**Effective Proposals to Employers – Transcript**

**July 24, 2007**

**Rick McAllister**
McAllister Educational Services, Inc.
50 Winslow Rd.
Weare, NH 03281
mcallinc@aol.com

**Power Point Presentation:** www.ed.uiuc.edu/illinoisrcep/activities/teleconf.htm

**Lynda Leach, Facilitator:** Welcome everyone to the second in a series of three job development teleconferences with Rick McAllister. We're glad you're on! Let's get started.

**Rick McAllister:** Thank you. This is the second session of a three-part teleconference series on employment facilitation in job development. In the last session we talked a little bit about the different stages of job development. We'll start there. If you're following along with the material, I'm going to be starting on page eight with the stages of job development. This is a review from last time. There are a number of ways of looking at job development. One of the ways that's probably very effective for doing an analysis and doing teaching of job development is to break it down into four primary stages. Now those four primary stages are initial contact, relationship building, the proposal, and service after the match.

During the first session, we spent a majority of the time talking about the elements leading up to the initial contact, relationship building. The four types of relationship building are staff formal, staff informal, employee formal, and employee informal. Now what that does is provide four avenues or doors to an employer. All four of those doors lead to the initial contact. We talked about the initial contact being the initial message that we send to employers to get our foot in the door to start building the relationship. We also talked about the fact that the relationship is everything. So we're talking about an approach that is designed to build a relationship. We're not talking about a one-time sale, we're not talking about an initial purchase, we're talking about building a relationship with an employer, which is the premise of good job development. When we talked about the initial contact, we talked about a presentation style or a presentation approach to the employer where we communicated the emphasis on job matching. The successful job development is going to be contingent upon selling the job match. Job match is the only thing that all three of our customers want from us.

The employer wants a job match, the consumer employee wants a job match, and our funding sources want a job match. So we spent the first teleconference talking about initial contact and a good presentation to the employer. Initial presentation would be something similar to, "My name is Rick

McAllister. I work for such and such an agency. We're an employment training service here in the area. It is very important that I understand your employment and training needs so that I can better prepare the people I'm working with to be good candidates in the job market." We talked about the advantages and disadvantages using that strategy. There were some very interesting questions that came to me by e-mail prior to this session that I want to discuss prior to going into the next stage of job development, which is a relationship-building stage. During this session we're going to cover both the relationship building stage and the proposal. We're going to cover service after the match and whole agency job development during the third session in August.

One of the questions I received was, "I live in a small community and most of the employers know what I do." I think that's very interesting for a couple of reasons. One of the reasons is that living in a small community makes it imperative that we build relationships, so I think that that part lends itself very well to the type of job development that we're talking about because we're talking about relationship building. The first implication is that they know what I'm selling, and if that's true then they know that I'm selling a job match. If they know what I'm selling and it's something other than job match, that's exactly the point of the job development issues we're talking about. If we're selling something other than a quality job match, we have to revisit our strategy. If we're focusing on selling disability, we're going to struggle tremendously because the one thing I can be sure of when I'm job developing is that an employer rarely is going to hire a person because they have a disability. An employer is going to hire somebody who can contribute to their organization who might also experience a disability. If they're hiring for some other reason than that, it's not hiring. It's some other relationship, and I'm not saying it's good or bad, but it's not necessarily hiring. So that question lends itself to our thinking about making sure that we're really selling job matches and focusing on job matches and that we are presenting job matches. When we're off track of that we're going to be very frustrated with the relationship to employers.

