. The first trial period is important because they get to know each other, establish trust, see how they function, and reduce risks. Two of the four companies say that the trial period is not absolutely vital; and one of them is afraid that too much or too long trial period may mean that pwd becomes cheap labour.

***Describe the impact on your staff, and their responses to the recruitment of a person with a disability.***

(see next page)

Tabell 25 Impact on staff and staff's response

C	Impact on staff and staff's response
1	Everybody was very satisfied because she worked well. We never talked about her as pwd, and we never mentioned the organisation she came from (AB Romerike) – that was up to her to talk about. Perhaps we should have been more open, but there is a balance
2	Never heard anything negative; the employee is very social and everybody likes him
3	Some scepticism, but it worked out all fine. The top bosses were the most sceptical.
4	We've had only positive reactions
5	The other employees don't have to do the tasks that this pwd employee now does, and he likes doing them. What's negative is that they feel that the company is too flexible towards him, and that he gets away with too much shirking
6	That has been very easy. Even if everybody had to take considerations, everybody had the attitude that this should work out all right
7	They were positive, but they also adopted an awaiting attitude, due to earlier experiences. Nobody was negative. Over time there has been a lot of irritation, even shouting.

(Extracts from employers, quotes)

***Which, if any, of the following factors motivated you to recruit a disabled person?***

Tabell 26 Motivation factors

	Company
Public relations	4, 5
Corporate image	4, 5
Financial reasons	6, 5, 3
Get a job done	7, 2, 4, 1, 6, 5, 3
Help people into the working life	7

Comment: We left out the category value "Compliance with equal opportunities legislation" since it is not well suited to the Norwegian situation. We kept the rest of the categories, but the question was asked as an open question, stating that they could chose several alternatives or add alternatives.

***Are you able to recruit employees with a disability because your organisation has tasks and job descriptions that match the abilities of disabled people, or would the right disabled person, given appropriate support, be able to take on any role in your organisation?***

Comment to the question: This question was so difficult that we had to reformulate it. But the Norwegian question was also not very good: "Can pwd take on any task in the company, given that this pwd has the right qualifications – or is the company nevertheless dependent on support from the outside?"

Message from the companies is: Any person with the right qualifications for any given job can do the job. Nobody can take on any role in any organisation without the right qualifications. Adjustments is always necessary, they like the job coach. For certain kinds of disabilities it's good to have a job coach available, for other disabilities it may not be necessary. The biggest challenge is to handle stress – tasks must be done in a hurry.

## 5. Policy makers' and funding bodies' views

### 5.1 Introduction

The intention was to interview six people, but one did not show up. So we ended up interviewing five persons from three organisations (see table 1). Because of problems in finding suitable time to interview all six, we arranged the interviews so that we interviewed some of them together. This came natural at two organisations where we interviewed two persons one place, and three persons the other place. We did not find it difficult to interview two and three people at the time. In both interviews they seem to complement one another. It did not appear as if anybody “held back” information because of the other’s presence; it seemed more like they were encouraged by each other to give answers of the questions. We have interviewed (see table 27 below):

- One person representing the national Labour Market policy level (Directorate of Labour, funding body)
- One person representing the regional Labour Market level
- Three persons representing the local District Labour Market level

In one interview, one of the interviewees had direct contact with the SE initiative and the other had not. In this case only the one in direct contact answered the questions in part II and the questions marked \* in part III. The other three interviewees co-operated directly with the SE-initiative (AB Romerike) and were therefore asked all the questions in the questionnaire. One of the four in direct co-operation with AB Romerike reported to co-operate with eight other SE initiatives. The other three co-operates with one other initiatives in addition to AB Romerike. During the interviews, the respondents talked only about this particular SE-initiative.

