DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 159 407 CE 017 707

AUTHOR Bruno, Lee
TITLE Intake and Assessment: CETA Program Models.
INSTITUTION Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 44p.; Contains occasional small print
AVAILABLE FROM Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (Stock Number 029-000-00327-1)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Admission Criteria; Agency Role; Aptitude Tests; Cost Effectiveness; Demonstration Programs; Diagnostic Tests; *Disadvantaged Groups; Educational Assessment; Employment Interviews; *Employment Services; *Evaluation Methods; Evaluation Needs; Federal Programs; Feedback; *Identification; Identification Tests; Informal Assessment; *Job Training; Models; Personality Assessment; Personality Tests; Personnel Selection; Placement; Program Development; *Recruitment; Screening Tests; Test Selection
IDENTIFIERS *Comprehensive Employment and Training Act

ABSTRACT

In this monograph, methods and models for revising or developing intake and assessment activities, facilitating enrollee success, and offering other program benefits are presented. The report, divided into four chapters, describes intake and assessment in chapter 1. Intake is defined as any process controlling the enrollee's flow into a program at a rate maintaining optimum enrollment levels. Three assessment levels are outlined: (1) judging eligibility for admission, (2) matching client to activity, and (3) using diagnostics for individualization of services. It is suggested that in designing intake and assessment activities, elements to be considered are sufficient information, cost-effectiveness considerations, and assessment functions. Chapter 2 presents an overview of assessment instruments and their limitations. In chapter 3 program model variations are described as evolving from the intensity of the assessment process, from the management activity (to maximize cost-effectiveness), and from the purpose(s) of the intake and assessment process. Nine intake and assessment models reflecting assessment level, multi-functional extent, and single or multi-agency effort are represented. Chapter 4 reviews selection, services, assessment systems, assessment devices, and client screening methods. A bibliography and three appendixes, including a summary of assessment tools for the disadvantaged, are attached. (This is one of a series of CETA program models.) (CSS)

Intake and Assessment: CETA Program Models

U.S. Department of Labor
Ray Marshall, Secretary

Employment and Training Administration
Ernest G. Green
Assistant Secretary for Employment
and Training
1978

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, D.C. 20402

Stock No. 029-000-00327-1

SPECIAL NOTE

This monograph is one of a series entitled *CETA Program Models* prepared for the Employment and Training Administration's Office of Community Employment Programs, with financial support by the Office of Research and Development. The series, on program activities and services, was prepared under contract number 81-11-71-09 with the National Council on Employment Policy and edited by Garth Mangum of the University of Utah.

The monographs being issued or prepared for publication are *On-the-Job Training* by James Bromley and Larry Wardle; *Job Development and Placement* by Miriam Johnson and Marged Sugarman; *Classroom Training--The OIC Approach* by Calvin Pressley and James McGraw; *Supportive Services* by Susan Turner and Carolyn Conradus; *Intake and Assessment* by Lee Bruno; *Work Experience Perspectives* by Marion Pines and James Morlock; and *Public Service Employment* by Ray Corpuz. Others may be added as circumstances warrant.

The authors, experienced employment and training program operators themselves, review the purposes and means of carrying out CETA functions and comment on methods they have found useful in conducting programs and avoiding pitfalls. The series is commended not only to program operators and their staffs, but also to community groups and other employment and training services professionals in the hope that this information will enable more people to learn about CETA programs, stimulate new ideas, and contribute to improving the quality of employment and training programs.

The series should not be regarded as official policy or requirements of the U.S. Department of Labor. Although every effort has been made to assure that the information is consistent with present regulations, prime sponsors are urged to consult current regulations before adopting changes the authors may advocate. The authors are solely responsible for the content.

Another series of use to CETA prime sponsors and their staffs is *CETA Title VI Project Description Reports*. There are two volumes in this series. The first monograph was prepared by MDC, Inc., Chapel Hill, N.C., under contract number 82-37-71-47. The second volume was prepared by ETA with assistance from prime sponsors, regional offices, and a private contractor.

Copies of other titles in these series may be obtained from:

Office of Community Employment Programs
Employment and Training Administration
U.S. Department of Labor
601 D Street, NW.
Washington, D.C. 20213

Reader comments and suggestions are welcomed and may be sent to the above address.

PREFACE

A frank discussion of client assessment in its broadest terms necessarily raises issues and generates differing opinions concerning intake and assessment as program components. In many instances, the object of assessment is an applicant for an employment or training service who is disadvantaged as a consequence of poverty, minority status, or other employment handicaps.

There is a serious lack of validated assessment techniques for accurately evaluating these clients. Routine use of some standardized tests in these cases has generated lawsuits by clients who contend that, because of their particular circumstances, the tests were discriminatory. Many recent court decisions have upheld this contention. It now appears prudent to have any client-screening process reviewed by an authority on equal employment opportunity compliance.

Another issue concerns client involvement in the intake and assessment process. It must be emphasized that such a process should be regarded primarily as a service to clients. Offering models that demonstrate how management may benefit from client assessment should not detract from the client-centered approach; nor should the use of structured assessment tools in a systematic attempt to solicit useful client data be regarded as dehumanizing. Rather, it is proposed that the methodology and model variations discussed herein would serve to more clearly define the judgmental parameters within which program staff could operate to the ultimate benefit of the client.

In this light, could it be suggested that clients' past experiences and self-perceptions at the point of intake—considered separately or together—are not always the most valid basis for decisionmaking? It is submitted that a good intake and assessment activity should provide clients with new and significant information about themselves that would not have been available otherwise. To the extent that a client is aided in life career planning, the intake and assessment activity is fulfilling its first objective. To the extent that programs are able to manage resources more wisely, it has achieved its second objective.

A third issue relates to the dangers of an informal selection system. Such a system is one in which enrollees are selected randomly or selected without regard to rational criteria, such as the first come, first served method. Clients who are aware of program opportunities, or who happen to be standing in line to make application at the right time, are enrolled, whereas another applicant who may or may not have better qualifications is not enrolled. Prime sponsors who maintain this selection system are not fulfilling their responsibility to the community to see that the program resources are equitably distributed.

Another informal selection system is one in which bias operates to screen out the "unwanted" applicant, frequently found to be the case where interviewers make decisions regarding intake and selection. The interviewer imposes his or her own personal biases on the client. Such an interviewer may unwittingly discourage a client from proceeding further or may even make a judgment that this individual is not suitable for a program enrollment. This may be done at

the initial point of intake where no records are maintained. In such situations, a prime sponsor may be unaware that a selection system is being operated.

A general description of intake and assessment, presented in chapter 1 of this monograph, examines the elements of the process. The chapter allows the reader to relate these elements to local factors that have an impact upon program design and performance. A firm grasp of the practical aspects of the intake and assessment process allows the reader to understand how elements such as individual client characteristics, program performance standards, and local biases may be influenced by the size of the project, interagency relationships, and the many other variables that directly or indirectly affect every prime sponsor's program.

Chapter 2 reviews the literature that seems to provide the most pertinent information relative to the assessment techniques available for use by employment and training programs in the selection of potential enrollees. It refers the reader to printed material (see also Bibliography) that permits further individual study of any specific area. By providing a readily accessible guide to the literature currently available, it may reduce the need for extensive research by program practitioners.

Variations of program models are discussed in chapter 3, which provides the reader with information that may suggest ideas for developing a plan of action. The chapter demonstrates how the elements described in chapter 1 may be combined and what impact these combinations have on the programs in which they are used. Model variations are followed by case studies that reflect current application by Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) prime sponsors. Although by no means a complete directory, the chapter identifies resources for a more detailed inquiry.

Chapter 4 briefly reviews the first three chapters and discusses current data limitations. It also suggests areas for additional study and research.

To receive the maximum benefit from this material, one should read the first and last chapters with particular care. They provide a good orientation to intake and assessment, as well as some basic tools for use in bringing about change and development, with a minimal investment of time. The intervening chapters suggest some shortcuts in using these tools, which should reduce the risk of reinventing the wheel.

This monograph should not be viewed as the final word on the successes and failures of CETA programs. It is offered as an opportunity to share the author's knowledge of intake and assessment, acquired by personal, practical experience, research of the literature, and experiences recounted by others. In presenting this information, as clearly and concisely as possible, the author attempted to provide an intermediate summation, intended to stimulate new ideas and challenge readers to refine their assessment techniques. To the extent that it realizes this objective, readers will be made aware of methods and models that may be employed to revise or develop intake and assessment activities, facilitate enrollee success, and offer other program benefits not customarily associated with employment and training program components.

Ms. Lee Bruno, the author of this monograph, is currently on assignment with the Employment and Training Administration's Office of National Programs. She organized and managed employment and training programs in Escambia County, Fla., and was director of the Escambia County Department of Health and Social Services, responsible for administering health, human resources, employment and training, veterans and youth services, and the agricultural extension office. Her experience also includes serving on the Employment and Training Administration's National Work Group on Program Review and Assessment and providing technical assistance in ex-offender programs and prime sponsor self-evaluation.

CONTENTS

Appendixes: Page

1. GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF INTAKE AND ASSESSMENT

Intake is a taken-for-granted process, so routine that it seldom becomes an object of refinement, which is unfortunate. Assessment is regarded with suspicion by many employment and training specialists as an activity that discriminates against the disadvantaged. To some people, assessing a client implies an adversary relationship whereby potential clients must compete to be served. This interpretation is so contrary to the philosophy of most employment and training programs that assessment has fallen into disrepute, regarded by some as a questionable practice. If we add to this the general failure of the science of psychometrics to prove itself competent to measure people—especially those who vary from the "norm"—there exists some basis for prejudice.

However, none of these considerations can alter the fact that the most important decision made in the course of the day-to-day operations of an employment and training program is decided which applicants to enroll. It is this decision that determines whether those intended to be served are in fact served, and how effectively that service is rendered.

Although explanations abound for the failure of employment and training programs to achieve their goals, commonsense dictates that most people have an affinity for that which meets their needs. The high drop out rate of CETA program enrollees suggests that many clients' needs are not being met. As a result, considerable resources are being wasted because of the incorrect matching of an enrollee to a training activity or job. Program planners establish a mix of services based on their best assumptions about clients' needs. The intake and assessment component tests these assumptions, thereby leading the way for program refinement and adjustments.

It is the thesis of this monograph that identifying client needs is an essential element in the development of good programs. Intake and assessment are activities where this is accomplished. The results have an impact on client success as well as the cost-effectiveness of any developmental program. As a service to clients, it expands their self-knowledge and permits more relevant counseling. It can also be an opportunity for clients to test reality in a supportive atmosphere, expand their vocational horizons, and sample the wares of the system that promises to serve them.

For a training or employment activity to be successful, it must be able either to identify those clients who can best use its services or to offer unlimited resources, time, and money to any and all possible applicants. Since the latter is unlikely to occur, it is important that program operators examine the rationale behind their enrollment process.

For purposes of clarification, intake is defined here as any process that controls the flow of enrollees into a program activity—such as work experience or classroom training—at a rate that maintains optimum enrollment levels. Assessment is defined as the process that determines selectivly which applicants are to comprise that flow of enrollees. A broader definition of assessment would be any analysis of client data that supports a judgment. Because of this close relationship, intake and assessment are usually regarded as one continuous process. Since counseling is a principal technique for implementing the intake and assessment activity, it is also regarded as integral to intake and assessment. Counseling provides the client with feedback from the assessment process, with information about employment and training opportunities so that a plan of action can evolve. Assessment (by this foregoing definition) is vastly broad in scope. It may be more useful to categorize it according to degree of resource commitment and the related purposes such a commitment serves.

Level 1—Judging Eligibility for Admission

All prime sponsors assesses or determine client eligibility in compliance with Federal requirements. This includes matching client characteristics with federally mandated criteria, as well as any additional requirements established locally, to assure service to specific target groups. Characteristics are identified by using a questionnaire that is widely known as an application or "intake" form. At times, the assistance of an interviewer is needed, but usually collecting these data is a simple and inexpensive undertaking. The problem appears in the process of analyzing the data to make judgments about priority for enrollment. The major contributions made by CETA prime sponsors to the art of intake and assessment have been rating systems to classify eligible clients into priority groups according to need.

Level 2—Matching Client to Activity

Most prime sponsors must decide whether eligible applicants are appropriate candidates for the limited services they have to offer. Such an assessment is made to determine if the client is likely to become employable as a result of the services they are able to give. In the second level of assessment, data are collected and analyzed to support a judgment as to which applicant among the many should be referred to a particular program activity. The matching of client to activity in this case would be largely influenced by the client's stated preferences and general education.

Initially, individual clients indicate that they need one or more of (1) training, (2) job placement, or (3) financial assistance; rarely do they say that they need anything else. The primary sources of data for a level 2 assessment are the individual client reports on themselves (usually collected by the interviewer in a structured atmosphere) and traditional academic tests.

Level 3—Diagnostics for Individualization of Services

A few prime sponsors assess client skills, interests, aptitudes, and other employability factors to obtain a more accurate match of needs for services. This level of assessment invariably involves a wider range of validated assessment instruments and structured interviews and questionnaires. A level 3 assessment assumes that client self-reports are not absolute indicators of client needs. In many instances, clients are neither willing nor able to articulate their strengths and weaknesses. Level 3 assessment is necessary when the program operator has a wide array of services available, as in a CETA program, and needs to make a judgment on type of service or services that would be most beneficial to a particular client.

For example, one prime sponsor learned that, in the first year of operation under CETA, day-care services were consuming an enormous portion of the services budget. However, a study showed that in many cases clients could provide their own day care from personal resources. Dental care, corrective lenses, and similar minor medical services were areas where they could not afford such services. Consequently, funds were shifted from day-care to minor medical services, with the result that no clients withdrew from training. Later, the level 3 assessment activity showed precisely where the needs for supportive services should be.

Summary

The first level of assessment establishes eligibility for services. The second level channels clients into program activities that match either their request for services, education, employment history, or interviewers' impressions. The third level uses diagnostic procedures to provide individual clients with meaningful information regarding their strengths and weaknesses. This gives the rationale for an individualized step-by-step employability plan. The use of this procedure is more likely to develop knowledge of each client's needs and thus enable service deliverers to channel resources more expeditiously and effectively.