A second question that came in which I thought was worth bringing up during this presentation was, "In the past, in my community we have had other agencies and other job developers who've gone out with employers and they've made mistakes. Now employers are holding me accountable for that." This brings up issues that are really important. One is that if we've gone out with an employer and we've messed it up, the reality is there's no quick answer. We're going to have to repair that damage by demonstrating a successful approach, building a relationship, providing a quality job match and making sure that we build that relationship. I frequently say that the only solution to having an employer who has had a bad situation is to go down to the local pharmacy and purchase a whole bunch of lip balm and get ready to kiss because we're going to have to kiss up in order to make up for the damage that's been done. There is no substitute. If we mess up with a friend, if we mess up with a business acquaintance, the only solution is to repair the damage by time and effort. One of the flaws of job development that I see over and over when I go to work with agencies is this desire to believe that job development is a quick process. We can be very lucky sometimes and it can take a very short period of time, but building a relationship is a not a short-term process. It's a lot like dating and we want to make sure that we're not asking for marriage on the first date.

Okay, let's talk a little bit about the second stage of job development. I believe we've covered the initial contact thoroughly and now let's talk about relationship building. Relationship building is where we've actually set up a situation where we're going into the employer's place of business. During the initial contact, and I'm on page 10 if you're following along in the materials, one of the things that we will be asking the employer for is an opportunity to be welcomed back to look at the job. This also assumes that we have a job skills inventory of some type. Job skills inventory is a type of assessment that allows us to evaluate a job. If you do not presently have a job skills inventory, I recommend that you contact the RCEP to get a copy of one. There are a number of them available to us and having one is critical. It allows us to truly look at the job in a very systematic way. Most people use a job analysis tool that allows us to look at the components of a job and the breakdown. We actually want to be able to quantify the amount of activity that goes into a job skills inventory.

Again, assuming that we have a tool to assess the job, ask the employer for an opportunity to come back and look at a job. A lot of people ask me, "Why would an employer let me look at a job?" The real question is, "Why would they not?" How can you possibly know a job if you've never seen it? One of the bizarre things that we say to employers frequently is, "I have someone who would be perfect for your job." The question in the employer's mind is, "Well, have you ever seen my job? How do you know?" The other piece that becomes problematic is we frequently think we know a job because we understand some of the components of it. For instance let's take a job coach position in Organization A. You have a set job description, you have a competency list, and you have a title. You go to Organization B, and in Organization B it is exactly the same job title, it is exactly the same job description, and it is exactly the same competency list. One could be very successful at Organization A and do miserably at Organization B. Now what's the difference between being successful in Organization A and feeling miserable in Organization B? It is the culture, the way that the company organizes and runs its business. That becomes the problem in job development – we think we know parts of a job or we know the type of job or we think it's a very simplistic job, but the reality is the culture can be very complex. How we do it is far more important to understanding whether someone's a match to the job than just the elements of the job.

In fact, the culture, I would argue, is far more important because you can compensate and do compensatory strategies for skills. Culture is very difficult to do if we don't understand it or we haven't captured it. It also allows us to know what we're talking about. So it's always a good idea to go in and look at the job, do a comprehensive job analysis, job skills inventory which allows us to do it in approximately 20 to 30 minutes, depending on the tool that you use. Again, the reality is that you would not do that on every job. You would only want to do that on the jobs in which you believe you are going to try to match somebody. If you look at a job and you decide that nobody in your pool presently matches, you might do a more cursory assessment and save it for another time. Now we have, by looking at a job, accomplished some very interesting things. One of the things that we've accomplished by looking at the job is that we've in all probability met the director and supervisor. That's the relationship that we need to cultivate the most because very rarely is it going to be successful even if upper management says, "Yes, we're going to do it," if the direct-line supervisor has not bought into the process. We're going to find that resistance and we're going to find some significant problems with that direct-line supervisor. We have to make sure that we build a relationship at the lowest level as well as the highest. So evaluating and looking at the job gives us an opportunity to do that. Using a good tool also allows us to communicate effectively with that person about the expectations of the job.

I strongly recommend that when we go in and look at a job that we not only use the job skills inventory, but that we also do a task list and a sequence list of those tasks so that we'd actually write down the steps that were going on in the job, highlight them, and highlight the sequence of them. If the person takes the job, they're going to be accountable for doing these steps. More importantly, if we do provide some on-site intervention, the type of interventions we're going to provide can be ascertained by this information. So we see the job, we look at the culture, and then we try to look at the flow of work, and then we leave. Once we leave, we're going to go back to our organization and we're actually going to do a gap analysis.

