

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 670

EC 220 534

AUTHOR Easterday, Joseph R.; And Others
 TITLE Evaluating Work Performance by Severely Handicapped Students in Work Experience Settings. Working Paper 87-5. COMPETE: Community-Based Model for Public-School Exit and Transition to Employment.
 INSTITUTION Indiana Univ., Bloomington. Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped.
 SPONS AGENCY Indiana State Dept. of Mental Health, Indianapolis.; Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC.
 PUB DATE 87
 GRANT G008430112
 NOTE 32p.; For related documents, see EC 220 524-535.
 PUB TYPE Guides - General (050) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Behavior Rating Scales; Community Programs; Education Work Relationship; *Employer Attitudes; Employment Experience; Evaluation Methods; *Job Performance; *Job Placement; *Moderate Mental Retardation; Secondary Education; *Severe Mental Retardation
 IDENTIFIERS *Supported Work Programs

ABSTRACT

This paper is a product of Project COMPETE, a service demonstration project undertaken for the purpose developing and validating a model and training sequence that applies the results of previous research and exemplary practices to improved transition services for moderately, severely, and profoundly retarded youth. The paper presents a set of evaluation instruments for students or clients in community work experience settings. The evaluation packet contains four evaluative instruments: (1) Critical Functions Profile; (2) Employer Concern Form; (3) Employer Rating Scale of Worker Performance; and (4) Work Performance Profile. A Yearly Exploration Summary form used to summarize evaluative data for a single learner across one year of work experience placements is also included. The Critical Functions Profile identifies functions necessary to produce required results and also provides a record of the job coach's time commitment. Employers complete the Employer Concern Form frequently to identify social and work performance problems or deficiencies as early as possible. The Employer Rating Scale is a summative instrument requiring comparison of the mentally retarded worker to others doing the same or similar jobs. The Work Performance Profile is completed by the job coach at the end of a work experience placement. (DB)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

Evaluating Work Performance by Severely
Handicapped Students in Work
Experience Settings

Joseph R. Easterday, Richard B. Dever,
Patricia L. Sitlington

Working Paper #87-5



Evaluating Work Performance by Severely
Handicapped Students in Work
Experience Settings

Joseph R. Easterday, Richard B. Dever,
Patricia L. Sitlington

Working Paper #87-5

Project COMPETE (Community-based Model for Public school Exit and Transition to Employment) is a service demonstration project funded to investigate secondary education and transition services for severely handicapped youth. COMPETE is a cooperative effort between the Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped at Indiana University, and agencies in Columbus and Seymour, Indiana: Developmental Services, Inc., and the Bartholomew County Special Services Cooperative.

The purpose of COMPETE is to develop and validate a model that applies the results of previous research and exemplary practices. Project COMPETE is developing a training sequence to assist moderately, severely, and profoundly retarded youth in making the transition from school to employment in the competitive environment possible. COMPETE is also concentrating on establishing formal linkages between the rehabilitation center and the public school system in order to ensure a totally integrated continuum of preparation for youth from secondary through post-secondary levels.

The attached working paper is one product of this project. For more information on Project COMPETE please contact either of the project staff below.

PROJECT COMPETE STAFF

Principal Investigator

Richard B. Dever, Ph.D.

Research Associate

Joseph R. Easterday

Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped
Smith Research Center, Rm. 150
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405
(812) 335-5849

Preparation of this working paper was supported by Grant No. USDE G008430112 from the U.S. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, and a grant from the Indiana Department of Mental Health. The authors were encouraged to freely express their opinions. Points of view expressed herein do not necessarily represent policies or opinions of the funding agencies.

Evaluating Work Performance by Severely Handicapped Students
in Work Experience Settings

All too often, teachers are required to do paperwork which neither contributes to the determination of specific instructional goals and objectives nor directly assists them in carrying out their primary function of teaching. However, records of student performance can be invaluable to professionals who work with severely handicapped pupils, e.g., for documenting instructional activities and interventions, satisfying accountability requirements, monitoring student progress, and guiding instructional personnel in the development of individualized training programs. Because information on student performance can be so useful, it is critical that teachers be efficient in collecting student performance data that is both accurate and effective in guiding instruction.

The purpose of this paper is to present a set of evaluation instruments for student/clients in community work experience settings. These instruments were developed by Project COMPETE Staff, and have been field tested and refined in community work experience settings. They are presented here as an evaluation packet. We believe that, while each of these instruments performs a specific evaluation task well, it is only when they are used as a unit that their full value is realized. This last statement, however, should not be construed to mean that once this evaluation packet is in use that other forms of evaluation related to community work training can be ignored. On the contrary, the evaluation instruments presented in this paper are intended to perform only one task, i.e., evaluate work performance in community work experience



settings. Evaluation of other knowledge and skills such as career awareness/interests, parent/guardian support and expectations, and community transportation skills for getting to work are no less important, but are not addressed in this paper (see Moon, Goodall, Barcus, & Brooke, 1985 for a good source of evaluative instruments for a wide range of purposes.)