Program operators may vary their levels of assessment to correspond with a particular kind of training or client group, thereby operating an intake and assessment activity that amounts to a combination of the three. An example would be a level 1 assessment for clients enrolling in a summer youth program or public service employment activity, a level 2 assessment for veterans enrolling in an on-the-job training component, and a level 3 assessment for illiterate ex-offenders with minimal academic skills who are enrolling in classroom training. The choice of assessment level reflects the assumptions that one can make about the clients' needs for services and the demands the training or employment activity make on the clients.

So far, client assessment has been treated only as part of an overall service delivery mechanism. It can also be used to support program management. Data derived from the client assessment process will reveal the following to program managers:

1. Types of clients applying for services.
2. Those whose needs cannot be addressed by current mix of services available.

3. [illegible] are most likely to benefit from the [illegible] activities offered?

4. Which employability factors, among level [illegible] assessment data, are being influenced by the services and activities made available to the client?

One useful program evaluation device is [illegible] periodic level 3 assessments of the enrolled clients to measure the degree to which they have become more employable since enrollment.

Three essential elements to be considered when designing an intake and assessment activity are information, cost-effectiveness, and the function of the assessment. The following discussion elaborates on these three elements.

Sufficient Information

Information must be sought that is sufficient to make reasonably reliable decisions. It must be valid information, free of bias or "contamination." The program manager must give careful thought to the scope of information desired about a potential client. Various mechanisms must then be developed to secure this information that will not affect the objectivity of the information obtained. For example, if the program operator wants to be sure that people with the greatest needs are being served, extraordinary care should be exercised in determining the factors that influence need. Knowledge of the existence and degree of any of these factors then becomes relevant in any particular case. This information should be secured by developing a structured interview that phrases the questions in such a way that they will not influence the responses. The interviewer should be trained in such a way that attitude and interview techniques will result in objectivity.

Cost-Effectiveness

As essential an element as the first, cost-effectiveness considerations are significant in establishing a sound program. Cost includes use of agency resources, such as staff and client time, as well as merely making sure there is enough money. The needed information must be obtained at a cost commensurate with its value; e.g., sophisticated level 3 assessment would not be worth its cost to most summer youth work experience projects.

At times, cost may be shared by several agencies, thereby increasing cost-effectiveness for the prime sponsor. Frequently agencies such as local health departments are willing to participate in such a collaboration because their goals are served by providing medical screening to disadvantaged people who lack preventive health care. In some cases, nonfinancial agreements have made possible complete physical [illegible] of the client in acquiring needed [illegible] services. In other cases, the clients may not be interested in training programs but are attracted to the placement assistance that may be available through the local employment service. Another client may not be physically capable of either training or employment and will benefit more from referral to the public assistance agency.

Is there a new agency in the community not yet well known to the population? Can an outreach service for this agency be provided through an assessment center? These are questions the prime sponsors might ask themselves. There are numerous ways in which a joint intake-assessment center can benefit the prime sponsor and the community.

It is unwise for one area of assessment to be shared by more than one entity. When intake and assessment responsibilities are shared, all entities should be accountable. For example, academic assessment should not be assigned to both the community college and the vocational rehabilitation counselor. In the event that academic assessments are not competently done or are delayed for some reason, one could not determine the responsible entity. Ideally, all agencies participating in this endeavor would agree to accept the authority of one agent. In some instances, this agent is the prime sponsor; in others, it can be the subcontractor to the prime sponsor. Agency interfacing can become a problem if good planning, communications, accountability, and monitoring are not administratively feasible. In addition to the advantage of shared cost, a multi-agency assessment activity [illegible] greater service opportunities to clients.

Function of the Assessment

The third element—function or purpose of assessment—is the end to which all assessment is a means. Whenever an assessment activity serves more than one purpose, it is said to be multifunctional. As previously stated, client assessment generally supports employment and training activity by helping to match appropriate clients to appropriate activities. It may serve other functions of either a client service or program management nature. An example of the latter case, cited earlier, is program evaluation wherein a client's employability is periodically monitored against the initial assessment results.

Client assessment should be a client-centered activity; it cannot be justified as strictly a program management tool. There are many ways that intake and assessment can be beneficial and supportive to a client, not the least of which is providing evaluative information to clients that enables them to make better judgments about themselves. Assessment should be done in conjunction with clients. The failure of staff members to share assessment data with their clients could be a reflection of the staff's insecurity as a change agent or their inability to relate to the clients.

Additional Issues of Intake and Assessment

Summary

2. METHODOLOGY

Historically, assessment for work potential began evolving during World War I when the Armed Forces used paper-and-pencil tests to determine work assignments of military personnel. It was probably here that the weaknesses of these instruments first became apparent. Since that time and the advent of modern rehabilitation agencies that work with the handicapped, veterans and others, experiments in work sampling as well as other assessment techniques became more organized.

The Testing Orientation and Work Evaluation in Rehabilitation (TOWER) system, developed by the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled in New York City in the late 1950's, was the first systematic individualized approach to vocational evaluation that was not dependent on paper-and-pencil testing. Since then, the Jewish Employment and Vocational Services (located in Philadelphia), through a contract with the Department of Labor, developed an evaluation system that is based upon work sampling. Industry has also contributed the Singer/Graflex system for work evaluation.

Toward the end of the 1960's, some of the techniques developed to assess employment potential of the handicapped began to be applied on a small scale to disadvantaged workers. Large employers also developed assessment techniques of different kinds to identify potential among executives. However, the various State departments of vocational rehabilitation remain the most progressive entities in experimenting with various assessment techniques. Unfortunately, these practitioners have not generally contributed to available literature. Yet the experiences of vocational rehabilitation agencies could serve as a rich resource for prime sponsor staff members who are exploring assessment techniques that they can use with their own enrollees.

Assessment techniques can generally be grouped as follows: (1) Tests, (2) interviews (sometimes referred to as "counseling"), (3) the historical, or case study, approach, and (4) observation. Each is reviewed here in terms of its application to employment and training programs.

Tests

Good testing principles and practices are a subject of such controversy that it is beyond the limitations of this monograph to advise the reader concerning them. Instead, this section summarizes the more frequently used tests and, when possible, includes relevant comments of prime sponsors. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) guidelines, various American Psychological Association standards, and the Buros *Mental Measurements Yearbook* (see Bibliography) are appropriate guides for selecting tests.

There are three varieties of tests: (1) Paper and pencil, (2) projective, and (3) work simulations (usually called "work samples" or "work evaluation" systems).

Paper-and-Pencil Tests

Under the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) and other categorical employment and training programs, program operators discovered that traditional tests were not suitable for most of their disadvantaged clientele. Traditional tests are generally paper-and-pencil procedures reminiscent of classroom examinations—an unpleasant experience in the memory of enrollees. Often the language of the tests is not familiar to the enrollees, or it deals in subject matter with which they have had no previous experience.

Some cultures may not consider scores on tests as rating high within their system of values. Enrollees from such cultures are not motivated to do well on a test. In one experiment with New York City enrollees, different forms of the same test were used to measure academic proficiency in reading, language skills, and math. After the first testing and without intervening instruction, a second form of the same test was administered and enrollees were offered financial

incentives for significant improvement in their test scores. The result was that academic scores averaged at least one grade level higher than those reflected on the first test. In some cases, students competed so strongly for the incentive to perform that they jumped four grade levels.

The point is that those from school-oriented backgrounds automatically assume that all persons taking a test that measures skills or ability will strive to do their best. This is not true among many socioeconomic groups enrolled in employment and training programs. Success on a test may entail the obligation to succeed in a program, while failure entails no such obligation.

Many time enrollees scored so low on tests that even the most unsophisticated program operator could see that the tests were not measuring ability or intelligence. The inability of standardized tests to accurately measure employability characteristics resulted in some program operators' abandoning testing altogether. Instead, they employ subjective judgments as to which enrollee can receive the most benefit from training or can succeed in a particular job. Other operators examined the standardized tests to see how they could be improved or how new tests could be developed that would give accurate accounts of an individual's potential for work or training. This section discusses standardized tests that have been found useful and indicates in which situations they may be used to advantage. Some of the standardized tests traditionally in use were reviewed because they have a limited value, but most of this section deals with new instruments that may not be known to program operators and that seem to offer more potential for enrollee evaluation.

The General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB), developed by the United States Employment Service (USES), is one of the best measures of general learning ability, verbal aptitude, numerical aptitude, special aptitude, form perception, clerical perception, motor coordination, finger dexterity, and manual dexterity for individuals who are functioning between the sixth- and twelfth-grade levels. Actually, experience of program operators in using this instrument has shown it to be most valid when used with individuals who have completed the tenth to twelfth grades. Its validity diminishes at (the higher or) lower levels. Without any firm agreement on what "sixth-grade level" refers to, program administrators should not use it with anyone who has not completed the tenth grade of high school. One CETA prime sponsor uses the GATB to assess general intelligence and vocational-related skills of individuals coming into the clinic who can function at the eighth-grade reading level, according to the California Achievement Test (CAT). Staff members did not find the GATB to be particularly helpful for any one performing at a lower grade level.

The California Achievement Test is a common measure of reading, vocabulary, and arithmetic skills that relates performance to grade-level equivalents. Since most classroom training programs require general education at a certain grade level for admission, the CAT has obvious usefulness. Unfortunately, test norms are at least ten years old so that when the person's performance is related to a grade level, it is at that grade level averaged ten years ago. Its advantage is that it can be administered to a group of people and is therefore efficient.

The nonverbal portion of the Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Test is pictorial, diagrammatic, or numeral. Since it assesses an abstract ability to learn, it is not always helpful in measuring ability to learn relevant job-related skills. The experience of the Escambia County (Florida) prime sponsor has been that this test is not as helpful as the revised Beta (a performance-oriented intelligence test) which is used along with the GATB. The revised Beta test includes six areas:

1. Ability to pay attention, to plan, and to use foresight.
2. Ability to perform repetitive tasks that involve new learning and short-term memory.
3. Abstract conceptualization skills.
4. Capacity to perceive spatial relationships.
5. Ability to differentiate essential from nonessential details.
6. Visual discrimination tests that measure clerical skills, speed, and accuracy.

Individuals who have good verbal skills but low performance skills probably will not show high scores on the revised Beta test because it emphasizes performance skills. On the other hand, those with low verbal skills but with adequate performance skills will tend to show high scores. It seems to be an excellent examination procedure for clients who have poor language capability.

The Strong Vocational Interest Blank has application only for persons who have college-level educations. Since it must be machine scored and is expensive, it may not lend itself to common usage.

The Kuder Preference Method is mentioned here because it is in such frequent use among secondary schools to measure occupational interest that it is frequently adopted by employment and training program operators for use with the disadvantaged. The language of this test so limits it use with such populations that program operators are discouraged with the results and are disinclined to use it. The test is rather long, is difficult to score, and is expensive when machine scored.

The Basic Occupational Literacy Test (BOLT) measures reading and arithmetic skills of the disadvantaged. It has the advantage of being able to measure these skills at a low academic level while still appealing to adult interest. This test could be helpful to a program operator performing level 2 assessments to determine whether the individual can benefit from a training program that calls for a specific skill level in arithmetic and reading.

The Social Access Questionnaire (SAQ) measures six personality factors and includes questions about personal history. Its purpose is to measure social and personality characteristics that contribute to job deviance. Designed by the Manpower Laboratory of Colorado State University, it could aid in determining those interventions necessary for successful training and job placement.

The non-reading Aptitude Test Battery (NATB) is an effort to adapt the GATB for use among the disadvantaged population with limited reading skills. The U.S. Employment Service also developed a brief screening exercise that contains a few GATB sample items to determine whether the GATB or NATB would be the test most applicable to a particular subject. Although the research on the NATB is not complete, it is sufficient to suggest that this is a useful assessment device to measure potential for training.

There are other paper-and-pencil tests, such as the Interest Check List, developed by the U.S. Employment Service, which list occupations that the client may check in accordance with his or her interests. The success of this instrument is dependent upon the client's reading skills and a general knowledge of a wide variety of occupations. It is not used successfully with younger clients or individuals who have limited employment history. It is possible to use "decentering"[1] to develop a similar checklist for clients being considered for local training programs or jobs.

An advantage of paper-and-pencil tests is that they tend to be more objective and easier to administer than are other assessment techniques. Many times they can be administered to large groups, whereas the other types of tests cannot. Many of the paper-and-pencil tests can be machine scored, which also adds to their efficiency.

Projective Tests

Projective tests are usually reserved for measuring personality factors. Any projective test calls for a client to be bright, imaginative, and verbal. The extent to which such tests can be useful as part of an assessment depends upon the likelihood that these characteristics can be found in the clients. Self-Concepts Profiling, a pictorial test, measures work attitudes of the seriously disadvantaged. Clients are asked to view pictures of people in work situations and talk about them. The subjects then categorize their own responses and impose their own structure in conceptualizing. A psychologist of considerable skill is required to aid the client's participation in this test. It is time consuming but probably no more so than an unstructured interview.

The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) is a clinical instrument that distinguishes between neurotics, psychotics, and "normals." Used for selection purposes in industry, it is highly regarded internationally as one of the best researched instruments currently in use as a measure of emotional stability. The test consists of 550 statements covering a wide range of subject matter. The client is asked to sort statements into one of three categories: "true," "false," or "cannot say." All forms of this test can be used with literate subjects over the age of 15 who have at least an eighth-grade reading level; thus it has some limitations for many manpower enrollees.

Some test-taking sophistication is required; otherwise, the test is fairly easy to administer. Its construction eliminates tests in which too many answers are not appropriate for the person taking the test; i.e., the score can indicate whether it has high relative validity or is invalid because the subject has suppressed or misrepresented certain materials in her or his responses.

The Minnesota test has the disadvantage that it can be used only by qualified psychologists. However, a psychologist at less than a doctorate level can use it if supervised by a person with high qualifications. There is danger in using this test as a sole basis for a diagnosis of emotional stability — it should be used only to support data from other assessments, particularly interviews and observations.