A gap analysis allows us to do the proposal. A gap analysis allows us to take what we know about the job and customize it to the person. Therefore, we're setting up the ability to provide a proposal. I like to take a piece of paper and draw three lines with four columns. There's actually going to be a fifth column which I'll talk about in a second, but if you take a piece of blank paper and draw three lines building four columns, you actually build a gap analysis tool that will be very effective. In the first column, one would put the "Expectations of the Job." You would only put the ones in where there's not a match. I'm going to go over that in a second. In the second column, one would put the "Skills or Status of the Individual." The third column at the top would say "Interventions," and the fourth column "Progress." Now let me give you some examples of some very basic gaps. These are not necessarily gaps that would occur with the consumers you might work with, but these are ones I think that we can all understand. I'm going to use them for demonstration purposes.

Let's assume that I went in and looked at a job and I came back with a comprehensive assessment of the job. At the same time that I've been doing the job development, I have also been assessing the person. We, as organizations, are usually very good at assessing the individual. So now I have two pools of information. I have the pool of information around the person and the pool of information around the job. By doing a comparative analysis of those two pieces of information, I can establish the groundwork for a quality proposal to the employer. So I take a look at the first element of the job that's required and the performance expectations around that job. I look at everything that I know about the individual and determine if there are any items that are going to prevent that person from performing the task. If the answer is "yes" there's a gap between the demand and the performance level of the person, then I would write that on my gap analysis form. I would put the specific job description or job task in the job column and the status of the person in the status column. By putting those two things side by side, the gap should actually jump out at me.

Let me give you an example. Let's assume that a job requires telling time to the minute. Now I could look at that demand of the job and say, "Geez, I have a person who doesn't tell time." That's not quite enough of an analysis because they don't tell time or they don't tell time to the minute doesn't quite give me the size of the gap. In order to get a good gap so that I can then build an intervention that can become part of my proposal, I have to truly understand how wide that gap is. The job requires telling time to the minute. If I work with a person who has no concept of time, or does not tell time to the minute, or tells time to the activity then the gap between those different elements is very significant. So I would actually capture the gap. So in this case I would say that the job requires telling time to the minute and in this case I'm going to say I'm working with a person who tells time to the hour. Now that becomes a very obvious gap. The next step that I would have to do in order to start preparing for the proposal is to look at an intervention or design an intervention that would allow me to compensate for that gap. So in doing that I would look potentially at the four strategies that can exist (some people break this down into more, but I like to break it down into three or four) and I'm actually going to say that I think you can even simplify it and break it down into three. Here are the three that I would recommend.

I would break it down into job modification, job restructuring, and training. Now job modification is where you give the person a tool or a jig where you physically modify the environment. So if we were looking at the gap of a person who tells time to the minute, tells time to the hour, the job requires telling time to the minute, then some examples of some job modification would be things like a talking clock, color coating the face of a clock, a timer, or some type of a digital clock. Now the real trick to this question is what intervention is correct? A lot of people would answer quickly "all of them" and that's incorrect. The correct answer to that is the option that works for both the employer in the situation that we're talking about and the employee within the situation that we're talking about at the work site. Because again, if it works for the person but doesn't work for the employer, it's not a functional intervention, and if it works for the employer and not the person, it's not a functional intervention. So the reality is that we're looking for an intervention that works for both. So if we picked the job modification, we would select the one that worked for both. Now not all job modifications are exactly the right choice.