Tabell 27 Interviewees policy makers and funding bodies

	<b>Directorate of labour (Aetat arbeidsdirektorat)</b>	<b>Regional/County labour market service (Aetat fylkesarbeidskontor)</b>	<b>Local labour market service (Aetat lokalt - Lillestrøm)</b>
<b>National</b>	Deputy director of Aetat (1)		
<b>Regional</b>		Senior principal (1)	
<b>Local</b>			Division superior (1) Manager of division for support of unemployed (1) Rehabilitation adviser (1)

### 5.2 Quality of the co-operation with AB Romerike

As mentioned above four out of five of the interviewed persons co-operated directly with AB Romerike. Answers given in this chapter comes only from these four persons, representing the regional and the local level. At the regional level the co-operation is reported to be mostly on a superior level (e.g. in difficult problem solving and when new job coach positions are made). At the local level the co-operation often concern the job seekers directly (e.g. deciding

who is getting into the SE-initiative, discussing what could be best for the job seeker and receiving reports on each job seeker participating in the SE-initiative).

#### Evaluation of the co-operation with AB Romerike

All persons (four out of four) that were asked the questions in this section answered that they regarded the co-operation with AB Romerike as “good”. Three of these regarded it as “very good” and reported that there had been a process going on for making the co-operation this good. Reasons given for this very good co-operation was that they had been able to get to know each other better and having had the opportunity of seeing and talking more directly to each other. The most important reasons, is that they have a good dialog with the SE-initiative and that they solve problems and misunderstandings when they occur. They also mentioned that they get regular information from AB Romerike on each job seeker and what they are doing.

#### Improvements of the co-operation

On the question on how the co-operation could be improved, different answers came up. Three said that the co-operation is as good as it can get; they are very satisfied with the co-operation as it is now. One reported that the co-operation between AB Romerike and the local labour marked service could get better implemented, by getting the co-operation more into system.

### **5.3 Quality of SE service and process**

This section reflects all five interviewed persons’ views, when not stated otherwise.

#### General aims of Supported Employment

All interviewees claimed to know the aims of SE. In summary, they mentioned that the most important aims are to help job seekers in a proper way to get and keep ordinary jobs with a salary. How much job and how much salary each job seeker should get, should be based on individual goals and cannot be stated in general terms. The aims are therefore not always to get a 100% job. The result is often that job seekers get a part time job, combining salary and disablement insurance.

#### Knowledge of the SE service’s process in detail

All interviewees say they know of the SE process in detail. A resume of what they know of the process:

- Build up trust and confidence between job seeker and job coach.
- Find out what the job seeker wants and what’s realistic.
- Find the right job for the job seeker.
- Search the labour marked and take contact with new employers.

- When in contact with employer: Inform about the job seeker, follow up the job seeker at work, and be available for both job seeker and employer.
- Job seeker can be in the initiative for 3 years.

The most important aspects, which came up, were:

- That the job seeker gets the ability to say what is important for him/her.
- Get to know the job seeker by meeting him/her in their private sphere (get to know the job seeker as the person he/she is).
- Important to work with the employers and find suitable work places according to the different abilities and needs of the job seekers.
- The geographic dimension: In some places there are many possible employers (e.g. in cities or big places) and you might not have to work so hard on the part of getting a suitable job. In other places, with fewer employers, it might be necessary to work harder to get possible jobs.

Essential skills and characteristics of a job coach

All five of the interviewees pointed out that it's difficult to give a characteristic of a good job coach, because the composition of the *job coach team* is so important. It is very important that the team in its entirety is constituted of various skills. But when this is said they all pointed out that communication and social skills seems to be the most important skills/characteristics of a job coach.

List of what they reeled off as important skills/characteristics:

- Empathy
- Psychological insight
- Working experience
- Experience of working with disabled persons
- Practical inclined
- Social skills (e.g. able to communicate and co-operate with others)
- Concerned about job seekers' resources more than problems
- Be able to work with many things at the same time
- Have the ability to find peoples' potentials, what they are good at

Strengths and weaknesses of SE in general

Many of the interviewees reported the same strengths and weaknesses (listed in table 2).

One of the interviewees stated that all of the labour market initiatives have strengths and weaknesses of their own. People in different initiatives need different things, and that's why there are different initiatives. It is therefore not easy to speak in general about what is a strength/weakness in one initiative compared to another.

