

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 102 305

CE 003 002

**AUTHOR** Dunn, Dennis J.  
**TITLE** Comparison of the JEVS, Singer/Graflex and TOWER Work Evaluation Systems. Reprint Series No. 5.  
**INSTITUTION** Wisconsin Univ. - Stout, Menomonie. Dept. of Rehabilitation and Manpower Services. Materials Development Center.  
**REPORT NO** REPRINT-Ser-5  
**PUB DATE** Dec 71  
**NOTE** 7p.

**EDRS PRICE** MF-\$0.76 HC-\$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE  
**DESCRIPTORS** \*Comparative Analysis; \*Evaluation Methods; Job Development; Job Placement; Job Training; Manpower Development; \*Personnel Evaluation; \*Systems Approach; Training; \*Vocational Adjustment; Vocational Counseling; Vocational Education; Vocational Rehabilitation

**IDENTIFIERS** JEVS System; Jewish Evaluation and Vocational Services System; Singer Graflex System; \*Work Evaluation Systems

**ABSTRACT**

Intended as a guide for potential purchase of work evaluation systems, the document compares three that are currently available: The Jewish Evaluation and Vocational Services (JEVS) System, the Singer/Graflex System, and the Testing, Orientation and Work Evaluation in Rehabilitation (TOWER) System. Manuals and related published materials for each system were reviewed for information about each system. Only published materials were used in preparing the comparison. Organized in outline form, the document compares the three systems according to the following evaluative criteria: (1) development, (2) organization, (3) work evaluation process, (4) administration, (5) scoring and norms, (6) observation, (7) reporting, (8) utility, (9) training in system, and (10) current status and cost. (MW)

# MATERIALS DEVELOPMENT CENTER

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Reprint Series No. 5

THE DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATION AND MANPOWER SERVICES  
School of Education University of Wisconsin-Stout Menomonie, Wisconsin (54751)

SHORT-TERM TRAINING PROGRAM  
DEPARTMENT OF REHABILITATION AND MANPOWER SERVICES  
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - STOUT

### COMPARISON OF THE JEVS, SINGER/GRAFLEX AND TOWER WORK EVALUATION SYSTEMS

Dr. Dennis J. Dunn  
Associate Professor

December, 1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION  
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-  
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM  
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-  
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT  
THE OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

There are currently three relatively complete work evaluation systems available on the market. However, there is not any convenient material available which compares all three systems. A paper by Rabucha\* has compared the TOWER and JEVS Systems. To a person viewing each system, one at a time, it is obvious that each offers certain advantages, but also that each has disadvantages.

The purpose of this material is to present a reasonably objective comparison of the three systems. Manuals and related published materials for each system were reviewed for information about each system. Only the published materials were used in preparing this comparison. Consequently, it is possible that some details about system operation are not covered in published materials, but are covered in evaluator training in the use of the system. The exception to this would be the Singer/Graflex System which currently offers no training in its use. No attempt has been made to incorporate the experience or opinions of system users into this material.

It is suggested that this comparison of systems be used as a guide for potential purchasers so they can examine each system in terms of their particular needs. Potential purchasers should also make an effort to obtain the opinions and experience of facilities using the systems prior to making a final decision.

---

\*Rubucha, W., Observed similarities between ICD's TOWER system of work evaluation and JEVS work sampling. Unpublished paper, Atlanta Evaluation and Employment Service Center, n.d.