The other choice might be a job restructuring. Job restructuring are things like adding tasks to the sequence of events, deleting tasks from the sequence of events, shifting the tasks in the sequence of events, or changing the rules. So you add tasks, delete tasks, change the tasks, or change the rules. Now again, the same question would be for that gap that we've talked about, the gap between telling time to the minute and telling time to the hour, what would be an effective job restructuring? Well one of them could be that you work next to a person. They have trouble lifting, you lift for them. That's an example of a job restructuring. You could take the task of telling time out of the sequence. That would be a job restructuring strategy. You could, in fact, change the rules so that you tell time to the hour. Those were all examples of job restructuring. Now again, which one is right? The one that meets the needs of both the employer and the employee becomes the job restructuring of choice, or you could have a combination of job modifications and job restructuring in some cases.

The third intervention is training. Training is a very difficult intervention at the job site. A lot of people resort to it really quickly, but the problem is that training is very difficult to run in a community-based setting. First of all, it is highly staff intensive even if you do involve the employer, which again if you can involve the employer that's better, but it's still highly staff intensive. It's subject to incredible error and if you come to one of the job coach trainings you'll see some of the activities that we do where it shows that training has incredible opportunities for error. It's subject to error, and it's the least permanent of the three types of intervention. So we go, "What do you mean it's the least permanent?" Well, how many of you have ever taken a foreign language in high school or college? If the answer is "yes," do I have to say more about the permanency of training? Unless you're using it everyday, training has some holes in it. So the reality is that of the three interventions, job modification, job restructuring, training, training is the one that is the most inefficient.

Now I'm not saying it's the worst because training is my life, but the reality is of those three types of interventions on the job site, training is the least efficient. Now we may in fact have to use to training, we may in fact have to use some combination of all three, but by laying out each item, we are able to make a good decision about which mechanism would be the most effective way to intervene for that gap. So after we've identified the interventions we would usually choose two.

The next question that's asked is actually a column that I don't really put on my paper, but I do in my head and that is that hidden column. The hidden column is "Can We Do It?" And the question is who is the "we" in can "we do it"? The "we" is the employer, the employee, us, family, friends, community, any resource that we can bring to bear. In fact, the intervention of last resort should always be us. We always want to be the intervention of last resort. So if we're the intervention of last resort then we would try to find some mechanism. But if the answer is "yes," we can do this intervention, then we go to the next gap. Here is where it gets tricky. If the answer is "no," we can't do this intervention, then we have to be very careful with "no." We really should probably treat that as two "no's," a little "no" and a big "no' because the purpose of this tool is not to screen people out of employment. We could use this tool to make a good argument why none of us belonged in our job. The whole purpose of using the tool is to try to make a case that we can then present the candidate to the employer.

We would say to the employer, "They can do it and here's how we can demonstrate that they can do it." So I would say if it was a "yes," we're good, if it's a "no," we have to be very careful. We want to treat that as a little "no," and what a little "no" means is I don't see that we can use this intervention to solve the problem at this employment site. So what I would do is I would go back and revisit my interventions, and I would try to identify some other options from the three families of job modification, job restructuring, and training that allow me to get a "yes." If ultimately, though, I eliminate all possible options of job modification, job restructuring, and training, then it becomes a big "no." Now if you have a big "no," you ought to write that in red because that means walk away, this is not a job match.

A lot of people get into a whole bunch of things about "maybe," "sort of," "wouldn't it be," "couldn't it be." Well if you've still got "maybe's" and "sort of's" you would want go back and make sure that you've modified your interventions. If you have a "no," walk away. This is not a process about the best candidate. A lot of times we set employers up because we jam people into jobs. Now I frequently hear people say to me, "We don't jam people into jobs." Let me give you some synonymous terms to jamming someone into a job. We have an employer who wants to work with us, who best fits? That's not about job matching, that's about getting the candidate who has the least issues. We want a match or no match.