Tabell 28 Strengths and weaknesses of SE in general

Strengths	Weaknesses
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possibility of integrating people into ordinary work (2).</li> <li>• Can give good follow-up to both job seeker and workplace, both practical and social support (3).</li> <li>• Flexibility in the support from job coach (ad-hoc help when and where it is needed) (2).</li> <li>• Job coaches are very available, easy to get at (5).</li> <li>• Are able to work with few job seekers (3).</li> <li>• Can be out working directly on the job seekers' working places (3)</li> <li>• Good knowledge of the labour markets demands (3)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vulnerability when the job coach teams are small (2).</li> <li>• Job seeker can get very connected/dependent of the job coach because of the close co-operation/relationship (2).</li> <li>• Sometimes when the job seeker is on his/her own (after the 3 years period in the initiative), they can't manage to keep the job they've got. Because they can't do without the SE - support (3).</li> <li>• Vulnerability when the job coaches quit their jobs (2).</li> <li>• In some cases the integration in ordinary workplaces leads to the role of a mascot for the job seeker and not to the integration of him/her (3)</li> </ul>

Coment: Numbers refer to how many interviews gave this answer

#### 5.4 What is successful SE?

What seems to be the most important indication of successful SE, and mentioned of all the interviewees, is to reach the main goal of *getting people into ordinary jobs*. It doesn't seem to be important that the job seeker gets a 100% job; it can indicate just as much success with a part time job.

It's also stated that success is reached when the job seekers get as *common working conditions* as possible.

Even though the main indicator of success is to get people into ordinary jobs, several of the interviewees stressed that initiatives can have done a good job even if a job seeker don't get a job. The explanation given to this is the importance of reaching a *clarification of the job seeker's working abilities*. Not everybody is able to work, and this is important to find out of. If the clarification of the job seeker shows that the person isn't able to work, the initiative can assist him/her in applying for disablement insurance instead.

Another indication mentioned of success is that the job coaches have a faith in succeeding with the work they do.

#### 5.5 How could SE in general be improved?

- Offer SE also to people with less disability than today, e.g. long-term unemployed people and people of foreign languages.

- SE could offer a more differentiated support to e.g. people with psychiatric disabilities. Give them abilities to start working maybe one day a week over a long period, and then increase it to several days when they feel more familiar and secure with the work.
- A more formal co-operation with others in the rehabilitation system (e.g. the local offices of social affairs, the local health care system)
- More information about SE to possible employers in the society. This may encourage some of them to try out the initiative.
- Increase and/or maintain the job coaches qualifications (the job coaches ask/wish for more qualifications on marketing)

## 5.6 Evaluating the SE-initiative

This section is based on answers from interviewees that reported a direct co-operation with AB Romerike (four persons).

All of the four interviewees evaluated the work done by AB Romerike as good. Here is a list of what three of the interviewees were satisfied about (and also expected from) AB Romerike:

- Fulfil the aim of 6 job seekers per job coach
- Thoroughly clarification of the job seekers
- Most of the job seekers get a paid job
- Co-operation with the organisation about the job seekers
- That there are acceptance for the fact that it is Aetat (funding body) who arrange/control the SE initiative

All interviewees say they don't have any suggestions for improvement of AB Romerike. They claim that the SE-initiative seems to have plans and long-term strategies on how to improve, and that they do the best they can.

One of the interviewees said that since there has been no complaints from the job seekers (this person has a lot to do with all the job seekers attending to AB Romerike), "that should speak for it self".

## 5.7 Evaluation methods and quality indicators

Evaluation

Evaluation of the SE initiative is mostly done through written reports and meetings. In addition, the informal contact by telephone (according to direct co-operation concerning job seekers) is also used as foundation for evaluating the initiative.

The more practical evaluation is done at the local level (local labour market service and mother organisation), while the more superior evaluation is done at the regional and national level (Directorate of labour and the county labour market office).

□ Superior level:

At the superior level the evaluation is done by national surveys, by following up the initiatives budgets and by reading the yearly reports they receive from each SE initiative. ‘

□ Local level:

There are written reports from the SE-initiatives every month (reporting new job seekers attending to the initiative and which job seekers going out of the initiative and to what). They also demand half-yearly reports and yearly reports from the initiatives. The mother organisation, local & regional level authorities and the national funding body receive these reports, and base the evaluation of the SE-initiative on these. The funding body (local level) have formal meetings with the initiative twice a year in addition to the on-going evaluation in the practical work and co-operation directly concerning job seekers.