The Project COMPETE work experience evaluation packet contains 4 evaluative instruments: (a) Critical Functions Profile; (b) Employer Concern Form; (c) Employer Rating Scale of Worker Performance; and (d) Work Performance Profile. A Yearly Exploration Summary form is also included. It is used to summarize evaluative data for a single learner across one entire year of work experience placements.

Critical Functions Profile (CFP)

The format for the critical functions analysis was adapted from the Task Analysis Data Sheet described by Bellamy, Horner, and Inman (1979). Note that a critical functions analysis is not the same as a task analysis. That is, whereas a task analysis details the specific behaviors, the sequence of steps, and the manner in which learners are required to perform tasks, an analysis of critical functions is simpler, and is based on the identification of "critical effects" (White, 1980): once the routines of a job are established, it is possible to determine the critical effects (or required outcomes) throughout the work day. The critical effects are then analyzed to determine the critical functions (or accomplishments) required to generate the critical effects. An analysis of critical functions identifies only those things a student/client must get done in order to complete a job successfully. If

a student/client can be taught to perform a critical function associated with the completion of a specific task with no further analysis of the skills required to accomplish that critical function, any subsequent analysis would be superfluous. Because a critical functions analysis is much simpler and requires less paper work than a task analysis, it should be used whenever possible.

Each vertical column of numbers on the right side of the Critical Function Profile (Appendix A) represents an individual probe trial to assess the acquisition of critical job tasks. The critical functions for a particular job are listed on the left-hand side of the CFP. They begin at the bottom left and are listed upward in the general order in which they occur throughout the work day. Listed in the column to the left of the critical functions are the standard times allotted to the performance of each critical function (determined by the job coach through observation of co-workers who keep pace with the job flow or employer demands). To record a probe assessment, the job trainer observes the worker, and makes a slash over each number in a vertical column corresponding to an achieved critical function. Note that the student/client must perform the critical function with no assistance and no prompts to receive this mark. If the student/client not only performs the critical function, but also does it within the standard time allotted, an "X" mark is entered. If the student/client performs the critical function, but needs some form of prompt to do so, a "P" is written next to the number. If performance of a particular critical function is not required during a probe trial, a "~" is drawn through the number (e.g., as when certain tasks are performed on alternate days).

4.

After all critical functions have been evaluated, the job trainer counts the achieved critical functions ("X" marks only) for that probe, and circles the corresponding number in the probe column. As more probes are made, the circled numbers in consecutive columns are connected by a line. These connecting circled numbers form a graph corresponding to the ongoing achievement of critical functions.

As a student/client's performance is evaluated on the CFP, some critical functions are likely to emerge as unaccomplished, as indicated by horizontal rows of numbers without cross marks and/or slashes. If necessary, these critical functions can be task analyzed using separate sheets of the CFP form. Because our experience indicates that many critical functions do not need to be task analyzed, the use of this procedure is economical of trainer time and effort.

One final feature of the Critical Functions Profile form is the record of the job coach's time commitment to actual training, observation, and other tasks on site. Training time involves actual instruction provided to the student/client, such as demonstrations of the task or provision of verbal directions. The term, "inactive" time may be misleading in some respects since it typically involves observation of the worker who is performing the job tasks without requiring trainer intervention. Miscellaneous time includes time spent talking to the employer, filling out recording forms, etc.

Employer Concern Form.

Employers are asked to complete the Concern Form (Appendix B) once each week for the first four weeks of placement, and once every other week for the remainder of the placement. In developing the Employer

Concern Form, Project COMPETE staff reviewed pertinent available research regarding employment terminations of mentally retarded workers (e.g., Kochany & Keller, 1981) and later refined the instrument as new research became available (e.g., Hanley-Maxwell, Rusch, Chadsey-Rusch, & Renzaglia, 1986). This instrument also reflects research regarding vocational and social survival skills (Rusch & Mithaug, 1980). The purpose of the Employer Concern Form is to identify both social and work performance problems, or deficiencies from the perspective of the worker's evaluative supervisor as early as possible so that appropriate training adjustments can be made that will assist the student/client's integration into the workplace.

Employer Rating Scale of Worker Performance.