Here's another example of a saying that – "We have an employer who wants to work with us, and we've got to save this site." Ahh, there's another example of our using something that is similar to, "We're going to jam somebody in there." Although we fooled ourselves into thinking, "We're saving the site." Again, when we do the discrepancy analysis, the gap analysis, and we look at the job gap and make a determination about whether we can intervene on it, that is a "yes" or "no" decision. We can do it, we cannot do it. Now there's occasionally a maybe, and grant you, there is occasionally a "maybe." But a "maybe" only means I need more information. Not maybe I can do it, it's I need to go back and get a little bit more information or I need to negotiate with the employer. Again ultimately, it's either we can deliver it, we believe we can, or it's "no", and if it's a big "no" we probably need to walk away and not make that proposal. If I get a "yes," then I go down to the next gap. A lot of people ask this question, "Well, how many "yes's" can I have?" It's infinite because as soon as I get a "no" it'll end.

Now some people also say this to me, "Well, I could spend 45 minutes doing this, get all "yes's", and then on the last one get a "no." Well, I would argue that if you have something suspicious, you probably should start with that, but the other side of that too is "yes," that could happen to you in theory. But if you spent 45 minutes to save a bad job match, that's 45 minutes well spent because of the number of hours it's going to take to repair the damage with the employer, the employee, and the funding agent for making a bad job match. Forty-five minutes is well spent. It rarely takes that long once you're comfortable with it. Once you've done one or two of these, they usually can be done pretty effectively. It's also a nice tool to do as a team because sometimes there are situations where one person has gone out and job developed and another person has actually built a relationship with a person. It's a nice opportunity for those two people to use this tool to communicate the information specific to the job, so they actually do the job gap analysis or discrepancy analysis together.

Okay, now I've completed the discrepancy analysis in the first three columns. I have all the job gaps, job elements, and personal status that show the gaps. I have those all listed and I have identified that they're all the interventions that I'm going to use, and I have "yes's" for each of the interventions. The three columns that I now have in front of me become three very critical things. They first become the proposal to the employer. The second become the IEP. As an organization, we sit around at a lot of meetings, IEPs, ISPs, IWRPs, ITPs, and we make up these things. Here we have the "real McCoy." If I'm actually going to provide support to this person in this job, this is going to become my IEP, IWRP, ITP, ISP, etc. This becomes that tool after we have made the proposal to the employer. Now if it's a "no," we don't need to make the proposal to the employer. We send them back a copy of the job skills inventory as promised and say to them, "We've looked at your job and we do not presently have a person who meets your needs." If it is a proposal, we call the employer up and we say to the employer, "I've looked at your job. I believe I have a quality candidate for you. I would like to discuss that candidate with you." We present to the employer and if the employer says, "Yes, I would be interested, then you are ready to ask the person if they're interested and set up the interview.

Now here's where a lot of people get a little bit out of sorts. A lot of people try at this point to tell the candidate about the job, but if we're job developing on somebody's behalf, until we've presented to the employer the proposal and the possible gaps, we don't have a job to present to the person. Now I'm talking about using a name, I'm talking about saying to an employer something like this, "I've looked at your job. I have a person who I believe would be very excited about doing the job and here are the supports that they're going to need in order to be successful. Would you be interested in providing those supports?"

Now again, in our assessment of the employer, we need to have been very careful that we start to understand that because if I have a consumer who's going to need very comprehensive interventions, then I want to make sure that I'm presenting that to an employer who is receptive. For instance, I might have Employer A and Employer B. Employer A's company does very similar work, but they're very rigid. Employer B does very similar work, but their culture is very flexible and they do lots of creative things. Now I have a consumer who I know is going to need very creative interventions, so it's critical that I present that person to Employer B. If I present them to Employer A, it's a set up for both Employer A and a set up for the person. I haven't done my job in job developing of presenting a proposal to the employer that demonstrates a good job match. So what I'd want to do is make sure that I knew that I had a good job match and present that to the employer.

Now again, the better our relationship with the employer, the more flexible they're going to be in things like job coaching, job creation, internships, apprenticeships. Those are all options that we always want to have in our bag of tricks. We can't present any of those things unless we've actually seen the job, so by building this type of approach with an employer they know that when we come back to them that we're not just trying to jam one of our people into their job, but we actually have thought through the elements of the job, the culture of the job, and we've thought through the interventions.