Regarding the evaluation systems and opportunities to evaluate the process directly, the interviewees seem to a great extent to agree in the answers they give. In summary they stated that it is possible to evaluate the process in its entirety quite well. But when it comes to evaluating *the different stages in the process*, they seem more insecure if the present system gives opportunities for that. They mention that with a more direct use of an available specification document (Kravspesifikasjon), they might be able to evaluate the process more in detail. One of the interviewees mean that the reports given half-yearly and yearly are quite specific in evaluating the different stages.

The degree of financing does not depend on the result of the evaluation.

Quality indicators

All of the interviewees point out that there are both qualitative and quantitative indicators of the quality of SE-initiatives. And they all claim that the most important indicators are, and should be qualitative, not quantitative.

When asked why, they insist that you can't use only quantitative measures when working with disabled persons. One interviewee claim that it has been shown that job seekers that succeed in getting and keeping a job, often has participated in the SE-initiative for a long period. In table 3 indicators reported by the interviewees are listed.

Tabell 29 Quality indicators

Qualitative	Quantitative
The initiative is available/easy of access for all the people they co-operate with	See if job seekers get and keep jobs.
Good job matches (find right jobs to the right persons)	See if job seekers try few or many jobs before they get and keep a steady job
Good co-operation and communication between all the involved people in the SE initiative	Look at the stability of the job coaches (high/low fluctuation of staff)

Another interesting finding in these interviews is that all the interviewees mentioned that it could be very informative to find out what the job seekers and the employers meant about the quality of SE. When finding out what job seekers and employers are satisfied or dissatisfied about; may give some suggestions for useful changes. This could be of great help in pointing out suitable quality indicators for the SE initiatives.

Further, the following remarks were briefly mentioned during the interview, without anybody really taking a stand:

- Each SE initiative should not be larger than consisting of 8 job coaches.
- Questions are asked if the SE-initiatives should be attached directly to the local labour market service. The labour market service is in charge of the SE-initiatives and there are questions asked as to why they have to buy a place for the initiative at the labour market enterprises.

## 5.8 Financing of SE

Financial sources and conditions of the financial supporting

In Norway the SE service is totally financed by the public financial system. This is a system where a permanent amount is given for each job coach position. The support is a monthly amount per job coach position, and it is given 6 months in advance. In addition to this it is also given an amount for each new established job coach positions, as a “starting help”. This “starting help” when new job coach positions are established, is 1 months extra support. The only condition of the financial support is that the Department of labour have approved the job coach positions. This is being done every year with new established job coach positions.

Time limit

The only time limit in connection of the finances of the SE service is the limit connected to the fact that a job seeker only can stay in the program for 3 years.

### Opportunities for further development within the present funding system

Two of the interviewees said that it is important with a funding system that is simple and fair to deal with. It is up to each local level to decide how to use their job coaches for the best of the job seekers' interests. In that there may be opportunities for further development, and one of the interviewees said that "it's only the creativity that might stop the development of the initiatives".

It was also mentioned in the interviews that there are two projects going on now, which can be seen as a development of SE within the present funding system ("Nystart I arbeidslivet" and "Mary"). The projects are heading for the same target group as in the more traditional SE (people with working disabilities), but what is new in these two projects is the direct and specific heading for "people in prison" and "methadone assisted rehabilitation to people with drug addiction".

### Alternative future developments in the funding of SE

One interviewee pointed out what he called a "utopian" for an alternative possible development of the SE, which is to engage job coaches in the local labour market service to work with job seekers that don't need so much support that is given today in the SE. E.g. give SE to people who have been long-term unemployed or to people who got difficulties getting a job because they are people of foreign languages. This kind of alternative development or expansion of SE was also proposed by three other interviewees. But they did stress that it was only desirable if they got many more job coach positions, and their intention was not to build down the SE support as it works today.

Another way of funding SE could be to give financial support based on how many job seekers there are in the system at each time. But the interviewees said this would probably not be a good way of doing it because of the risk of a negative "quick flow" through the system, and it would also be more complicated to deal with the administration of the financial system.