The Employer Rating Scale of Worker Performance (Appendix C) is a summative evaluation instrument completed by the employer during the last week of a work experience placement. There are two important features of this instrument: (1) the items in this rating instrument are derived from employers' responses to open-ended questions about employer-preferred and non-preferred worker characteristics (see COMPETE Working Papers #85-4 and #87-2); and (2) this form requires the employer to compare the performance of a mentally retarded worker to that of a nonhandicapped co-worker doing the same or a similar job. The comparison feature of this instrument has two purposes: (a) it is intended to provide the employer with information related to future hiring decisions regarding a mentally retarded job applicant; and (b) it provides Project COMPETE staff with a valuable quality control measure.

Work Performance Profile

The Work Performance Profile (Appendix D) evaluates worker performance in 15 areas related to competitive employment. Each area is rated on a A-B-C-D scale. An "A" rating generally means that the worker demonstrates almost no appropriate behaviors related to the performance area. A "B" rating denotes work behavior that, while still at an unacceptable level, does show some performance of the skill area. A "C" rating indicates a generally acceptable behavior related to the performance area, but the acceptable performance is inconsistent. A "D" rating generally denotes performance related to a skill area that would be acceptable for a nonhandicapped individual performing the same or a similar type of job.

The Work Performance Profile was originally filled out by the employer during the last week of the work experience placement to provide a summative evaluation of worker performance. This function was subsequently assumed by the much shorter Employer Rating Scale of Worker Performance (COMPETE Working Paper 87-2). At present, the Work Performance Profile is completed only by the job coach at the end of a work experience placement.

Yearly Exploration Summary

The Yearly Exploration Summary form (Appendix E) is used to summarize the Employer Concern Data, and Employers' Rating Scales, and Work Performance Profiles for a single worker across a year. The first column is used to record up to 4 work experience placements, including the location, the supervisor, the length of placement, and general task requirements of the job. The remaining 3 columns summarize information

obtained from the Work Performance Profile, Employer Concerns Form, and Employers' Rating Scale.

Concluding Statement

The four evaluation instruments presented in this working paper are used regularly by Project COMPETE staff in their daily work of training student/clients at community-based work experience sites. These forms have been modified and refined in the course of extensive field use and on-going research by COMPETE and other projects. The information provided by these forms is relevant and efficiently gathered, and the packet has proven useful in making decisions about future training needs of severely handicapped student/clients.

References

- Bellamy, G.T., Horner, R.H., & Inman, D.P. (1979). Vocational habilitation of severely retarded adults: A direct service technology. Baltimore, MD: University Park Press.
- Chadsey-Rusch, J., & Rusch, F.R. (1986). The ecology of the workplace. In J. Chadsey-Rusch, C. Hanley-Maxwell, L.A. Phelps, & F.R. Rusch (Eds.), School-to-work transition issues and models (pp. 58-94). Champaign, IL: The Transition Institute at Illinois, College of Education, University of Illinois.
- Easterday, J.R., & Sitlington, P.L. (1985). Conducting an analysis of community work environments relative to the employment of the severely handicapped. (COMPETE Working Paper No. 85-4). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped.
- Easterday, J. R., Dever, R. B., & Sitlington, P. L. (1987). Severely Handicapped youth competing in the labor market: Implementation and effectiveness report from the first two years of Project COMPETE. (COMPETE Working Paper No. 87-2). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped.
- Hanley-Maxwell, C., Rusch, F.R., Chadsey-Rusch, J., & Renzaglia, A. (1986). Reported factors contributing to job terminations of individuals with severe disabilities. Journal of the Association for the Severely Handicapped, 11(1), 45-52.

- Sitlington, P.L., & Easterday, J R. (1985a). Conducting a labor market trend analysis: Process and results. (COMPETE Working Paper No. 85-3). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped.
- Sitlington, P.L., & Easterday, J.R. (1985b). An analysis of employer incentive rankings relative to the employment of retarded persons. (COMPETE Working Paper No. 85-6) Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped.
- Stewart, D.M. (1977). Survey of community attitudes toward hiring the handicapped. Mental Retardation, 15(1), 30-31.
- Wehman, P., Rehabilitation Research and Training Center.
- Rusch, F.R., & Mithaug, D.E. (1980). Vocational training for mentally retarded adults: A behavior analytic approach. Champaign, IL: Research Press.
- White, O. (1980). Adaptive performance objectives: Form vs. function. In W. Sailor, B. Wilcox, & L. Brown (Eds.), Methods of instruction for severely handicapped students. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

APPENDIX A
CRITICAL FUNCTIONS PROFILE

Project COMPETE
CRITICAL FUNCTION PROFILE

Scoring Code:

- / = C F done correctly w/o prompt
- (Blank) = C F done incorrectly
- P = Prompt needed other than naturally occurring
- ~ = C F not required during probe
- 0 = Total number of C F's in probe with / score
- X = C F done correctly within standard time