When I make a proposal to an employer, there are possibly two extremes. Let's hear the two extremes so that we hear the contradictions that exist in one and the advantages that exist in the other. If I walk into an employer and I say, "Hi, my name is Rick McAllister. I've looked at your job and I have this person who would be really good for your job. We will come in and provide job coaching and we'll be here as long as you need us to be to make sure that it works between you and the candidate." That may sound good at the onset, but that's really selling a program and that's not really selling a job match. It's guaranteeing that we will do the work. Many, many problems with that.

Let's hear the second option. I walked into an employer after having done the match and say to the employer, "Look, I've looked at your job. I understand it. I have this candidate who I believe is a very good candidate. They're excited about doing the job and here are the ways in which they'll need support in order to pull it off." Now a lot of people say something very interesting to me right here. They say, "Why would an employer hire somebody who needs support when they could hire somebody who doesn't?" I'm always concerned when I hear that because I think a few things had happened. One, that person has probably never been a supervisor because if they had been a supervisor my question to anyone is, "Who all have you ever hired who didn't need supports?" That same person probably has never been a co-worker either because my other question would be so which all of your co-workers have you ever worked with who didn't need any supports? Needing supports is a part of employment. We just have to make sure that the supports are reasonable to the employer and we've have to make sure that we can deliver them in a reasonable way. That's the whole essence of the gap analysis approach to making the proposal to the employer. So now we make the proposal to the employer, they say "yes," or they might say "no." And again some say, "What if they say no?" Well if they say "no" at this point no harm is done because they haven't said "no" about working with us. They've said "no" that they're not willing to provide that level of intervention. That's incredibly important to know right up front because we wouldn't want to be three to five months into this or three to five weeks into this and have the employer all of the sudden say, "Geez, I didn't think this was what it was going to be like."

Now a lot of people also say to me, "Well, what happens when we get on the job?" Well the truth of the matter is of course when we get on the job we start identifying new discrepancies because we in fact know the person better and we know the job better. If we've really done a good job up front, we're going to have few of these, but they are still going to happen. We add them to the gap analysis. The gap analysis becomes an addition to the proposal if the employer says "yes" and the candidate says "yes." It becomes the structure of support. Who's going to provide the intervention, how are they going to provide it? Job coaching, by the way, is not an intervention. Job coaching is a delivery vehicle for a bunch of different interventions. Presence or absence of a job coach isn't really the issue. It's what the job coach does or doesn't do that becomes the issue. I frequently hear a lot of job coaches say, “Well, I’m out at the site supporting this person, but I have no idea what I’m supposed to be doing.” The gap analysis approach to the proposal and the follow-up allows us to provide for consistent transition, which is very favorable to the employer. So the employer says “yes,” the consumer says “yes,” we make the match, as we’re working there we identify new gaps, we add them. Once a person is on a job, they could be there three to five weeks, if we identify a gap that then goes from “no” to the big “no,” it’s time for that person to give their notice and leave because that gap is going to be overwhelming.