Work Simulations

Probably the assessment device that is developing the greatest popularity at this time is the use of work simulations (or work samples) to evaluate work potential. Work samples such as those developed by the Jewish Employment and Vocational Services are meant to address problems associated with paper-and-pencil tests; namely, that such tests measure an individual's vocabulary and reading skill more than anything else. The value of a well-constructed work sample is that it can measure personal characteristics that relate to training or job success as well as the client's trainability.

The use of work samples grew out of the efforts of rehabilitation agencies to work with the physically and mentally handicapped. The work sample is a simulated work experience that relates directly to measurements of job-related skills as they are demonstrated in practice. By assessing the performance and time required by the client to complete the task, the client's work potential can be compared with the norm for the various sample tests. The chief disadvantage of a work sample is that it depends greatly upon observation and the interpretations of the observer-assessor. The assessor using work samples needs special skills.

Although training is available to provide staff members with these skills, it is not included in the usual university curriculum. The other disadvantage of a work sample is that it entails expense in setting up a laboratory that simulates a variety of work experiences. To operate an assessment center that includes work samples, one must have: (1) Sufficient time to put a client through a work sample, (2) qualified staff who can understand and interpret the behavior of the

[1] "Decentering" is the process by which vocabulary and reading levels are altered to fit a specific culture. This is accomplished by using as translators members of the target population who are bilingual -- that is, familiar with terms used by both the middle class and disadvantaged groups. To check to see if the translation is complete, a second bilingual group is invited to interpret its meaning to see if it accurately reflects the original document. This is a practical method for use in developing application forms, checklists, and interview schedules.

[2] Appendix B is a detailed guide for conducting a behavioral assessment developed by Goodwill Industries of South Florida, Inc. Although not relevant to employment and training programs, it does demonstrate how one program operator formalized the behavioral assessment that invariably occurs during intake and assessment.

client engaged in a work sample, and (3) ample space to accommodate a work laboratory. These real costs seem to discourage many employment and training program operators from employing the work sample approach.

On the other hand, there are a great many advantages. The properly selected work sample can provide the most valid information on how a client is likely to participate in training or proceed in employment. It avoids measuring unrelated skills such as vocabulary and language when they are not directly related to the occupation sampled. It reflects no cultural bias. It has an educational effect on the clients in that it introduces them to occupations with which they may have no familiarity or exposure, thereby suggesting career opportunities they had not previously considered.

Seven packaged work samples are worthy of some attention: The McCarron-Dial Work Evaluation System, the Jewish Employment and Vocational Services (JEVS) system, the Singer Vocational Evaluation System (Singer/Graflex system),* the Talent Assessment Programs, the Tower system, the Valpar Component Work Sample Series, and the Wide Range Employment Sample Test. All are discussed in *A Comparison of Seven Vocational Systems* by the Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute. (listed in the Bibliography). Anyone considering purchasing a packaged work sample should read this document before making a choice. This section reviews only three of these work samples TOWER, JEVS, and Valpar because of their known use in employment and training projects.

The TOWER System. The TOWER is mentioned here because it has the longest history of use and is considered a pioneer effort in the field of work samples. TOWER has been used extensively for clients with mental and physical disabilities and has earned high praise among rehabilitation agencies for its predictive value. However, research does not support some of the testimonials. It requires 5 to 7 weeks to complete all 110 samples. Since the work samples are not individually packaged, a program operator would have to purchase the entire system to use any portion of it. For these reasons, the TOWER has cost liabilities. If assessment of emotionally or physically handicapped people is important to a program, it would probably be advisable to consult local rehabilitation agencies, which may be using work samples for this purpose, and purchase special assessment services as needed.

The Jewish Employment and Vocational Services System. JEVS developed a standardized set of work samples through a contract with the Department of Labor. This evaluation system has been used to assess more disadvantaged persons than has any other work sample system. As of 1972, 35 projects, including 12 Work Incentive (WIN) Program and 18 Concentrated Employment Program centers, had adopted the JEVS approach. The extent of current use is unknown. The JEVS work evaluation system consists of 28 basic assessment samples that represent 10 worker trait group assessments of occupational catagories taken from the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*. Its chief value is in judging areas of interest and competency among the clients. The work samples are all self-contained in carrels. The entire system requires 3 weeks to complete. Since administration of the samples relies upon audiovisual and programmed instructions, fewer staff can asses more people than is possible with other systems.

The Valpar Component Work Sample Series. Valpar was initially developed for workers injured in industrial accidents. It contains 12 subsets that measure skills in dealing with: (1) Small tools (mechanical), (2) size discrimination, (3) numerical sorting, (4) upper extremity range and motion, (5) clerical comprehension and aptitude, (6) independent problem solving, (7) multilevel sorting, (8) simulated assembly, (9) whole body range of motion, (10) tri-level measurement, (11) eye, hand, and foot coordination, and (12) soldering. Each sample can be used separately and is individually packaged. It requires 12 to 15 hours to complete all of the units. While training is available, this system does not require special training for its administration. The ease with which it can be administered and scored is one of its most attractive features.

Interviews

Scheduled interviews are also a form of assessment. A scheduled interview differs from an unstructured interview in that it relies upon a written format to guide the interviewer. It permits some flexibility to accommodate the personal differences of interviewees.

An interview schedule has other advantages over the unstructured interviews that are commonly the basis for assessment in most manpower programs. A guided, structured interview reduces the number of extraneous variables that would bias the information gathered. Remembering that an essential element of assessment is valid, unbiased information, one should limit the use of unstructured interviews.

Case Study

Biographical data provide a valuable assessment tool. The Biographical Information Blank has been used extensively by the Jobs Corps to predict length of participation in training or job tenure in the event of placement. It covers nine major categories, some of which may be found in traditional application blanks. Other categories concern feelings, attitudes, and value judgments.

The purpose of this instrument is to determine whether the client is a good program or employment risk. It has also been

* The Singer/Graflex system requires some test sophistication. One prime sponsor familiar with this method does not recommend it. It is rather expensive because considerable material cannot be reused.

used by State Employment Security Agencies and among WIN participants to determine what intervention strategies may be necessary to maintain their enrollment.

Observation

Not to be overlooked is observation as an assessment tool. It is often criticized as being the least objective of all methods of assessment. Despite some truth to this criticism, client behavior monitored by a trained observer may provide some of the most effective measures of client motivation, interest, and ability on the grounds that the best predictor of future behavior is past behavior. During the period of assessment, the client observed to be on time, to be attentive, cooperative, eager to participate, and able to follow directions is likely to exhibit the same behavior in a training program.

Although measurement of behavior is not a difficult process, analysis is another matter. A client who is inattentive, frequently absent, or late may reflect lack of interest in the assessment process, fear of being assessed or, anticipating failure, a casual disregard for the whole affair for ego protection purposes. On the other hand, a client may have been kept awake by a sick child night after night and had other problems that bear no relationship to motivation. However, some take the point of view that the "why's" behind the behavior are unimportant. Poor attendance has the same effect on the training process when it results from lack of interest as when it is the consequence of poor health. Understanding the "why's" is generally necessary, though, when an intervention strategy is available and under consideration.

Choosing and Using Assessment Methods

This chapter is designed to give the reader a brief overview of what assessment instruments are available and what their limitations are. The information presented is not intended to be sufficient for firm decisions concerning the choice of assessment instruments. For further information, consult *Methods of Assessing the Disadvantaged in Manpower Programs* (see Bibliography). Readers interested in expanding upon the interview as an informational device should read *Worker Traits Training Units* (also listed in the Bibliography). For assistance in quickly surveying all of the assessment instruments currently in use, refer to Appendix C, "Summary of Assessment Tools for the Disadvantaged."

Good assessment tools and trained staff to administer them are essential requirements of an effective intake and assessment activity. Some of the assessment devices, particularly the work samples, offer training for people purchasing the materials. Training in the use of paper-and-pencil tests is included in advanced postgraduate work in the field of psychometrics. All of the tests mentioned here probably could be administered by a psychometrist at the master's degree level who had a qualified psychologist at the doctoral level available as a consultant. The training required for use of the USES-developed tests, the GATB and the NATB, may be obtained through the local SESA office. Generally, projective tests call for a higher degree of training than do the nonprojective tests. In contrast, the trained and skilled observer may have only a bachelor's degree with a major in psychology that is behavioristic in its orientation.

Good interviewers possess, by virtue of training or innate ability, a high degree of sensitivity and awareness of self. Self-awareness is an essential characteristic of all assessors because they tend to project their own personality, attitudes, and biases on clients. Recognizing this inclination is the first step toward curtailing biases of those giving the test. Another recommended approach is team assessment, allowing personal biases to cancel each other. The team approach to evaluation is one in which each team member uses different methods to gain information. To the extent that the team can agree in overlapping areas, validity is enhanced.

In addition to valid assessment tools and trained personnel, strong linkages to other program components are critical to intake and assessment. The goal is to provide valid information that is sufficient for clients and program operators to make judgments concerning the distribution of services. Therefore, the assignment to a particular activity or service should be the joint decision of the staff person who will be held accountable for the program results and the client.

The nature of the linkage between intake and assessment and other program activities determines whether intake and assessment are regarded as helpful or are resented by staff members of other program components. Unless the assessment unit is to be held accountable for program outcomes, unit members should not decide on enrollment. Usually, client assessment is held to be an area of specialization, whereas the client services component is in the hands of generalists who assume responsibility for caseload management and the implementation of a plan for services. Assessment should not imply selection; it should provide input to decision makers. The relevant decision makers are, first, clients, and second, the staff responsible for program results.

Often overlooked is the opportunity for feedback to the intake and assessment unit concerning the accuracy of its predictions. Once the client has been assessed and enrolled in a program activity, seldom does the intake and assessment unit hear anything more. A constant feedback into the intake and assessment unit would allow its members to readjust their procedures or alter their approach. Without feedback, there is no positive change. It is extremely important that intake and assessment units see their roles as supportive of other program activities, since that is clearly their function.

3. DESCRIPTION OF VARIATIONS IN THE PROGRAM MODEL

In the earlier discussion of the essential elements of the design of an intake and assessment activity, it was stated that the first element concerned the kinds of data sought, which could be categorized into three levels according to: (1) The intensity of the assessment process, (2) how the activity is managed to maximize cost-effectiveness, and (3) whether there is one or more than one purpose of the intake and assessment process. By combining these three essential elements, one can evolve nine possible intake and assessment models, reflecting the level of assessment, the extent to which it is multifunctional, and whether it is managed as a product of one or more than one agency effort. These nine models are illustrated in the matrix in chart 1. The models identify essential elements of an intake and assessment activity and are designed to help the reader structure his or her thinking on the subject.

CHART 1. INTAKE AND ASSESSMENT MATRIX

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
A	A	A
B	B	B
C	C	C

Legend:
A = Single function, single agency.
B = Multifunction, single agency
C = Multifunction, multiagency.

One should keep in mind that level 1, 2, or 3 refers to the intensity of the assessment process: function refers to a primary purpose, and single agency or multiagency refers to the number of agencies that contribute to the intake and assessment process. To the extent that these elements can be identified, one can determine which of the models is currently being operated. This chapter describes in detail variations of the models and gives readers an idea of the available options according to their particular circumstances.

The Single Function, Single Agency Model (Level 1)

The level 1 model is used by prime sponsors whose priority is to determine eligibility as quickly and as inexpensively as possible. Assessment is conducted at the level 1 activity by a structured or unstructured interview that involves completing an intake or application form. It uses the data collected for no other purpose than to determine eligibility or priority for enrollment. It is operated by one agent, usually the prime sponsor or an agency under contract to the prime sponsor. Because of the simplicity of its design, the planning, management, and monitoring activities can be handled by the same supervisory personnel.

The internal structures are simple, since a single agency's staff is involved in conducting assessment. The prime sponsor operating this model reflects the philosophy of accepting clients on a first come, first served basis. Although cost per participant will be the lowest of all models, the overall program costs may be inflated by high turnover among clients incorrectly matched to training activity. Since a prime sponsor must examine total cost for achieving successful job placement, this will be an important consideration in using this model. It is especially true of indirect placements when

To simplify the discussion, a centralized intake system is assumed. Obviously, intake could be accomplished by several employment and training agencies (i.e., contractors, subgrantees). The "single agency" would be the CETA prime sponsor.

labor market conditions are not conducive to easy placement. When labor demand is high, even poorly served clients and unsuccessful trainees may be able to secure jobs.

This model benefits participants by permitting them ready access to available program services. Operating such a model can best be justified by small prime sponsors that have only a limited number of clients and a limited number of program activities available to them. This is the most commonly used assessment procedure for summer youth employment programs, when time is a significant constraint upon assessment activity and services are usually limted to work experience.

The validity of these assessments depends upon the professional judgment of the interviewer responsible for helping the client complete the application or other forms. Of course, the accuracy of the client's self-reports determines the extent to which this information is reliable and valid.

Generally, the results of programs that operate this model are: (1) High dropout rates or nonpositive terminations, (2) low cost per participant served, with more participants being served in order to replace those who drop out, and (3) high cost per placement. This model is popular with both participants and program operators. Program operators like it because it is simple to administer and relatively inexpensive in terms of short-range objectives. Participants like this model because they move quickly from the status of an applicant to one of an enrollee, which is their short-range objective. It is only in long-range outcomes, such as success in training programs and training-related placements, that the disadvantage of this model is felt. Because of the many events occurring between intake and assessment and termination, the responsibility for the failure of the program or the client is seldom related to the intake and assessment activity.

The New York balance-of-State prime sponsor has developed an innovative tool for determining eligibility; it demonstrates the level 1 single function, single agency model. Within the balance-of-State jurisdiction, there is an employment and training office responsible for intake and assessment in each county. The county office completes an application form on each CETA applicant and then may apply a "priority profile matrix" (see appendix A) to develop a score. Scores indicate the extent of need on the part of the individual applicant. Those applicants who have the highest scores are referred to the subcontractor for training or, in the case of public service employment, are referred to the employing agency for selection. The prime sponsor assumes no assessment responsibility beyond this point, leaving final selection of the applicants to the individual subcontractor.