## 6 Preliminary conclusions

### 6.1 Introduction

On May 8<sup>th</sup> the Norwegian team had a workshop based on our national reports in the Quip project.<sup>2</sup>

Session 1: Brainstorming on what results we have in the Quip project. We phrased the question: What do we know so far? And: What do we not know enough about? We made a rule that we would only consider what we know from the Quip reports, meaning that all

---

<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately our practical partner (AB Romerike) could not attend the meeting due to internal problems in their organisation.

suggestions had to be linked to something written in the reports. After the brainstorming, we worked to group or categorise the suggestions in order to see which suggestions were connected. This was a difficult one, since it appears that all suggestions in one way or another were connected. Anyway, we tried. The result is presented below.

Session 2: Working with the quality indicators and criteria. We started with a general discussion on what could possibly be understood by these terms. It turned out that everybody had tried to use the table for the preparations, but none of us could figure out very clearly how to understand it. We agreed to understand “quality indicator” very much as a terms for theme, while “criteria” then would be a specification on that particular theme. Then we split the group and worked together in pairs before we presented the results in the group. It turned out that each pair had ended up with a high degree of overlapping indicators/criteria. The result is presented below.

In general, our biggest problem was to leave out our general knowledge (even prejudices) on SE, and to stick to the actual data from this particular supported employment initiative (AB Romerike).

It must be added that at the time of the workshop we had not yet started the interviews on policy makers and funding bodies. However, policy makers’ views can to a certain degree be seen in public reports, rules & regulations & guidelines. For the quality criteria, we have used these sources for the policy makers files.

## 6.2 Preliminary results

The following is a summary of a brainstorming on the QUIP project among the participants of the workshop.

We know that it is:

- Difficult to find job match
- Difficult to find interested employers

We know more about:

- Why employers are satisfied with SE
- Problems employers some times experience with JS<sup>3</sup>
- What employers want from SE

We know that:

- Permanent jobs for JS as a long time result of participating in SE is unclear
- The question of what is a job, a real job, is unclear in SE

---

<sup>3</sup> JS = job seeker

In connection to this, we know more about:

- Quality indicators/criteria in possible job matches as seen from JS's point of view

We know that:

- JS wants jobs
- Employers want to get a job done
- Factors such as safety, trust, to be taken seriously are more important to JS than simply doing a job
- JS wants status

In connection to this, we know more about:

- Why JS want a job
- What kind of job JS wants
- What JS like and dislikes about SE
- What JS wants to achieve in SE
- Good access of JS to SE

We know:

- Who JCs are, the JC background
- JC like their jobs, but there is apparently a high turnover
- JC works too little with JS's professional network
- JC does everything, JC is an all rounder
- JC appears to be a guaranty for solving problems

In connection to this, we also know more about:

- Why JC are JC
- Forms of natural support
- The problematic aspect concerning methods in SE and the JC - JS relationship
- Lack of professional parallel treatment/follow up with SE

We know more about

- The important skills/competence of a JC
- Why JCs feel a lack of professional and economic autonomy in SE
- What is a good organisation of SE
- Problems with lack of reality orientation among JS
- The paradox between lack of user involvement and high degree of users satisfaction
- Problematic aspects concerning user involvement in SE, seen in action plans, definitions and making

We know that

- JSs is a very heterogeneous group
- A change in target group has taken place in SE, more mental illness, less PWLD
- There is a change in the support needs; JS seem to need too little help

- SE has become more “clarification” for the LMS, this is not as stated in SE goals/guidelines

We know:

- SE is seen in – and as a - contrast to LMS
- There is a close relationship between JC og JS
- There is a paradox between a) lack of user involvement in SE and b) a high degree of users satisfaction in SE
- What kind of support JS gets
- JS is very satisfied with SE
- Forms of natural support
- JC like their jobs

We notice that:

- SE is concerned about human recourses, not problem oriented
- SE has become more preoccupied with life quality than getting jobs
- JS wants safety, trust, to been taken seriously – and that this apparently is more important than doing a job
- JS wants status
- There are problematic aspect concerning methods in SE and the JC-JS relationship

We know that:

- The internal life of the SE organisation is time consuming
- JC needs more time to spend outside office

We know:

- What JS likes and dislikes about jobs
- That wage to JS is unclear in SE
- What employers wants from SE
- There are serious benefit trap problems in SE
- Quality criteria's of a JC
- There is a difference between JS own perception of VD than official diagnosis and also JCs perception

What we still don't know enough about:

- How does JS come in to contact with/get aware of SE?
- Informal recruitment possibilities to SE?
- Why JS wants a job?