ED102305

E003002

TOWER

SINGER/GRAFLEX

JEVS

<p><u>1. Development</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. sponsor</li> <li>b. target group</li> <li>c. basis of system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Department of Labor</li> <li>b. culturally different, disadvantaged</li> <li>c. Dictionary of Occupational Titles</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Singer/Graflex</li> <li>b. not specified</li> <li>c. not specified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Voc. Rehab. Administration</li> <li>b. physically disabled</li> <li>c. job analysis</li> </ul>
<p><u>2. Organization</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. number of work samples</li> <li>b. grouping of samples</li> <li>c. packaging of samples</li> <li>d. manual</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 28</li> <li>b. grouped into ten Worker Trait Arrangements</li> <li>c. each sample is individually boxed</li> <li>d. offset manual provides complete system details</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 10</li> <li>b. each sample is independent</li> <li>c. each sample is self-contained in carrel</li> <li>d. Xerox manual; some system details not provided</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 110</li> <li>b. grouped into 14 major areas of work</li> <li>c. samples are not individually packaged</li> <li>d. printed manual and related materials; some system details not provided</li> </ul>
<p><u>3. Work Evaluation Process</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. preliminary screening</li> <li>b. sequence of sampling</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. not required</li> <li>b. progressive; begins with simplest work samples and proceeds in order through battery</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. not required</li> <li>b. not specified</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. emphasized for planning purposes</li> <li>b. progressive within major areas; choice of areas depends upon client interest and/or evaluation plan</li> </ul>

TOWER

SINGER/GRAFLEX

JEVS

<p>c. individual involvement</p> <p>d. evaluation setting</p> <p>e. time to complete entire system</p>	<p>c. client contact with evaluator is minimized feedback on performance and behavior occurs at end of process</p> <p>d. stress realistic work atmosphere and setting</p> <p>e. approximately 2 weeks</p>	<p>c. extensive involvement through ratings of interest and performance by client; little provision for accurate feedback</p> <p>d. not specified</p> <p>e. not specified (est. - 1 week)</p>	<p>c. not specified; little provision for client feedback</p> <p>d. stress realistic work atmosphere and setting</p> <p>e. approximately 3 weeks</p>
<p>4. <u>Administration</u></p> <p>a. procedures</p> <p>b. method of instruction giving</p> <p>c. repeating work samples</p> <p>d. providing assistance</p>	<p>a. procedures well indicated; including layout, materials needed, etc.</p> <p>b. primarily verbal and demonstrations; written instructions used only when they are a requirement in a job area</p> <p>c. not recommended--invalidates results</p> <p>d. requiring assistance after initial instruction period results in score</p>	<p>a. general procedures are indicated for system (see below for details)</p> <p>b. all instructions are given using verbal (tape) instructions, illustrated with a slide. Programmed A/V material is occasionally supplemented with written material</p> <p>c. not specified</p> <p>d. evaluator encouraged to provide assistance necessary for client to complete the task</p>	<p>a. procedures well indicated; purpose and materials stated</p> <p>b. primarily written instructions supplemented by evaluator explanation and demonstration when needed</p> <p>c. encouraged for upgrading</p> <p>d. evaluator encouraged to ensure client knows how to do task before he begins work</p>

	JEVS	SINGER/GRAFLEX	TOWER
5. <u>Scoring and Norms</u>	<p>a. use of time clock by client required for each sample</p> <p>b. time includes the giving of instructions for the work sample</p> <p>c. rated on a 5-point scale; norms developed on 200 disadvantaged youth in Philadelphia</p> <p>d. most samples use random check of items compared to scoring criteria provided</p> <p>e. minimal use made of scoring aids</p> <p>f. rated on 5-point scale, based on U.S. Govt. Mil. contract specifications</p> <p>g. time and quality given equal weight</p>	<p>a. evaluator times client</p> <p>b. time interval varies as specified for each sample in manual</p> <p>c. rated on a 5-point scale; norms developed from "study of employment requirements" in Rochester, N.Y.</p> <p>d. check all items against scoring criteria provided</p> <p>e. some use made of scoring aids</p> <p>f. rated on 5-point scale; norms developed in Roch. (see (c) above)</p> <p>g. emphasis is on quality of finished product</p>	<p>a. timing necessary but no procedure established for who does timing</p> <p>b. time includes only amount of time necessary to complete work on the sample</p> <p>c. rated on a 5-point scale; norms developed at LCD, but group not specified</p> <p>d. check all items against scoring criteria provided</p> <p>e. extensive use of transparent overlays</p> <p>f. rated on 5-point scale; norms developed at LCD</p> <p>g. emphasis is on quality of finished product</p>
6. <u>Observation</u>	<p>a. 25 work factors specified in performance of samples; each sample has factors listed</p> <p>b. work behaviors to be observed specified and defined</p>	<p>a. few work performance factors specified; none for individual samples</p> <p>b. work behaviors to be observed are defined</p>	<p>a. few work performance factors specified; none for individual samples</p> <p>b. work behaviors not specifically defined</p>