This is an example of a level 1 assessment in operation, unusually refined in that a matrix converts client characteristics into a numerical code that can be combined into an overall rating of the eligibility of each client. This instrument addresses one of the frequently cited problems among prime sponsors. In view of the eligibility requirements and the priority classifications identified by the prime sponsor, how does one decide whom to enroll when the number of eligible people exceeds program capacity and represents a variety of different target groups? The New York balance-of-State matrix addresses this problem by quantifying these characteristics so that they can be combined into a total score.

The information secured through the intake and assessment process is used only to determine who should be accepted for service. This is not uncommon in balance-of-State projects where the areas being served may be sparsely populated or noncontiguous, with few resources to draw upon. It would still be advisable that some assessment activity at level 2 be undertaken, even in those instances when there are more needy eligible persons available for training than there are training slots. Even in small balance-of-State districts, cost-effectiveness is a consideration. With limited resources, it becomes even more important that clients be carefully screened so that high turnover can be avoided.

The Multifunction, Single Agency Model (Level 1)

This model serves some functions in addition to eligibility determination. The assessment process is linked to some other service or program benefit. Possible program benefits may be, for example, the use of data regarding client eligibility for a research effort or a Federal reporting requirement. A program director could use a multifunction model to increase the benefits for the program management and the client without significantly increasing the cost of collecting data. Although the level 1 assessment activity does not produce a great deal of data, it can be helpful in providing the information to support the management information system that will eventually produce the Federal reports.

Getting the maximum use of the data calls for careful planning and some expansion of data collected. The management of this system calls for well-constructed forms to collect the information and a flow chart that allows it to be used for other designated purposes. Monitoring this model entails reviewing client data for accuracy as well as determining to what extent the information is used for its intended purpose. Since the model calls for no addition in staff and only a slight increase in the complexity of the work, coordination would not seem to be a problem. To the extent that the function served involves other agencies, there would be some need to coordinate activities of the assessing agency with those of the other agencies.

There should be little increase in cost and therefore greater cost-effectiveness over the previous model. To the extent that the use of the data produces satisfactory results, this model can be said to be a good one. One of its disadvantages is that it produces limited data. Getting maximum use of the limited data would be an advantage. Many prime sponsors currently are using level 1 assessment activity, incorporating a single function model. Converting it to a multifunction model would be a way to get more use from the CETA dollar without a major transition.

The Multifunction, Multiagency Model (Level 1)

This model operates at a level 1 assessment activity, serves more than one function, and is jointly supported by more than one agency. The basis for any multiagency model is a collaboration of several community agencies that have agreed to make their individual contributions to the assessment process in return for shared benefits. Since this model only determines eligibility for admission to a program activity, it is unlikely that many agencies would be interested in it. In addition, the cost of level 1 assessment activity is not going to be so great that the prime sponsor would seek other agencies to share expenses. Such a model presents many management problems because of the division of labor among several entities. Hence coordination becomes a greater problem. There is considerable risk of breakdowns in communications among the agencies; thus this model may prove to be a greater administrative burden than its intended benefits are worth.

The only advantage of this model is that getting other agencies to share the cost of eligibility determination increases the cost-effectiveness to the prime sponsor. It is recommended for use only when the participating agencies have a history of successfully coordinating their efforts with minimal management problems.

The Single Function, Single Agency Model (Level 2)

Because of the increased complexity of providing some measures to determine who will be suitable for enrollment in any particular activity, the staff for this model must have some special training in test administration. Since there are more tasks to perform, there must be more staff people to perform them. This increases costs per participant. However, the likelihood of assigning clients to the appropriate activities is greater, and turnover should be reduced. Placement costs should decrease.

Planning of this model calls for:

1. Determining which characteristics a client should possess, not only to be eligible for enrollment but also to be successful in the program activities available.
2. Identifying which information is needed to document those characteristics.
3. Selecting the instruments and procedures that will solicit that information.
4. Appointing staff people who can administer the assessment.

Feedback becomes important in this model because it requires that predictions be made. Monitoring the accuracy of the predictions should be constant. This may be accomplished by follow-up reports of clients' success in training or in placement, which are reviewed by the assessment staff and compared with the information collected. This calls for a monitoring process not needed in the level 1 methods.

External coordination takes on greater importance, since it is essential to the monitoring process. Internally, coordination is complicated by the structuring of the assessment process into specific tasks delegated to individual staff members. These people must coordinate their findings and work together in the assessment of a particular client. Scheduling tests involves coordinating with other staff persons who are also scheduling tests for the same client. It is possible, of course, that in this level of assessment a single staff person may administer whatever measures are deemed to be of value. In such a case, coordination should not pose a problem.

One consideration in deciding on this model is its possible adverse effects on clients. Generally, people do not enjoy any assessment process for fear they will not do well. It is possible that clients will be screened out as a consequence of the information obtained during intake and assessment. They may then be inhibited, by fear of similar rejection, from seeking other employment and training programs that may be better able to serve their needs. Turning away clients who have completed an assessment process reinforces negative feelings toward agencies that serve them. As a result, they may be discouraged from making further attempts to seek vocational objectives. This effect must be weighed against the results for clients who are better matched with the training or employment activity and hence succeed. The model differs from the level 1 single function, single agency model as to the time when the client experiences failure—at the time of assessment or in the course of training.

In summary, this model is far more supportive of the training and placement activity than are the level 1 models, but it may not be perceived as helpful to clients who were rejected as a consequence of the assessment process. It increases the cost of intake and assessment, but reduces placement costs. It is more difficult to administer than are level 1 models.

The Broward Manpower Council in Florida is a consortium that represents one county and two municipalities. The council has three locations for intake; in addition, it has a mobile van that is scheduled to be in various communities at certain times for the purpose of intake. The entire intake and assessment process is managed by prime sponsor staff—therefore it represents a single agency model. The intake process in the Boward consortium begins by having a potential client complete an application form at one of the intake centers. There is some general orientation for the client at this time, and the Psychological Corporation's ABLE test (which assesses academic skills in reading, vocabulary, and math) is given. The test is designed to appeal to the culturally disadvantaged adult. The scores can be converted to grade equivalents, which enables the Broward consortium staff to determine if the client's choice of training and occupational

objective is commensurate with her or his academic background. The client, along with the test results, is then referred to a counselor. The counselor assists the client in confirming his or her vocational objective or, when this is not appropriate, in selecting other goals.

There is also further orientation at this phase of assessment, with structured and unstructured interviews being the source of most of the information. In the event that the counselor feels further testing is necessary, the client is referred to the staff psychometrist, who may apply any of a number of additional assessment instruments.

The results of these assessments allow the counselor to determine which particular program is most appropriate for the client. If there is no opening in the appropriate program, the client's name is placed on a waiting list until such time as he or she can be enrolled. Although this assessment process includes the use of a variety of sophisticated instruments, it is important to note that most clients receive academic assessment only. Thus, this process represents a level 2 assessment for most clients and a level 3 assessment for some. One psychometrist and a number of counselors comprise the staff, making this a fairly inexpensive activity.

There is some prejudice against tests of this nature, and some communities may accept their use only in this limited way. Not getting consistent data on every client limits the many functions the information could possibly provide. For instance, Broward County has only one function for its level 2 assessment: the proper assignment of clients to appropriate training or employment activities. Although there is some informal referral to other agencies, it is not considered a function of the assessment center.

The Broward Manpower Council is operating a level 2 single function, single agency model. It could very easily move to a level 3 assessment by expanding its staff and assessment services. The cost of this might be prohibitive if it continues to meet only the single function of client services. In the event that it can use the information gathered for other functions and purposes, the extra cost could be justified.

The Multifunction, Single Agency Model (Level 2)

In this model, the assessment data are used for purposes in addition to client enrollment, thereby supporting a multifunction goal. At this level of assessment, program operators would have some knowledge of the nature of the clients they could not enroll, an invaluable tool. Thus, one function that may be served by this model is program planning. The relationship of the assessment activity to the planning process would determine how this model might be managed. Multiple centers would have to have one central data collection point, which would have an impact on the management information system.

The coordination of this model depends upon how many centers are collecting the information and how many subcontractors may be using the information. It is unusual for an agency to share its information without sharing the cost of collecting the information. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that this model may serve multiple functions, but they will be functions that are determined by the prime sponsor. It is conceivable, however, that the level 2 assessment activity could collect data related to adult education programs, which the prime sponsor could make available to the local school board. It would be a generous prime sponsor that would meet the information needs of an outside agency; however, it is something to be considered.

Because of the higher level of assessment activity, this model is more expensive than level 1 models. However, the increased cost of collecting the data is offset by the multifunction aspect of the model. In the final analysis, cost-effectiveness should not be a disadvantage in operating the model.

This model will have the greatest impact on the community of those considered thus far. It is in a position to make other agency resources available to the participants by functioning as a referral service. It has the advantage of being reasonably inexpensive to operate while offering many benefits to clients and program operators. It does not require staff skills that exceed those available to most prime sponsors. Because it is a single agency operation, it requires minimal external and internal coordination.

Montgomery County, Md., operates a level 2 multifunction, single agency model. With the support of a substantial number of other community resources, Montgomery County is able to serve all who apply for job-related training. The intake and assessment component directs eligible applicants to appropriate services that correspond to client needs. It is used also as a means of collecting data to support program review and adjustments.

The Montgomery County level 2 assessment involves certification of eligibility at the reception center. An intake form is completed and reviewed by an assessment counselor, who also interviews the client. These techniques solicit information regarding past training, education, work history, personal data, and client vocational preferences. If the clients are determined to be job ready, they are referred to the placement unit. If job training is indicated, the assessment counselor recommends a vocational area and refers the client to the employment counseling unit. There, an employment counselor engages the client in further interviews and may administer the GATB or other tests that are prerequisite to acceptance by particular training institutions. Based upon the client's self-reports and test results, an employability plan and training request are initiated. This program operator may refer clients to any of a variety of training facilities.

A number of good assessment tools are available: the revised Beta, the differential aptitude tests, the Binet Handtool Dexterity Test, the Crawford Small Parts Dexterity Test, the Short Employment Test (SET) Clerical Aptitude Test, the Wonderlic Personnel Test, the Kuder Preference Test, the Geist Picture Interest Inventory, the Sixteen Personality Factors test, the Aptitude for Nursing Exam, the Lorge Vocational Survey, or the Personnel Test for Industry (PTI) Test of Ability to Follow Oral Directions.

Tests are used more to determine whether a client is acceptable to the trainer under consideration rather than to decide upon a vocational choice. The client's past history and interests generally determine vocational choice. This information is obtained through interviews after the client has had the opportunity to review special literature on occupations.

The Multifunction, Multiagency Model (Level 2)

This model would be likely to be found in operations where several agencies have agreed that the data derived from the assessment process would be mutually beneficial and thereby warrant a joint endeavor to achieve shared objectives. An example would be an agency specifically designed to accommodate needs not met by the prime sponsor. This agency could have an outreach recruitment facility located at the assessment center. The prime sponsor benefits in that it has some alternative to offer clients who cannot be enrolled, namely, the services of the other agency. Providing access to such alternatives is wise from a political as well as a humanitarian view.

As stated earlier, the more information gathered in the course of assessment, the greater the probability that assessment can serve several purposes. This, in turn, makes it an attractive joint venture for other agencies. This model calls for thoughtful planning because it offers many possibilities to the prime sponsor. Each potential use of data must be weighed.

Of course, the management of a level 2 multifunction, multiagency model entails more staff training and more monitoring of information flow than do the models discussed earlier. When several agencies are cooperating to conduct assessment, supervision is a key management issue. Having staff reporting to a different administrator poses peculiar problems. This can be avoided by giving one agency total responsibility for the activity and subcontracting with the other agencies. However, the reluctance of many agencies to relinquish control over their staffs poses a problem for anyone operating this model.

In some cases, the assessment process can be divided neatly into sectors, with each agency being allowed a particular sector to manage. The results of the assessment process are later coordinated in one central office. This information is then divided into sharing units and redirected to the appropriate agency requiring it. This process probably requires a more intricate management information system and more time spent in planning the flow of information than do single agency operations. There may also be problems in maintaining control over access to confidential information.

Invariably any multiagency model is going to entail some management time spent maintaining good communications and a high level of trust among agencies. This model cannot function well if the agencies involved are not committed to the same objectives.

Although problems of coordination and management are disadvantages, better cost-effectiveness is a key advantage of this model. A level 2 assessment center is less expensive to the prime sponsor if it meets several functions and shares cost among several agencies. In many instances, this model provides the only means whereby a prime sponsor is able to get involved in a level 2 assessment activity considered necessary for good program results.

The Metropolitan Baltimore Consortium consists of the City of Baltimore and five surrounding counties. This sizable urban employment and training program uses a level 2 multifunction, multiagency model but allows for a level 3 assessment in special cases. The Baltimore consortium provides intake and some level 2 assessment through its fifteen manpower service centers. Four of these centers are contained in mobile units operated by the prime sponsor. Six are subcontracted to the employment service (with four of them jointly funded by the employment service and the prime sponsor), and five are subcontracted to community-based organizations. Manpower service centers receive applications for CETA-funded training. After eligibility has been established, a service center may provide either direct job placement or assessment to determine an appropriate referral to one of the training contractors.

In addition to the multiple intake centers, there are also multiple training contractors. Eligibility criteria for each training program are set jointly by the prime sponsor and the training contractor. The manpower service center provides a level 2 assessment for determining appropriate referrals for training. This assessment includes counseling interviews and testing in math and reading. The Job Corps reading test is used to determine reading grade level. Level II of the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) math section is used to measure a client's math grade level. Decisions regarding training and job referrals are based primarily on the counselor's holistic assessment of the client (prior education, avocations, physical health, interests, previous work experience, vocational training, and so forth). Set in this context, math and reading grade levels are seen as two of the many factors to be considered.

Two clients are referred for each opening in accordance with agreements with the training contractor. The purpose of the level 2 assessment is to effect an approximate match of a client's training needs with services available through the training contractor. The high volume of applications demands that testing be as brief as possible at this point. Once clients have been referred for openings, the training contractor may administer more tests and further screen them to select appropriate enrollees. The Psychological Corporation's Fundamental Achievement Series is a common test used by training contractors.