Now again if we put the person in the job and we identify a gap and it’s a little “no” or a “yes,” a little “no” that we turn into a “yes,” then that’s doing the job of providing support to that person on the site. The proposal also takes us to the next level if we’ve used it correctly. Let’s assume that we’ve had a consumer who said “yes,” the employer said “yes,” we put the person in the job, we provided them support, and we faded back that support and we’re now providing ongoing support. Now let’s just take our minds off ongoing support for a little bit just to take a different view of it. Let’s pretend that our job is to check metal bridges. As we all know, metal bridges get little stress fractures, little cracks in them, and workers go down and weld them together. Now if our job was to test a metal bridge for little cracks or the stability of those little cracks, would we get on the bridge and jump up and down as a way to test it? No, that’s ridiculous. Would we stand on the edge of a bridge, and as a car drove by go, “Hey, how’s it going?” That would be ridiculous too because cars would be “yes,” everything’s good until they dropped down into the water. The same thing happens with employers. We call employers up and go, “Hey, how’s it going?” Employers always go, invariably, “Going super!” and then a week later we get a call that this person can’t work here anymore. We say, “How did that happen?” The reality is because we didn’t use the supports correctly. Instead we stood on the edge of the bridge and yelled to the car, “How’s it going?” What in reality we’d do is we would go down and look underneath the bridge for the welds to make sure that they were still holding tight. The gap analysis (discrepancy analysis tool) that we’ve built as part of our proposal and as part of our ongoing intervention strategy in fact shows us where those gaps were. That same tool (the fourth column) also serves as an incredible report. If you look across the columns think, “Okay, for this job element, here’s the gap, here’s our intervention, and if you put in that fourth column on your page – “Progress.” You have an incredibly powerful progress note to your funding agent. You have an incredibly powerful way to communicate with co-workers because there are going to be times when, as a co-worker, one person is going to be providing support and another person is going to be sick or have to cover for that person. The reality is if you have new staff covering for you, you want them to do things exactly the same way using exactly the same format.

So again the gap analysis proposal keeps everything clean with the employer. It keeps everything clean with your co-workers. It keeps everything clean with your funding agent. We take it through from start to finish. That’s the gap analysis approach to the proposal. Now, if you’re following along you see that I’ve covered material through page 11 at this point. Now that wasn’t much of a jump in pages, but we’ve covered a pretty significant amount of information. During the third session, in August, we will cover the different types of job development elements and whole agency job development.

I would like to just jump ahead though and cover a couple of items on pages 13 and 14 that don’t fit comfortably in the next section. They’re things that we’ve talked a little bit about and I want to give you an example of them. One of the things that we’ve talked about in the first two sections is the employer file. Now, the employer file is very critical to job development so that we maintain a record of the employers. Also, and if you look on page, if you're following along with the pages, and you look on page 14 you're going to see the elements of the employer file. They are listed there. They are the demographics, the contact record, the plan, and the job skills inventory. Let's go over what those are. Demographics include the name of the company, where they're located, who the contact person is, addresses, all of the demographic information about the company. The contact record, though, is a critical thing that I think sometimes is omitted in employer files. This is a record of each time somebody from an organization has contacted the employer. It should say the date, the purpose of the contact, and a quick summary of what went on in the contact. That's critical for many reasons. If I contacted somebody on Thursday we want to prevent somebody else from our organization going in next Wednesday or Thursday. We'd look pretty silly to the employer.

The other thing it does is it keeps a record of issues we've had with the employer – a bad placement, a bad contact with an employer, a bad relationship, or a positive one, or with whom we have built a relationship. It was one of our board member's cousins, one of our employees' third cousin who we knew, or their best friend. That kind of contact record keeps some critical information about building our customer base. The plan is two fold. One is if we make a match then the discrepancy analysis plan should go in there of what we've promised the employer. The other part of the plan should be our plan to do business with the employer. Each one of our customers requires that we have an effective strategy. That would include the elements of a plan that might be in the employer file with all job skills inventories and job assessments. Above the employer file, on page 13, we have a job development log and why I put that in there is I think all of us know how that works, but I want to be clear that the job development log and the employer file are two different creatures. A lot of people substitute a job development log for an employer file. A job development log is simply a list of the contacts that we've made at a given time, at a given period of time, and they might even keep our hours on that. The reality is that if we keep putting it on this type of a sheet, by the 6th or 7th week we just have too many of these sheets to track, and we don't really have any viable data around the employer. The employer file either in an electronic or physical format is critical to our doing that effectively. During the third session, as I said, we're going to spend a lot of time talking about whole agency job developing, employer advisory networks, and such. If you have questions, please e-mail me at mcallinc@aol.com.

**Lynda Leach:** Thanks Rick! If you have questions, please feel free to contact Rick. I'd like to remind you that the third session with Rick is on August 21, 2:00 p.m. CDT. Thank you Rick for a great presentation and thank you all for being with us today. Talk to you next month.