TOWER

SINGER/GRAFLEX

JEVS

<p>c. rating system</p> <p>d. frequency of observation</p>	<p>c. uses 3-point rating system for most performances and behaviors; points on scale clearly defined and illustrated</p> <p>d. extensive observations; recording for individual samples on specific factors with all performance and behavior recorded at least on a daily basis</p>	<p>c. uses 5-point rating system; points on scale not clearly defined for individual performances and behaviors</p> <p>d. frequent observations are not emphasized</p>	<p>c. uses 5-point rating system; points on scale not clearly defined for individual performances and behaviors</p> <p>d. frequent observation is suggested; space is provided for observations on each sample</p>
<p>7. <u>Reporting</u></p> <p>a. forms</p> <p>b. final report format</p>	<p>a. standard forms included for work sample recording; daily observation summary; feedback interview; final report</p> <p>b. standard format; includes ranking of performance on samples; recommended WTGA and rationale; extensive written comments on performance and behavior</p>	<p>a. standard forms included for attendance and punctuality; vocational evaluation report; performance summary</p> <p>b. primarily global ratings; personal contact with counselor recommended</p>	<p>a. standard forms included for interest rating; performance rating; work behavior rating; also includes picture interest test</p> <p>b. narrative recommended</p>
<p>8. <u>Utility</u></p> <p>a. vocational exploration</p>	<p>a. limited opportunity; samples tend to be abstract</p>	<p>a. exposed to a variety of vocational areas</p>	<p>a. extensive amount of occupational information provided to client</p>

	JEVS	SINGER/GRAFLEX	TOWER
<p>b. vocational recommendations</p> <p>c. counselor utilization</p> <p>d. research evidence</p>	<p>b. highly related to DOT; wide breadth of jobs; geared for both training and job placement</p> <p>c. oriented toward counselor</p> <p>d. highly positive</p>	<p>b. limited range of jobs; only crudely related to DOT; primarily oriented to training</p> <p>c. not specified</p> <p>d. none</p>	<p>b. limited range of related jobs; not highly related to DOT; primarily oriented to training</p> <p>c. counselor involvement in process recommended</p> <p>d. research evidence is equivocal</p>
<p>9. <u>Training in System</u></p> <p>a. training required</p> <p>b. training available</p> <p>c. duration</p> <p>d. follow-up</p>	<p>a. yes</p> <p>b. yes</p> <p>c. 2 weeks</p> <p>d. four technical assistance visits to assist with establishment of facility and maintenance of standardized procedures</p>	<p>a. no</p> <p>b. no</p> <p>c. -----</p> <p>d. -----</p>	<p>a. yes</p> <p>b. yes</p> <p>c. 6 weeks</p> <p>d. no</p>
<p>10. <u>Current Status</u></p> <p>a. availability</p> <p>b. approximate cost to set up system</p> <p>c. future development</p>	<p>a. available only to facilities approved by USTES</p> <p>b. \$5,000</p> <p>c. under active research by USTES; changes to be made based on empirical evidence</p>	<p>a. available through Singer/Graflex</p> <p>b. \$9,000</p> <p>c. under active development; system purchasers to be involved in research activities</p>	<p>a. available through ICO</p> <p>b. \$5,000</p> <p>c. no developmental or revision activities indicated</p>