When the service center identifies clients requiring individualized services before becoming employable, it refers them to the Baltimore Goodwill Industries, Inc. This agency

serves as another training contractor, with specific emphasis on the hard-to-serve client. This more comprehensive service package includes a level 3 assessment, followed by a highly individualized plan for services. Such services may include work adjustment, job readiness, vocational training, supportive services, and job placement.

The Baltimore Goodwill Industries, Inc., uses the Hester Vegas System to provide a computerized printout of client characteristics, using the code numbers of the *Dictionary of Occupational Titles*. It may also conduct some psychological testing, work sampling, and exposure to the Singer/Graflex evaluation system. Its Vocational Exploration Guidance Assessment involves an exposure to a number of different work areas, followed by an in-depth interview. A vocational evaluation with these methods may take three or four weeks.

Baltimore has developed a process that meets the following identified needs: (1) Service to a high volume of clients in a densely populated urban area; (2) screening for appropriate referral to training and job placement; and (3) providing services to especially disadvantaged and hard-to-serve enrollees.

Data from the level 2 assessment conducted by the service centers are fed into the Baltimore Management Information System (MIS), where they become the raw data for Federal reports. This information is also used by the Baltimore consortium's research department as a basis for study of client placements. Therefore, the assessment process not only provides clients with an appropriate referral to training but also supports the program's research efforts and reporting requirements. It is classified as a multiagency model in that the Baltimore model provides its assessment services with the assistance of the employment service, which in some cases contributes personnel and other resources.

The Single Function, Single Agency Model (Level 3)

The primary difference between this model and those previously described is the extent of the assessment activity. A level 3 activity includes a full range of diagnostic procedures that serve as the basis for a plan of individualized services. This should be undertaken only when a number of services and activities are available to clients. The process involves the use of a wide variety of assessment instruments, the selection of which is based upon an analysis of information needed to correctly match clients to available services or job opportunities. Because of the cost associated with this activity, it is important that the prime sponsor carefully analyze what information is needed to avoid collecting data that will have no relevance to the services or activities available. Obviously, every eligible client cannot be given an extensive assessment because the cost is prohibitive. Prescreening is usually accomplished with the help of structured interviews, group counseling sessions, in-depth orientation to the program, and use of rough indicators of general education.

Because of the sophistication of the assessment process and the test measures to be used, a large and well trained staff is required. A level 3 assessment activity precludes the possibility that any one staff person can independently complete the entire diagnostic process for the client. This means that a number of staff members must function as an assessment team, each relating to the client in his or her particular area of expertise. If the team approach is properly used, the staff will have overlapping areas that will allow for checks of biases that tend to affect validation of the data collected.

Interdependent team members require greater attention to coordination than do staff functioning independently of one another. Clients must be scheduled for interviews, tests, work samples, and other assessments so that each member of the team has the client available when needed. This requirement for internal coordination of clients and team members is one of the disadvantages of a level 3 assessment. If it is not well managed, this process can be prolonged to the despair of the client and the frustration of the program operators awaiting the information.

Monitoring has the same importance to this model as it did to level 2 models. Feedback on the accuracy of all predictions and relevancy of data must be directed to the assessment unit. Since there are more data involved, there is a greater need for increased feedback.

The materials, staff, and time involved to complete a level 3 assessment greatly increase the cost per participant assessed. However, because of the validity, availability, and scope of the data obtained, it should reduce the cost per client successfully served in a program activity or placed in a job. The kinds of level 3 assessment tools commonly used are interviews, aptitude and interest tests, work evaluations, attitudinal measures, social assessments, and physical examinations. The increased cost is likely to discourage any prime sponsor from operating level 3 assessment alone, particularly when it serves only one function. The cost is likely to exceed the benefits.

A level 2 assessment usually involves the paper-and-pencil test, whereas a level 3 assessment probably includes this test, plus more structured interviews, projective tests, interest tests, social assessments, and physical examinations. None of these additional assessments are likely to incur resistance among clients since they relate primarily to concrete behaviors and generally involve one-to-one client-staff relationships. Clients are less likely to feel that they are competing with others in their groups and can enjoy the special attention that the process affords them. The increased assessment is unlikely to result in more people being rejected than would be found unsuitable by the level 2 assessment (although physical examinations may reveal disabilities that would prohibit clients from participating in training activities).

A level 3 assessment may be resisted by planning councils or elected officials who are prejudiced against "fancy" tests, especially when they are administered by a psychologist. Many people view such testing as having the implication that

mental aberrations are suspected. The layman also may be unaware of the usefulness of some of the more sophisticated assessment tools and may resist spending money in this way.

The overall advantage of this model is that it provides the most helpful kinds of information to govern selection of services and training activity for a particular client. However, when this kind of assessment is incorporated in a model that has only one function and is operated by a single agency, the cost is generally prohibitive.

The Multifunction, Single Agency Model (Level 3)

This model provides a full diagnostic analysis of each participant. It can be a great sources of information for fulfilling other program functions. The prime sponsor would use this model in situations where the community lacks an adequate information referral service and the planning council considers it to be the CETA program's responsibility to provide intensive counseling to unemployed people, including those that it will not be able to enroll. One service that lends itself to this model is counseling in areas such as health care and domestic relations.

Because of the extent of the level 3 inquiry and the data available to pinpoint real needs, information and referral services are more beneficial to the client than are those resulting from more limited assessments. Similarly, an agency is more likely to be responsive to a client referred to it, because of the quality of the material supporting the referral. This model provides immediate service to the client in the community in a measurable way. Other agencies are benefited by having case histories and some diagnostic information available to them.

Of course, planning for the operation of this model suggests consideration of a number of factors:

1. Selection of assessment instructions.
2. Selection of staff to conduct the assessment activity.
3. How the information, some of which is highly confidential, can be used.
4. How this information will be transferred from the assessment center to the user agency.
5. How information can support other agency activities.

Monitoring this model requires great care in reviewing the accuracy of the information initially collected and even greater care in tracing its use by participating agencies to be assured that it was not misused.

The management of this model presents distinctive problems. The scheduling of the administration of tests, counseling interviews, and so forth must be coordinated carefully so that clients are available to the various assessment specialists when needed. Moreover, the management of this model requires that the flow of information be controlled. If the prime sponsor is operating an information and referral service, linkages between the prime sponsor and other agencies must be effective. To evaluate benefits to the client, the sponsor would have to determine that the client, when referred, received some benefits that he or she could not have received just as well without the referral. This would entail followup monitoring the referrals.

A chief disadvantage of this model is that the expense of operating a level 3 assessment activity is almost too great for a small prime sponsor. It is unlikely that any prime sponsor could justify the cost of this model solely in terms of meeting its program objectives and goals. However, a manpower planning council could justify an information and referral service as a general support to the labor market, going beyond those people who will become CETA enrollees.

The Multifunction, Multiagency Model (Level 3)

Of all the models so far discussed, this is the most complex and difficult to operate. However, since it is a multiagency model, expenses can be shared by collaborating agencies in a way that may make it cost-effective for all concerned. A level 3 assessment activity provides ample data to accommodate many purposes and therefore offers more to a greater number of agencies. This model offers the most to the community and to the client.

In planning this model, one should first consider the kinds of information required in the assessment process in order to serve the function of individualization of services to the client. Second, one must think through what other functions could be served by multiple use of the same information or by a slight expansion of the information. Could this information be used as a basis for a refined information and referral service? Could it be used as a means of monitoring client change and therefore the effectiveness of program activities? The planner should give thought to other agencies that have similar goals and an interest in the same client population. If a welfare office has a commitment to serve low-income mothers receiving public assistance by rehabilitating them for eventual self-support, it would have some of the same information needs as the prime sponsor.

Planning would not only identify these agencies but also, based upon their needs, would expand and refine the level 3 assessment. They would need to have input regarding a share of the cost of the assessment process and the extent to which they could commit resources to this end. This would be the basis for a plan for the management of the model that would take into consideration the extensive need for monitoring to assure coordination and timeliness. Any level 3 assessment can be time consuming, and caution should be exercised to see that the clients are served expeditiously—a greater problem when more than one agency is involved in the process.

Monitoring should also determine what effect the model is having on the client in terms of perceived benefits. If the management plan calls for each agency to contribute staff members to perform specific assessment activities, some one person or agency must be assigned the responsibility for management. Direct lines of communication should be established and specific duties of each staff member, including the assessment supervisor, spelled out in writing. The use to be made of the information should also be agreed upon. In this regard, differing agency philosophies and policies come into play. Some agencies may feel that no information obtained in this process can be used to prevent a client from taking advantage of the prime sponsor's service. The prime sponsor may view assessment as a means of screening people for training and employment activities. Such conflicts would have to be resolved in the course of the planning of this model.

The tradeoff is the model's cost-effectiveness. A highly sophisticated and expensive assessment process can be within the financial reach of any prime sponsor if a sufficient number of agencies in the community are willing and able to share the cost. Agencies that generally share an interest in serving the same clients as the prime sponsor would be the local welfare department, the employment service, and vocational rehabilitation agencies. This model provides a most effective basis for an information and referral service that prevents clients from being shuttled from one agency to another without follow-up. It prevents inappropriate referrals because of inaccurate or insufficient information. This model's greatest advantage is that it provides the community with a coordinated information referral service that is capable of obtaining the most suitable agency services for the client. Its disadvantage is related to its complex linkages, both internally and externally. Skills in planning and management are required to maintain such a model with success.

The Escamoia County (Fla.) prime sponsor is an example of a level 3 multifunction, multiagency model. This is surprising in that Escambia is a small prime sponsor with a Title I grant of approximately $1 million annually. Escambia County maintains a level 3 assessment system at a cost to the prime sponsor of approximately $68,000 per year.

Intake is contracted to the Florida State Employment Service, which interviews applicants to determine eligibility and referral for either employment or training. Those applicants referred for training are assembled in groups for program orientation and prescreening by the assessment center. A California Achievement Test locator exam and brief paragraphs written by applicants are examined along with application forms. Since the assessment center is also an information and referral service serving State health and rehabilitative agencies as well as CETA programs, selection of clients to be assessed provides opportunities for services that exist in several different agencies. For example, if there are no openings for CETA-skills training but there are openings in the remedial education class, clients who have the greatest need for these services would enter the assessment center. Clients with severe handicaps would be enrolled as potential vocational rehabilitation clients.

The assessment process requires approximately two weeks to complete. Staff consists of (1) A full-time nurse and a part-time physician to conduct physical examinations, (2) a psychologist who administers the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and revised Beta, in addition to providing career counseling, (3) a work evaluator who administers the Jewish Employment and Vocational Services work evaluation of each client, (4) a teacher who conducts academic assessments and monitors simulated classroom situations to further determine the client's academic aptitude, and (5) a vocational rehabilitation counselor who serves as overall supervisor of the unit and assists the client in making final career choices. The vocational rehabilitation counselor also refers clients to CETA training or some other agency that may provide them with needed services and follows up on the referrals. Clients receive no stipends while undergoing assessment.

The information obtained through this intensive assessment process provides the diagnostics that establish the basis for the employability plan and schedule for individualized services. An advantage of having various staff each perform a portion of the assessment, rather than one psychometrist do all of the assessment, is that it allows for biases to be canceled out. The assessment team members meet to combine their assessments of each individual case. The resulting file of data and conclusions or recommendations for services is shared with both the client and the training counselor. At that point, the role of assessment ends. The client and counselor review the data and formulate an employability plan that meets the approval of the client and the program management. This plan not only spells out vocational objectives and training activities, but also outlines the supportive services required.

Evaluation, Monitoring, and Referral

A number of functions other than assessment are served by the same information gathered on clients. One is evaluation. Escambia County evaluates its training programs by reviewing the baseline data collected on the new trainees every 90 days to determine what changes have occurred in the employability factors assessed. There are 26 such factors evaluated during the assessment process. Each is reviewed by the training coordinator to determine what change may have occurred during the 90 days of service delivery. This assessment is again repeated at the time of termination for the client. These reviews enable the program evaluation unit to trace changes among all clients on a regular basis.

When some clients seem to be progressing along the factor relating to academic proficiency but not in the areas of phys-

real impairment, the program operators examine their program for health. At the same time, an individual client's progress in all 26 factors can be compared with the total group's progress. In this way a client who seems to be making less progress than other enrollees can be identified, along with any needs for a different plan of services than the one being implemented.

The disadvantage of using this program evaluation technique is that it requires staff time to reevaluate the various employability factors every 90 days. This calls for a repetition of the assessment process to reassess the clients or a judgment on the part of the caseload manager as to the kind of progress that has been made. The latter is less precise but administratively more feasible. To the extent that these intervening measures are reliable, a consistent measure of program activity and the results of that activity are possible. The value is obvious. The program's operations can be monitored and evaluated on the basis of which positive change is produced in the employability of the clients—the overall goal of a training program. Change or lack of change suggests revisions in program mix and closer examination of a particular activity or service. By correlating changes in clients' employability factors to client success or failure in achieving desirable employment, the program operator can determine if there is any predictive value to the various employability factors.

Escambia County has undertaken a plan to make its intervening client assessments more reliable by providing special training to caseload managers, who are in touch with the client on a regular basis. In many instances, change can be rated on the basis of a client's achievement of particular objectives in the program. For instance, if a client is assessed as having no vocational skills, he or she will be given a five, the lowest rating on that employability factor. If the training provides the client with employment skills, the instructor conducting the skills training rates the client. The caseload manager then only needs to solicit this information, not produce it. Frequently, the same is true of academic assessment of clients enrolled in remedial education class, who are rated by their instructor to determine the grade level change during their enrollment.

Less easy to measure are behavioral changes. In this instance, the assessments are subjective, and there can be a wide variance between the initial subjective judgment of the assessor and any subsequent judgments made by program staff at other points in the intervention process. The risk is that observed changes may merely reflect the observers' biases rather than any actual change.

Another function served by the client assessment center is that of information and referral. Many clients assessed have needs that cannot be met by a CETA training program. In some instances, these clients would not be appropriate referrals for training. In the first year of operation, the assessment center's statistics showed that a third of all the clients assessed were referred to a training activity and received training. These clients had an unusually low dropout rate (28 percent) and a high placement rate (95 percent). Another third were found to suffer such severe physical or mental impairments that they were eligible for vocational rehabilitation services. In these cases, the vocational rehabilitation counselor who participated in the assessment made appropriate referrals for that client.