- What happens with JS after leaving SE?
- What criteria does LMS use when they recommend SE to JS?
- Why did PWLD disappear from SE? Is it really so, or is it just that new target groups have been added?
- Why are there so few persons with physical disabilities in SE?
- How to plan for career development for JS?
- Wage and steady/permanent jobs in SE?
- Adequate organisation of SE, or alternatives?
- How to improve SE?
- Why is there a high turnover in SE?

### 6.3 Quality indicators and quality criteria

Tabell 30 Quality indicators and quality criteria for jobs provided by SE

Quality indicators	Quality Criteria	Job Coach	Job Seeker	Employer	Policy Maker
<b>Job – wage</b>	Wage	X	X	X	X
	Same wage level as others		X		
	Paid for every hour worked		x		
<b>Job - type</b>	Permanent/steady	X	X		x
	Ordinary/open	x	x	x	x
	Individ. development	X			
<b>Job – work tasks</b>	Get tasks done		X	x	
	Get feedback		X		
	Clear/obvious tasks		X		
	Control over tasks		X		
	Visible job results		x		
<b>Job – sociality</b>	A place to go		X		
	Meet people		X		
	Something to do		X		
	Do things with others		X		
	Nice atmosphere		X		
	Fun, enjoyment		X		
<b>Job - match</b>	Interested employers	X			X
	Inclusion	X	X		
	Trust and safety	X	X		
	Relationships	X	X		
	Motivated for ordinary work		X	X	
	Status		X		
	JS satisfaction	x			
	Trial period/work practice			x	

Tabell 31 Quality indicators and quality criteria for methods in SE

Quality indicators	Quality Criteria	Job Coach	Job Seeker	Employer	Policy Maker
<b>Method - support</b>	Avoid problems			X	
	Get tasks done		x	X	
	Follow up		x	X	
	Find job	x	X		x
	Apply for job	x	X		
	Training in job	x	x	X	
	Job interview		x		
	Many-sided help/support		X		
	Guidance	X			
	JC as guarantor for good work	X			
<b>Method - user involvement</b>	Be heard		X		
	Be seen		X		
	Be made responsible				X

Tabell 32 Quality indicators and quality criteria job coaches in SE

Quality indicators	Quality Criteria	Job Coach	Job Seeker	Employer	Policy Maker
<b>Job coach - skills</b>	Empathy	x	x	X	
	Trust	x	X		
	Patience	x	x		
	Understanding	x	X		
	Safety	x	x	X	
	Follow up		x	X	
	Work experience	X		X	
	Self-reflection	X		X	
	Knowledge	X		X	
	Professionalism	X		X	X
Co operational ability	X		X		
<b>Job coach - work situation</b>	Minimum time spent on internal meetings	X			
	Spend time on SE process at the work places	X	X		
	Functional organisation	X			
	Professional/financial autonomy	X			
	Professional development	X			
	Good wages	X			
	Accessibility		X	X	

Tabell 33 Quality indicators and quality criteria for professional network of SE

Quality indicators	Quality Criteria	Job Coach	Job Seeker	Employer	Policy Maker
<b>Professional network</b>	Relevant expertise	X			
	Other agencies	X			X
	Relevant family	X			
	Arenas for meeting	X			

Tabell 34 Quality indicators and quality criteria for target group of SE

Quality indicators	Quality Criteria	Job Coach	Job Seeker	Employer	Policy Maker
<b>Target group</b>	Job seekers who are "reality oriented"	X			
	Job seekers who are motivated	X			
	Job seekers who are "ready"	X			

## 7. Conclusion: "Bringing stakeholders' quality perspectives together"

The following conclusion is based on the results from the Norwegian workshop at the QUIP conference in Budapest, Hungary, 11 - 12 October 2002.<sup>4</sup>

The aim of the workshop:

1. Find similarities and differences among the represented stakeholders in regard to experiences with supported employment.
2. Through the exchange of experiences to produce recommendations for further development on supported employment in regard to defining quality criteria.