Approximately a third of the clients assessed were not eligible for vocational rehabilitation, nor were they appropriate referrals for training available under CETA. Members of this group, termed "gray-area clients," were generally found to be functioning at a low academic level (third- to fourth-grade). During the assessment process, they exhibited behavior that would not be conducive to successful training (acting out overt hostility, being disruptive in a group, or showing no apparent motivation for training or interest in programs available under CETA). The gray-area client group also included program "hoppers," alcoholics, and drug users. This has led the CETA prime sponsor to plan to have special programs to accommodate some members of the group in fiscal 1978. The assessment center also has identified specifically the characteristics of those people who were "falling between agencies." In conjunction with other agencies, some effort is being made to provide special programs that will help these individuals take advantage of the educational opportunities provided through CETA or the community school system.

The expense of an operation that provides such complete services is prohibitive unless the cost is shared by a number of agencies in addition to the CETA prime sponsor. Such is the case in Escambia County, where the local health department, the vocational rehabilitation service, the social welfare office, and other agencies recognize the need to join their resources with the CETA program to serve essentially the same population segment. Many of the staff and resources required in an assessment center are provided by these agencies. This reduces the cost of this operation to $68,000 a year to the CETA prime sponsor. The relationships of the contributing agencies and their respective responsibilities are clarified in written agreements.

4. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Before prime sponsors consider the type of intake and assessment activity that will meet their needs, they must first clearly and specifically describe those needs. By doing so, they can determine the functions that intake and assessment will serve. Once the functions have been determined, the next step is to select those instruments and procedures that provide the information to support these needs, including information on eligibility and priority for selection. Unless the prime sponsor is in the fortunate circumstance of being able to serve all who are applying, some system for additional screening is necessary. To the extent that the data supporting this system are valid and reliable, the selection process will be a more equitable one.

The Selection System

Beware of informal selection systems. "First come, first served" is the most popular system in operation today. The only good thing that can be said about this informal selection system is that it does not operate with any deliberate bias. An informal means of making judgments on client selection is hard to defend. Any prime sponsor that cannot accommodate every eligible applicant in its jurisdiction is using a selection system of some kind, formal or informal. The advantages of a formal selection system are that it offers some opportunity for control, can be monitored and evaluated for its effectiveness, can be studied for possible changes, and both the system and judgments arising from it are thus easiest to defend. Every prime sponsor, regardless of size, should establish some formal selection system. There is no other dependable way of selecting from among the eligible applicants those clients who can be served effectively.

The Services System

Generally, prime sponsors are unaware when they are missing the mark in providing appropriate services to the client. A prime sponsor will try to provide the standard services, such as day care, counseling, general education, and skills training. Clients take advantage of these services simply because they are available to them. Prime sponsors then conclude that their plan for services is a good one.

Too often program services are determined by a professional's projection of what clients' needs will be. This is a legitimate way to start developing a program. However, as the prime sponsor acquires experience with clients, level 2 or 3 assessment should indicate where the program should be modified to bring it more in line with the realities of the clients' environment.

The Assessment System

A level 1 assessment screens for eligibility and priority for service. A level 2 assessment is a minimal requirement for a good intake and assessment activity. Level 3 assessments make possible individualized plans for services by providing more client data in greater detail. Unfortunately, many enrollees' needs are either misinterpreted or overlooked because of inadequate assessment systems. Those prime sponsors blessed with acutely sensitive and observant staff, who enjoy small caseloads and continued contact with their clients, may overcome the lack of an assessment center.

Assessment Devices

The instruments available for assessment have many shortcomings. The older tests do not fit the special characteristics of the disadvantaged population served by CETA programs. The newer instruments designed to serve disadvantaged persons have not been in existence long enough to be validated with a high level of confidence. Program directors are perplexed in their search for a valid and reliable assessment instrument.

The success of any program activity depends upon the competency of the people dealing on a one-to-one basis with the client. There is no substitute for know-how on the part of the staff that conducts assessment. Any assessment instrument, be it an interview or the MMPI, will not compensate for staff limitations. Assessment instruments should be considered as a way to aid competent staff to make objective judgments when confronted with extremely subjective criteria. They organize one's thinking and approach toward the gathering of information. One should not hesitate to use an instrument simply because it has not been proved beyond a doubt to be valid, but should exercise caution when using test results. There are no infallible instruments. Some are more nearly valid than others, and this, along with costs, reusability, and sophistication of the assessor, should be the guide to their selection.

The selection of assessment instruments is based largely upon what purpose assessment will serve. It is assumed that assessment will always be used to determine client eligibility. If this is its only function, a prime sponsor probably would not be interested in any testing instruments that have been described here. On the other hand, if the function of the assessment center is to provide an information and referral service, the program director should include a structured interview, biographical information, and a physical examination or basic physiological screening so that a referral to medical resources will be possible. If the assessment center is serving as a means of outreach and recruitment for the use of a community health center, perhaps it would include psychological screening.

Once the functions have been agreed upon and the appropriate assessment devices selected to provide the information that will accommodate those functions, the program director must decide how to manage intake and assessment. Much can be said for the interagency approach. It is cost-effective and opens the door to other agency resources for a client. When each CETA client has had contact with another agency's staff, a rapport is usually established that facilitates the client's receipt of services from that agency.

In many cases, prime sponsors are concerned about maintaining the integrity of their programs and separating their programs from the political arena. Some thought should be given to having an agency outside the prime sponsor's direct control provide the certification of eligibility for CETA clients. The local State employment service is readily available and meets this criterion. As an agency neither budgeted by nor under the control of a local government official, the employment office, through a financial or nonfinancial agreement, is ideally suited to take applications of clients, to judge whether they meet the specified eligibility criteria, and to complete the certification process.

The State employment office, because it has considerable contact with unemployed people, could also provide either a level 2 or a level 3 assessment. It has a role to play in most intake and assessment processes.

In some communities, the local health or welfare agency has staff who could do sophisticated testing. Such an agency may contribute its staff to a joint intake, assessment, and referral effort with the CETA program.

Another agency that has the same goals and renders care to many disadvantaged people is the vocational rehabilitation service. This agency normally provides diagnostic evaluations to determine eligibility for its services. It can often provide the same service to all CETA clients, in exchange for sharing the cost of assessment.

Local welfare departments and WIN projects may be interested in assisting efforts to bring service to the welfare client or potential welfare recipient.

Arrangements among agencies to provide assessment services involve careful planning. Controls over the activities should be carefully defined and delegated to particular individuals.

Although working in conjunction with other agencies is cumbersome and can be frustrating and aggravating for a prime sponsor, the rewards to the client and the community make this effort worth careful consideration. If interagency cooperation is a problem in one's community, perhaps this is the time to take the first step toward facilitating an interagency effort. A prime sponsor might be able to offer an assessment center just as inexpensively—and more conveniently—on its own. Yet in the hope of making closer cooperation among agencies the scenario for the future, it might still want to take the lead in planning an interagency center.

A key element of an intake and assessment activity is its logistics, as demonstrated by the Broward Manpower Council, which uses mobile units to provide services to remote areas. It is unlikely that a level 3 assessment center, especially when it includes a work evaluation laboratory, can be replicated throughout a large area. It would be necessary to transport the clients to an assessment center, or to set up a mobile assessment unit. The latter is expensive and would not work as well, because testing requires private offices, and a work evaluation laboratory must have considerable space for equipment. More limited mobile units or multiple intake centers can be established throughout the prime sponsor's jurisdiction; then, with the help of some prescreening, certain clients can be selected for extensive assessment and referred to a central location.

Screening Clients

One of the problems that level 3 assessment encounters is screening certain clients to take certain tests. One approach is to have a battery of tests that all clients must take. The same history and data are thus available for every client, which is invaluable for program evaluation or research purposes.

Another approach is the "filter" system. Eligible clients are given an intensive orientation and structured interviews, with screening according to individual needs and expressed wishes for services. These are matched with services available in the community, and referrals are made.

Screening for agency eligibility criteria permits a large group of CETA eligibles to be referred for services. Those who are not diverted by the process are "filtered" through to CETA. Although this process does not assure that every eligible applicant will receive services, it does reduce the number not receiving any services. More importantly, it identifies those clients whose needs are not being met by the community. CETA sponsors have the option of developing new programs that can better assist the client or approaching a consortium of agencies and asking them to pool their resources to meet the identified needs. Communities that have undertaken such efforts find that it is the first time that clients have been identified and described as to characteristics and needs – the first step toward developing programs.

Summary

An assessment activity may lean toward either of two possible extremes. One is the "medical" model, which assumes that a client is there because something is out of order. The process of diagnosis, prescription, and treatment is controlled by agency staff who regard the success of the therapy as a reflection of their skills and expertise. The "humanistic" model assumes that, so long as everyone, particularly the staff, is feeling good about whatever is going on, results are bound to be good. Somewhere in between is an approach that accepts the client as a mature human being, capable, with information and counsel, of charting his or her own path to a successful career future. Although there are no laws of human behavior as there are laws of physics, there is a depth of understanding about the causes of behavior and learning that suggests commonalities among people in general. These commonalities become the attributes measured by various assessment techniques.

The state of the art of assessment in employment and training programs is generally crude and unproved. Those prime sponsors that have instituted assessment are unwilling to give it up, but they can produce little documentation that it has had any positive effect on programs or clients. The need for research is obvious.

Equally credentialed experts argue for and against testing. A prime sponsor may as likely be condemned for testing clients as for not testing. This monograph does not suggest any course of action regarding testing, but it does argue for a formal assessment (as opposed to an informal assessment), outlines program issues and management concerns that affect assessment, and references other literature for further research. A prime sponsor wanting to know whether its intake and assessment component is having a positive effect on employment and training program outcomes will have to rely on its in-house program evaluation capabilities for confirmation. It will be through research undertaken by prime sponsors in the "laboratories" of their programs that the state-of-the-art of client assessment will grow.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Analysis of Data on Testing from CETA Prime Sponsors. Washington: Mark Battle Associates, 1976.

Backer, Thomas E. *Methods of Assessing the Disadvantaged in Manpower Programs: A Review and Analysis.* Los Angeles: Human Interaction Research Institute, 1973.

Bates, Percy; Harrison, Don; and Gordon, Jesse. *A Systems Approach to a Taxonomy of Disadvantagement.* Ann Arbor, Mich.: Manpower Science Services, Inc., April 1973.

Buros, O. K., *Mental Measurements Yearbook.* Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon Press, 1972.

Comrey, Andrew L.; Backer, Thomas E.; and Glaser, Edward M. *A Source Book for Mental Health Measures.* Los Angeles: Human Interaction Research Institute, 1973.

Crow, Stanley H. *Positions on the Practice of Vocational Rehabilitation.* Washington: Vocational Evaluation and Work Adjustment Association, 1978.

Equal Employment Opportunity. A Guide for Prime Sponsors Under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973. Washington, U.S. Department of Labor, 1974.

Erfurt, John C. *A Compendium of Information Relevant to Manpower Agencies.* Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, 1972.

Glaser, Edward M. *Individualization of Manpower Services.* Los Angeles: Human Interaction Research Institute, 1975.

Glaser, Edward M., and Ross, Harvey L. *Productive Employment of the Disadvantaged: Guidelines for Action.* R&D Findings No. 15. Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, 1973.

Human Interaction Research Institute. *Can This Person Do the Job?.* Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, 1974.

Kin, Patricia; Good, Ellison; and Brantner, John P. *A Practical Guide to the MMPI.* Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1961 and 1974.

Orientation, Counseling, and Assessment in Manpower Programs. Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, 1969.

Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. Washington: American Psychological Association, 1974.

Stout Vocational Rehabilitation Institute. *A Comparison of Seven Vocational Evaluation Systems.* Menomie, Wis.: University of Wisconsin-Stout, 1976.

Techniques for Obtaining Worker Traits Requirements Data from Employers. Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, 1975.

Worker Traits Training Units. Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, 1975.

APPENDIXES

A. Report by New York State to the Department of Labor's Manpower Planning Secretariat: A CETA Participant Selection System for Titles I and II

Using the System

This selection system, specifically designed for New York State prime sponsors, is intended to serve as a management tool. By using this system, a coordinator will have an additional tool for the selection of CETA participants. A score, obtained from a matrix, provides for the selection of individuals based on need. Therefore, persons with the highest points—the most needy—are then selected for a particular program.

Conversely, when funding for a program is halted, the matrix may be used as a layoff system. Participants with the lowest point totals are basically the ones who are least in need; therefore, they should be the first ones to be laid off.

By choosing this system, program coordinators are able to conduct an assessment of their participants by making a check of the participant's score over a period of time because a higher score indicates a more needy person. For instance, if at the end of a training period a participant has a higher score than when he or she entered into training, the employment has not been beneficial or the participant needs more training.

Method. The usefulness of this system is partially reflected in the ease with which it is set up. The vertical categories (see matrices at end of next section) are labeled as economic characteristics and do not change from prime sponsor to prime sponsor. Horizontal components are social characteristics and reflect significant segments within the prime sponsor or balance-of-State area.

Beginning at the right-hand side, number the social characteristics commencing with one (1) and proceed in integers. This is done so that the category that has the highest number receives the highest priority. Economic characteristics are numbered from bottom to top, starting with 1.0 and proceeding in two-tenth intervals. The rank for a category is arrived at by cross-multiplication.

A final score is obtained by adding the points for each specific social characteristic on one horizontal line. For example, if a CETA participant is eligible for a Title I position and is a food stamp recipient, the interviewer would use the second horizontal line. Assume also that the individual is the head of a household, 27 years of age, and a female; the total score is then 22—11 for head of household, eight for being in the 25 to 44 age group and three for female.

Rules. Paragraph 95.31(c) of the CETA *Rules and Regulations* (May 23, 1975) provides for the use of a system that establishes priorities:

1. A person may take credit for only one economic characteristic; i.e., whichever yields the highest rank.
2. A person must claim at least one social characteristic, but should claim more than one where qualified.

3. A person may claim only one kind of veteran status: i.e., whichever yields the highest rank.
4. The economic characteristic defines which horizontal line to use.
5. The "other" category is also included to give an interviewer some managerial control over the selection process.
6. Only one "family member" should ordinarily be included in a county's CETA program.
7. Participants must be informed that job opportunities are transitional and will not ordinarily exceed 18 months.

Categories. The economic characteristics determining eligibility of potential participants for each of the titles are defined in the CETA *Rules and Regulations*. They do not vary from county to county or from prime sponsor to prime sponsor. They are targeted to the population that the specific title was designed to serve.

A significant segment, defined in paragraph 94.4 (yy) of the *Rules and Regulations*, is a group of people to be characterized, if appropriate, by sex, age, and racial or ethnic origin and by occupational or veteran status which causes them to generally experience unusual difficulty in obtaining employment and who are in need of the services provided by the title; i.e., a significant segment need not be the same in all titles. Other descriptive categories may be used to define a significant segment, if appropriate.

Data on significant segments may be obtained from several sources, including the following:

1. 1970 census of population.
2. Unemployment insurance beneficiary data.
3. Employment security automated reporting system (ESARS).
4. The universe of need.
5. State-aided programs—public assistance enrollees.
6. Economic profiles—New York State Department of Labor, Manpower Planning Secretariat.
7. Labor force data.

One of the basic responsibilities of prime sponsors in accordance with paragraph 95.31 of the *Rules and Regulations* is to establish priorities for receipt of assistance authorized under the act, taking into account the priorities identified by the Secretary and the significant segments represented among the economically disadvantaged, unemployed, and underemployed residing within its jurisdiction.

Title I

Economic Groups To Be Served

1. *Home relief recipients.* By serving those most needy individuals first, the prime sponsor is relieving the enormous welfare burden currently in place in all states.
2. *Economically disadvantaged.* As defined in paragraph 94.4 (t), (1), (2) a person is poor if he or she is a member of a family (adapted in accordance with paragraph 95.32 of the *Rules and Regulations*):
   a. Who receives cash welfare payments or
   b. Whose annual income, in relation to family size, does not exceed the Office of Management and Budget poverty level.
3. *Unemployed.* As defined in paragraph 94.4(ggg), (1), (2), a person who is without a job and who wants and is available for work, defined as "a person who did not work during the calendar week in which the determination of his or her eligibility for participation is made."
4. *Underemployed.* As defined in paragraph 94.4(fff), (1), (2), a person who is working part time (less than 35 hours per week) but seeking full-time work, or a person who is working full-time work but whose salary relative to family size is below the poverty level.

Special Consideration. Adapted in accordance with paragraph 95.32(e), (1), special consideration shall be given to veterans in two categories:

1. Disabled veteran (defined in paragraph 94.4[2], [3]) is a person who served in the armed forces and who was discharged or released therefrom with other than a dishonerable discharge and who has been given a disability rating of 30 percent or more.

2. Special veteran (defined in paragraph 94.4[zz]) is an individual who served in the armed forces in Indochina or Korea between August 5, 1964 and May 7, 1975, and who received other than a dishonorable discharge.

Social Characteristics

1. *Head of household.* Defined as a person who is eligible to claim more than himself or herself on income tax forms.

2. *Dropout.* Defined as an individual who is at least 25 years old and has not attained 12 years of education.

Title II

Eligible Areas. An area of substantial unemployment (defined in paragraph 94.4[d],[l], [i],[ii]) shall mean any area which:

1. Has a population of at least 10,000 persons.

2. Qualifies for a minimum allocation of $25,000 under Title II of the act.

3. Has a rate of unemployment of at least 6.5 percent for a period of 3 consecutive months.

Ecomonic Groups To be Served. Adapted in accordance with paragraph 99.36(b):

1. Unemployed persons who have exhausted their unemployment insurance benefits.
2. Unemployed persons who are not eligible for unemployment insurance benefits.
3. Persons who are unemployed for 15 or more weeks.
4. Persons who are unemployed for at least 30 days but not more than 15 weeks.

Special Consideration. In accordance with paragraph 99.37(a),(b),(c) special consideration shall be given to:

1. The economically disadvantaged:
   a. Home relief.
   b. Other economically disadvantaged, such as food stamp recipients or those who have a family income below the poverty level.
2. Veterans
   a. Disabled.
   b. Special.
3. Former trainees.

Conclusion

It is important to note that the matrix can and should be tailored to individual counties. Each county has its own priorities and significant segments. The county manpower coordinator must decide whom to serve: once this decision is made, the self-sustaining matrix will accomplish this end.

The matrix converts client characteristics into a numerical code that can be combined into an overall rating of eligibility of each client. This instrument addresses one of the frequently cited problems among prime sponsors. In view of the eligibility requirements as specified by the *Rules and Regulations* under CETA and the priority classifications identified by the coordinator, how does one decide whom to enroll when there are a number of people meeting criteria for eligibility and representing different target groups? This matrix addresses the problem by quantifying these characteristics so that they can be combined into a total score.

Finally, it must be stressed that, while the matrix is not the final answer in a participant selection system, it is an important tool that can aid employment and training planners in most effectively serving their respective populations.

CETA TITLE I—INTAKE PREFERENCE MATRIX

Social Characteristics With Assigned Weight

Economic Characteristics With Assigned Weight

		9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
		Disabled veterans	*Veterans*	*Heads of households*	*Dropouts*	*25 to 44 years of age*	*45 years over*	*Under 21 years*	*Minorities and women*	*Other*
1.8	Home relief recipients	16	14	13	11	9	7	5	4	2
1.6	Other economically disadvantaged	14	13	11	10	8	6	5	3	2
1.4	Unemployed 15 or more weeks	13	11	10	8	7	6	4	3	1
1.2	Unemployed less than 15 weeks	11	10	8	7	6	5	4	2	1
1.0	Underemployed	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

NOTE: The values in each cell (square) are derived by multiplying social characteristic weight by economic characteristic weight and then rounding off. These weights, as well as the position of characteristics, are illustrative. To use this system, prime sponsors would locate characteristics and assign values according to their needs and policy.

CETA Titles II and VI Intake Preference Matrix

Social Characteristics With Assigned Weight

Economic Characteristics With Assigned Weight		10 *Home relief recipients*	9 *Other economically disadvantaged*	8 *Disabled veterans*	7 *Veterans*	6 *Heads of households*	5 *Former trainees*	4 *Older workers*	3 *Youth*	2 *Minorities and women*	1 *Other*
1.6	Unemployment insurance exhaustees	16	14	13	11	10	8	6	5	3	2
1.4	Not eligible for unemployment insurance	14	13	11	10	8	7	6	4	3	1
1.2	Unemployed 15 or more weeks	12	11	10	8	7	6	5	4	2	1
1.0	Unemployed less than 15 weeks	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1

NOTE: For explanation, see footnote accompanying CETA Title I Matrix, above.

B. Goodwill Industries of South Florida, Inc., Re-Education Program

Behavioral Assessment Procedures

Source

The following items are from the Burk's Behavior Rating Scales adapted to the workshop situation in order to prompt specific data during the work evaluation.

Procedure

Enter in the "recommendation for the behavioral prescription" only those items on the "behavioral assessment checklist" rated one (1) or two (2) on the rating guide of the "work evaluation report"; i.e., "completely inadequate or below average vocationally."

1. Behaviors and performances receiving a rating of one (1) are acceptable only in a highly structured, supportive, non-competitive work setting such as a sheltered workshop.
2. Behaviors and performances receiving a rating of two (2) suggest that the participant is achieving below the level of competitive employment. However, there are indications that with additional treatment and/or training, he may be able to function with such a work setting.

Behavioral Assessment Checklist

A. Personal appearance
   1. Grooming
   2. Work attire

B. Physical assets and liabilities
   1. Poor physical strength
      a. Avoids physical effort.
      b. Gets hurt in physical work.
      c. Gets tired quickly.
      d. Will not do rough work.
      e. Appears physically lethargic.
      f. Slow.
   2. Poor coordination
      a. Has trouble holding onto things.
      b. Shows poor coordination in large muscle activity.
      c. Handwriting is poor.
      d. Accidentally runs into people and objects.
      e. Drawings and paintings are messy.
   3. Obesity

C. Mental abilities
   1. Poor academics
      a. Shows poor reading.
      b. Shows poor spelling.
      c. Follows academic directions poorly.
      d. Assignments are poorly written.
   2. Poor intellectuality
      a. Does not ask questions.
      b. Perseverates; cannot shift responses.
      c. Gives inappropriate responses.
      d. Does not show imagination.
      e. Has trouble remembering things.
      f. Shows poor vocabulary.
      g. Does not show common sense.

3. Poor attention
   a. Shows erratic, flighty, or scattered behavior.
   b. Is easily distracted; lacks continuity of effort and perseverance.
   c. Attention span not increased by punishment or reward.
   d. Attention span is short.
   e. Cannot finish what he is doing; jumps to something else.
4. Poor reality contact
   a. Tells bizarre stories.
   b. Uses unintelligible language.
   c. Shows daydreaming.
   d. Shows tics and grimaces without apparent reason.
   f. Rotates or rocks his body.
   g. Makes weird drawings.
   h. Is unaware of what is going on around him.

D. Emotional stability
1. Excessive anxiety
   a. Shows many fears.
   b. Appears tense.
   c. Worries too much.
   d. Flushes easily.
   e. Appears nervous.
2. Poor impulse control
   a. Becomes overexcited easily.
   b. Is hyperactive and restless.
   c. Shows explosive and unpredictable behavior.
   d. Is impulsive.
   e. Cannot control self (will speak out or jump out of seat).
3. Poor anger control
   a. Becomes angry quickly.
   b. Becomes angry if asked to do something.
   c. Is quickly frustrated and loses emotional control.
   d. Explodes under stress.
   e. Flares up if teased or pushed.
4. Excessive self-blame
   a. Questions indicate a worry about the future.
   b. Upset if makes a mistake.
   c. Shows overremorse for doing wrong.
   d. Is upset if things do not turn out perfect.
   e. Blames himself if things go wrong.
5. Excessive resistance
   a. Is stubborn and uncooperative.
   b. Is rebellious if disciplined.
   c. Denies responsibility for own actions.
   d. Does things his own way.
   e. Will not take suggestions from others.
6. Excessive dependency
   a. Is dependent on others to lead him around.
   b. Is overobedient.
   c. Is easily led.
   d. Wants others to do things for him.
   e. Seeks constant praise.
7. Excessive sense of persecution
   a. Maintains others pick on him.
   b. Complains he never gets his fair share of things.
   c. Will not forgive others.
   d. Accuses others of things they actually did not do.
   e. Complains others do not like him.

E. Interpersonal Relationships
1. Poor sense of identity
   a. Acts as nonconformist.
   b. Wears unusual clothing styles.
   c. Associates with loners.
   d. Rejects classmates in hostile manner.
   e. "Style" of behaving deliberately different from most.
2. Excessive withdrawal
   a. Is difficult to get to know.
   b. Shows little feeling when others are upset.
   c. Withdraws quickly from group activities; prefers to work by self.
   d. Is shy.
   e. Does not show feelings.
   f. Appears disinterested in work of others.
3. Poor social conformity
   a. Displays a "don't care" attitude; does what he wants.
   b. Tells falsehoods.
   c. Does not follow through on a promise.
   d. Takes things which do not belong to him.
   e. Shows little respect for authority.
   f. Is tardy.
   g. Is involved in undesirable escapades.
   h. Is truant.
4. Excessive aggressiveness
   a. Laughs when others are in trouble.
   b. Hits or pushes others.
   c. Wants to boss others.
   d. Is sarcastic.
   e. Teases others.
   f. Plays tricks on other children.
5. Excessive sexuality
   a. Employs much sex talk.
   b. Reads questionable sexual material.
   c. Acts boy crazy or girl crazy.
   d. Wears sexually provocative clothing.
   e. Studies pictures of pornographic nature.
   f. Shows exclusive interest in opposite sex.

F. Work habits
1. Poor ego strength
   a. Depreciates and distrusts own abilities.
   b. Is easily satisfied with inferior performance.
   c. Avoids competition.
   d. Is easily frustrated and gives up passively.
   e. Acts silly.
   f. Shows little self-confidence.
   g. Plays the clown.

2. Excessive suffering
   a. Sulks.
   b. Appears unhappy.
   c. Seems to welcome punishment.
   d. Deliberately puts himself in position of being criticized.
   e. Gives picture of "poor me."
   f. Feelings easily hurt.
   g. Appears depressed.

II. Ratings and Behaviors in Job Sampling

A. Learning and comprehension
   1. Responses to instruction
      a. Requires minimal instruction for task completion.
      b. Requires moderate instruction and completes task.
      c. Requires extensive instruction for task completion.
      d. Does not complete task with extensive instruction.
   2. "On-task" behavior
      a. Rarely on task.
      b. Fluctuates from on task to off task.
      c. More on task than off task.
      d. Stays on task.
   3. Flexibility—rotation of tasks
      a. Adjusts well to new tasks.
      b. Adjusts to new tasks with minor difficulties.
      c. Adjusts to new tasks with major difficulties.
      d. Cannot adjust to new tasks.

B. Performance characteristics
   1. Frustration and tolerance
      a. Attends to job regardless of obstacles.
      b. Attends to job with evident frustration.
      c. Has difficulty attending to job when confronted with obstacles.
      d. Cannot complete job when confronted with obstacles.
   2. Consistency of effort
      a. Shows consistent work behavior.
      b. Shows moderately consistent work behavior.
      c. Work behavior was erratic.
      d. Work behavior was unstable.