The workshop started out with a short presentation of the participants and a general discussion about SE and the QUIP project, and then went over to the stakeholders' stories. The general discussion revealed that partners in QUIP have very different starting grounds; from countries involved in pioneer work to countries with national programs.

<sup>4</sup> Participants were Åse Almvang (Skeidar Oslo AS), Per Brannsten (Directorate of Labour), Elisabet Røhme Sivertsen (Directorate of Labour), Tor Ove Gjersvik (AB Romerike), Einar Madsen (AB Romerike), Yngve Moxness (AB Romerike), Eivind Rivrud (Akershus University College), Grete Wangen (Akershus University College) and Øystein Spjelkavik (Work Research Institute).

There are also differences in the views on who the targeted persons for SE are. Spain for instance works with people with Down's syndrome whereas job coaches in Norway expressed that they would like to see more people with learning disabilities in SE. We also found that there are differences in the work of job coaches around among the countries; in some places their role is very wide and varied, whereas Norway is concerned about how to limit and define the job coach role.

The participants discussed the methodology in SE and emphasised that the methods are suited for other professional areas and in other services. In Norway, however, it is important to distinguish between the national SE program and the method.

Representatives from the Directorate of Labour were concerned about the qualitative development of SE in terms of the Norwegian requirements specifications recently been implemented. They were also concerned about being in the role to order service from SE

The job seeker told a story that emphasised the job coach as some kind of basic guidance person who helps job seeker to make his own decisions.

The employer focused on the importance to organise SE in way that it leads to some kind of sharing of risks involved by hiring a supported employee; the existence of a competent job coach that operates within the framework of a stable organisation means that the risks anticipated by employers are reduced – in effect, as noted by all group participants, this means that different stakeholders share the risks involved, also the supported employee as a responsible person.

The employer told a story that focused on the duration of time, and argued that it is important to use enough time in the SE process in order to establish a definitive job contract and a meaningful day. The time must be used to establish good follow-up routines and routines for effective cooperation. This was a point also job coaches and job seeker agreed to.

A job coach presented a story, which emphasised the importance of well being at work and possibilities for career development. The job coach's story also illuminated the importance of asking questions in a way that gives the job seeker opportunity to really express how she/he feels

Participants at the workshop were all different stakeholders with different focus on SE, but all agreed to the same goal for supported employment:

- The goal for SE is work in the open labour market and the process leading to the goal must be holistic and have a clear perspective on work.

The stories presented at the workshop all reflected this common ground. The stories presented were very personal stories, and therefore it would be incorrect to present them in this report.

However, the stories were illustrative in terms of reflecting this common view amongst the participants and the recommendations were also reflected by the personal stories.

The following points were generated from the stakeholders' stories:

- A prerequisite for good cooperation in supported employment means that
  - a. all actors at the workplace are involved
  - b. other services that may be necessary to a successful SE process are involved
  
- Job match in supported employment means
  - a. meaningful employment to the supported employee
  - b. jobs that ensures inclusion of the supported employee at the workplace
  - c. steady jobs to supported employees
  
- Quality systems in supported employment should
  - a. focus on routines and methods
  - b. be interwoven in national framework and clear intentions
  - c. produce stable and suitable organisations for SE performance
  
- Action plans in supported employment
  - a. are based on a user's perspective
  - b. include career planning and career development
  - c. focus on resources and possibilities, not diagnosis and problems

The workshop produced nine recommendations for the development of a good quality SE process (should not be understood as a priority list)<sup>5</sup>:

- Focus on job match and a meaningful work.
- Focus on equal terms for all employees, including employee with a disability at the workplace.
- Focus on job coach as supervisor, not decision maker.
- Get a job quickly and focus on enough time (for job coach and job seeker) to achieve independence for job seeker. Less focus on job preparations and assessments prior to job
- Focus on ongoing process evaluation of each individual SE-process.
- Focus on job, not therapy (referrals to others).
- Focus on risk sharing between stakeholders.
- Develop clear guidelines and requirements for the SE services.
- Secure exchange of experiences for stakeholders of the SE process; sharing competencies

---

<sup>5</sup> The participants of the workshop also worked with the "quality house"; made comments and put marks on what they held to be the most important criteria featured in the house. The result of this exercise was handed over to the responsible researchers of the QUIP project in Vienna.