C. Work attitudes
   1. Adaptation
      a. Upon being familiarized with shop rules, the client adjusts with little delay.
      b. Upon being familiarized with shop rules, the client adjusts with some delay.
      c. Client has difficulty adjusting to shop rules after being familiarized.
      d. Client cannot adjust to shop rules though familiar with same.
   2. Motivation toward work
      a. Demonstrates initiative in finding tasks to perform.
      b. Client will frequently seek tasks to perform.
      c. Client rarely seeks tasks to perform.
      d. Client is content to sit idle.
   3. Stress responses
      a. Works best under little or no stress.
      b. Work responses improved by occasional stress.
      c. Work responses best under constant moderate stress.
      d. Work responses best under constant strong stress.
   4. Punctuality
      a. Institutes work behavior immediately.
      b. Seldom delays institution of work behaviors.
      c. Frequently late in instituting work behaviors.
      d. Consistently late in instituting work behaviors.
   5. On-task work behaviors
      a. Stays on task while working.
      b. Stays on task more than off task while working.
      c. Stays on task one-half of the time.
      d. Stays off task most of the time.

D. Interpersonal relations
   1. Reaction to supervision
      a. Works best with little or no supervision.
      b. Works best with limited, supportive supervision.
      c. Works best with firm supervision.
      d. Cannot work without supervision.
   2. Peer relations
      a. Achieves group acceptance quickly and easily.
      b. Achieves group acceptance after a short period of time.
      c. Achieves group acceptance to a limited degree.
      d. Does not achieve group acceptance.

E. Appearance
   1. Grooming
      a. Consistently neat and clean.
      b. Needs periodic reminders about dress and/or personal care.
      c. Careless about personal cleanliness to the point of giving offense.
      d. Consistently unkempt and disordered—makes little or no effort to meet standards of typical group.

GOODWILL INDUSTRIES OF SOUTH FLORIDA, INC. RE-EDUCATION PROGRAM

Form For Recording and Controlling Behaviors

Program _____ Name _____

Work station _____ Dates _____

	Mon.	Tues.	Wed.	Thurs.	Fri.	Defining behavioral goals
1 L						
P						
2 L						
P						
3 L						
P						
4 L						
P						
Total of P						

P = Count of actual behavior or pieces.
L = Limit (estimate) of inappropriate behavior or pieces which determine reward or not.
V = Reward granted.
X = Reward denied.
1-2-3-4 = Quarter of the working day (divided by a.m. break, lunch, and p.m. breaks)

C. Summary of Assessment Tools for the Disadvantaged

Assessment tool	*Purpose for which it was constructed*	*Other planned purposes*	*Time needed to administer*	*Required skill level of tester*	*Expense of administration*	*Group or individual*	*Validity, reliability, normati data available*[1]	*Population of intended use*	*Format*
Basic Occupational Literacy Test	Counseling and personal development	Assignment to training	2½ hrs.	Medium	Minimal	Group	V/R/N	Disadvantaged adults	Measures arithmetic and reading skills.
Biographical Information Blank	Job placement	Counseling and personal development. Assignment to training	No time limit	Minimal	"	Both	"	Disadvantaged manpower program enrollees	Application blank style; simple, fourth grade reading level format.
Colorado Manpower Laboratory Instruments									
a. Social Access Questionnaire	Research	Admission to program	30 min.	Medium	"	"	"	Disadvantaged manpower program applicants and enrollees	Eighty-nine item questionnaire measuring six personality factors and personal history. Multiple choice and bipolar agree-disagree items.
b. Revised Miskimins Self-Goals Other Test	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	Complex chart and rating system asking client to use three different perspectives in filling out the chart three times.

[1] V = validity data available.
R = reliability data available
N = normative data available.
No entry means that no data were available at the time this chart was prepared.

Source: Backer, Thomas E., *Methods of Assessing the Disadvantaged in Manpower Programs: A Review and Analysis*, (Los Angeles: Human Interaction Research Insti

C. Summary of Assessment Tools for the Disadvantaged--*Continued*

Assessment tool	*Purpose for which it was constructed*	*Other planned purposes*	*Time needed to administer*	*Required skill level of tester*	*Expense of administration*	*Group or individual*	*Validity, reliability, normative data available*[1]	*Population of intended use*	*Format*
c. Work Requirements Rating Scale	Research			Minimal	Minimal	Both		Disadvantaged manpower program applicants and enrollees	Forty-seven item questionnaire dealing with the importance of occupationally related behavior.
d. Importance Questionnaire	"	Admission to program or job placement	"	"	"	"	"	"	Twenty items relating to job conditions or opportunities. Subject rates each on an importance scale.
e. Employment Satisfaction Questionnaire	"	Program evaluation	"	"	"	"	"	"	Twenty items relating to job satisfaction. Subject rates each item on satisfaction scale.
f. Job Conditions Questionnaire	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	Eight page questionnaire concerning perceived work environment.
g. Job Expectancy Rating	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	One page form for rating six job conditions.
h. Job importance Prediction Scale	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	Twelve items from which subject is asked to select the four most important job conditions for himself.
i. Self-Acceptance Questionnaire	"	"	"	"	"	"	V/R	"	Fifteen highly-guided self-relation items in true-false response form.
j. Similarities Scale	"	Counseling or job placement	"	"	"	"	"	"	Eighty items about behaviors that the subject is asked to rate.

[1] V = validity data available
R = reliability data available
N = normative data available
No entry means that no data were available at the time this chart was prepared

Source: Backer, Thomas E., *Methods of Assessing the Disadvantaged in Manpower Programs: A Review and Analysis*, (Los Angeles: Human Interaction Research Institute, 1971)

C. Summary of Assessment Tools for the Disadvantaged (Continued)

Assessment tool	Purpose for which it was constructed	Other planned purposes	Time needed to administer	Required skill level of tester	Expense of administration	Group or individual	Validity, reliability, normative data available	Population intended for use	Format
Educational Testing Service Youth Assessment Battery (13 tests)	Counseling and personal development	Program evaluation	2 hrs.	Medium	Minimal	Group	V R [illegible]	Disadvantaged youth [illegible]	
a. Job knowledge									Twenty-seven item (female form), 30 item (male form) word and picture booklet; multiple choice items
b. and c. Vocational Plans and Vocational Aspirations									Sixteen item booklets, same format for both male and female forms
d. Interest in Vocational Tasks									Twenty-eight item booklet, pictures of tasks from seven occupational clusters
e. Attitudes Toward Authority									Thirteen items (female), 12 items (male form), subjects rate frequency of behavior of pictured people
f. Self-Esteem									Sixteen items depicts adolescents in various settings
g. Deferred Gratification									Sixteen items, subjects rate how other people would endorse generalities
h. and i. Job Seeking and Job Holding Skills									Seventeen job-seeking, 11 job-holding items; measures of attitudes and factual knowledge

V = validity data available
R = reliability data available
N = normative data available
No entry means that no data were available at the time this table was prepared.

Source: Backer, Thomas E., *Methods of Assessing the Disadvantaged in Manpower Programs: A Review and Analysis*, [illegible]

C. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT TOOLS FOR THE DISADVANTAGED—*Continued*

Assessment tool	*Purpose for which it was constructed*	*Other planned purposes*	*Time needed to administer*	*Required skill level of tester*	*Expense of administration*	*Group or individual*	*Validity, reliability, normative data available*[1]	*Population of intended use*	*Format*
j. Motivation for Vocational Achievement	Counseling and personal development	Program evaluation	2½ hrs.	Medium	Minimal	Group (4-15)	V/R/N	Disadvantaged youth 16-21	Seventeen items in Likert-style format.
k. Practical Reasoning-Map Reading	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	Ten four-choice multiple response items.
l. Practical Reasoning-Zip Coding	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	Ten items; multiple-choice format.
m. Practical Reasoning-File Card Sorting	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	"	Ten multiple choice items; file cards are attached to test booklet.
Educational Testing Service NYC Enrollee and Former Questionnaires	Program evaluation short and long run effects					Individual	V/R		Interview format; short answer sentence completion and multiple choice items.
Goodwin Work Orientation Questionnaire	Research	Counselor training		Medium	Minimal	Both self-administering and home interview	V/R/N	WIN trainees	Eight-page questionnaire with Likert-type items ("agree-disagree").
Indik Work Motivation Scales (motive to work, motive to avoid work, expectancy to work, expectancy to avoid work, incentive to work)	"	Assignment to training	15 min.	"	Medium	Individual	V/R	MDTA trainees	Orally administered interview-type questionnaire with Likert and multiple choice completion items.
Jewish Employment and Vocational Services Work Sample System	Counseling and personal development	Assignment to training; job placement	1-2 weeks	High	High	Both	V/N	Disadvantaged	Twenty-eight work samples representing job activities in ten occupational areas.

[1] V = validity data available
R = reliability data available
N = normative data available
No entry means that no data were available at the time this chart was prepared

SOURCE: Bacaer, Thomas E., *Methods of Assessing the Disadvantaged in Manpower Programs: A Review and Analysis*, (Los Angeles: Human Interaction Research Institute, 1973)

C. Summary of Assessment Tools for the Disadvantaged—*Continued*

Assessment tool	*Purpose for which it was constructed*	*Other planned purposes*	*Time needed to administer*	*Required skill level of tester*	*Expense of administration*	*Group or individual*	*Validity, reliability, normative data available*[1]	*Population of intended use*	*Format*
Jorgenson, et al Social Vocabulary Index	Test development and research			Medium	Minimal	Both	V/R	Rural rehabilitation clients	Paper-and-pencil test, self-administering, 20 items each on six scales: Self-concept, self-acceptance, ideal-self, concept of others, vocabulary, and social desirability.
Jorgenson, et al Revised Interaction Scale	"			Minimal	"	Individual		"	Two-part paper-and pencil questionnaire.
Mandell, et al NYC Enrollee Interview Forms I and II	Evaluation and program development	Assignment to training		Medium	Medium	"		NYC enrollees	Form I: 20 item multiple-choice or fill-in interview format. Form II: 58 items giving job qualifications or expectations, interview form; subject rates items for degree of necessity or importance.
NATB	Counseling and job placement	"	3¼ hrs.	"	"	Group	V/R/N	Disadvantaged	Fourteen subtests, mostly nonverbal.
Psychological Corporation Multimedia Orientation	Pre-testing orientation		30 min.	Minimal	Minimal	"		Disadvantaged clients with low test-taking skills	Tape recording guides clients through a booklet of exercises with test-like items. Clients are given another similar booklet to take home.
Self-Concept Profiling Technique (O'Mahoney)	Counseling and personal development			High	Medium	Individual	V/R		Projective technique using pictures of people in work situations.
Self-Interview Checklist	Job placement			Minimal	Minimal	"	V/R/N		Job preference and experience checklist used as part of Cleff job/man matching.

[1] V = validity data available.
R = reliability data available.
N = normative data available.
No entry means that no data were available at the time this chart was prepared.

SOURCE: Backer, Thomas E., *Methods of Assessing the Disadvantaged in Manpower Programs: A Review and Analysis*. (Los Angeles: Human Interaction Research Institute, 1973).

C. Summary of Assessment Tools for the Disadvantaged—*Continued*

Assessment tool	*Purpose for which it was constructed*	*Other planned purposes*	*Time needed to administer*	*Required skill level of tester*	*Expense of administration*	*Group or individual*	*Validity, reliability, normative data available*[1]	*Population of intended use*	*Format*
Singer/Graflex Vocational Evaluation System	Counseling and personal development	Assignment to training		High	High	Group	N	Vocational trainees, rehabilitation clients, disadvantaged	Teaching machine, sound tape and film strip present programmed instruction in ten occupational areas.
Tolerance for Bureaucratic Structure Scale	Job placement			Minimal	Minimal	Both		Manpower enrollees	Forty-three items in four-point Likert scale format.
TOWER Evaluation System	Counseling and personal development		3 weeks	High	High		V	Handicapped	One hundred ten work samples
Tseng Rating Scales	Research			Minimal	Minimal	Group	R/N	Trainees in vocational rehabilitation	Short rating scales
USES Pretesting Orientation Exercises	Pretesting orientation		1 hr.	Medium	Medium			Disadvantaged	Short test booklet resembling GATB in format.
Vocational Exploration Groups	Counseling and personal development		3-5 hrs.				V	Manpower enrollees	Group process for interaction and personalization on topics of jobs.
Walther Work-Relevant Attitudes Inventory	Program evaluation and planning	Counseling and personal development	10-15 min.	Minimal	Minimal	Both	R/V/N	NYC and New Careers enrollees	Twenty-six item inventory measuring factors related to work adjustment and satisfaction.
Wolf, et al Attraction to Work Scale, Barrier to Work Scale, Loss Scale	Job placement					Group	V/R	WIN trainees	Short paper-and-pencil questionnaires.
Work Behavior Samples	Assignment to training			High	Medium	Individual		Manpower enrollees	Under development; involves rating behavior of evaluees in real interpersonal situations.

V = validity data available
R = reliability data available
N = normative data available.
No entry means that no data were available at the time this chart was prepared.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1978 O—269-747

SOURCE: Backer, Thomas E., *Methods of Assessing the Disadvantaged in Manpower Programs: A Review and Analysis*, (Los Angeles: Human Interaction Research Institute, 1973)

WHERE TO GET MORE INFORMATION

For more information, contact the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C. 20213, or any of the Regional Administrators for Employment and Training whose addresses are listed below.

Location	States Served	
John F. Kennedy Bldg. Boston, Mass. 02203	Connecticut Maine Massachusetts	New Hampshire Rhode Island Vermont
1515 Broadway New York, N.Y. 10036	New Jersey New York Canal Zone	Puerto Rico Virgin Islands
P.O. Box 8796 Philadelphia, Pa. 19101	Delaware District of Columbia Maryland	Pennsylvania Virginia West Virginia
1371 Peachtree Street, NE. Atlanta, Ga. 30309	Alabama Florida Georgia Kentucky	Mississippi North Carolina South Carolina Tennessee
230 South Dearborn Street Chicago, Ill. 60604	Illinois Indiana Michigan	Minnesota Ohio Wisconsin
911 Walnut Street Kansas City, Mo. 64106	Iowa Kansas	Missouri Nebraska
555 Griffin Square Bldg. Dallas, Tex. 75202	Arkansas Louisiana New Mexico	Oklahoma Texas
1961 Stout Street Denver, Colo. 80294	Colorado Montana North Dakota	South Dakota Utah Wyoming
450 Golden Gate Avenue San Francisco, Calif. 94102	Arizona California Hawaii Nevada	American Samoa Guam Trust Territory
909 First Avenue Seattle, Wash. 98174	Alaska Idaho	Oregon Washington