Training Area: _____
 Duty: _____
 Learner: _____
 Trainer: _____

Stand. Time:	Critical Functions
30	_____
29	_____
28	_____
27	_____
26	_____
25	_____
24	_____
23	_____
22	_____
21	_____
20	_____
19	_____
18	_____
17	_____
16	_____
15	_____
14	_____
13	_____
12	_____
11	_____
10	_____
9	_____
8	_____
7	_____
6	_____
5	_____
4	_____
3	_____
2	_____
1	_____

Date:

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
29	29	29	29	29	29	29	29
28	28	28	28	28	28	28	28
27	27	27	27	27	27	27	27
26	26	26	26	26	26	26	26
25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25
24	24	24	24	24	24	24	24
23	23	23	23	23	23	23	23
22	22	22	22	22	22	22	22
21	21	21	21	21	21	21	21
20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19
18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
17	17	17	17	17	17	17	17
16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
15	15	15	15	15	15	15	15
14	14	14	14	14	14	14	14
13	13	13	13	13	13	13	13
12	12	12	12	12	12	12	12
11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

Notes:

ACTIVE:

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

INACTIVE:

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

MISCELLANEOUS:

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

TRAINER'S TIME: Active = Engaged in training
 Inactive = Observation
 Misc. = All other activities at site



APPENDIX B
EMPLOYER CONCERNS FORM

PROJECT COMPETE
EMPLOYER CONCERN REPORT

WORKER _____ POSITION _____

EMPLOYER _____ DATE _____ TRAINER _____

CHECK EACH AREA THAT IS CURRENTLY A CONCERN OR PROBLEM

- _____ 1. ABILITY TO PERFORM ASSIGNED TASKS
- _____ 2. GETTING ALONG WITH THE PUBLIC
- _____ 3. PERFORM ASSIGNED TASKS AT AN ACCEPTABLE RATE
- _____ 4. GETTING ALONG WITH CO-WORKERS
- _____ 5. NECESSARY NON-VOCATIONAL SKILLS (E.G., TELL TIME, MATH, READ,
WRITING)
- _____ 6. GETTING ALONG WITH WORK SUPERVISOR
- _____ 7. FOLLOWING DIRECTIONS
- _____ 8. BEHAVIOR DURING WORK OR BREAK TIMES
- _____ 9. SELF-DIRECTION
- _____ 10. GENERAL APPEARANCE (ATTIRE, CLEANLINESS, GROOMING)
- _____ 11. OTHER

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS / SPECIFIC INCIDENTS:

APPENDIX C
EMPLOYER RATING SCALE OF WORKER PERFORMANCE

(Project COMPETE) Employers' Rating Scale of Worker Performance*

Worker: _____ Evaluator: _____

Placement/Job: _____ Trainer: _____ Date: _____

INSTRUCTIONS: Compare this worker to another employee who has performed satisfactorily doing the same or similar type of job. Please rate the present worker on the list of criteria below using the following 1-2-3-4-5 scale.

Better 1 A little better 2 About the same 3 Not quite as good 4 Worse 5

(Circle your responses below)

GENERAL WORK SKILLS

Staying on task/Working hard..... 1 2 3 4 5

Work ability/Performance..... 1 2 3 4 5

WORK HABITS

Attendance/Punctuality..... 1 2 3 4 5

Self-direction/Initiative..... 1 2 3 4 5

WORK ATTITUDES

General work attitude..... 1 2 3 4 5

Responsibility/Dependability..... 1 2 3 4 5

Enthusiasm/Motivation..... 1 2 3 4 5

Takes pride in his/her work..... 1 2 3 4 5

Honesty..... 1 2 3 4 5

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Cleanliness/Hygiene.. 1 2 3 4 5

Appearance..... 1 2 3 4 5

GETTING ALONG WITH OTHERS

With supervisors..... 1 2 3 4 5

With co-workers..... 1 2 3 4 5

With public..... 1 2 3 4 5

Positive and friendly personality..... 1 2 3 4 5

If _____ were a regular paid employee of your business, would you want to keep him/her on as an employee? (Circle one): YES NO NOT SURE

If NO, or NOT SURE, please tell us why so that we may train this person to become more employable.

* Developed by Joseph R. Easterday (Indiana University, CITH) and Mary Austin (Developmental Services, Inc.)



APPENDIX D
WORK PERFORMANCE PROFILE

PROJECT COMPETE WORK PERFORMANCE PROFILE*

Client _____ Work Site/Position _____

Evaluator _____ Evaluator's Title _____

Rating Period: From _____ To _____ Date of Evaluation _____

Purpose

This evaluation instrument is designed to measure the vocational performance of severely handicapped youth participating in work experience settings. It is intended to measure actual performance over a period of time, rather than presumed ability. Each subject should be rated according to the level at which he/she has performed for the period of time stated above.

Directions

The rater using this instrument should be familiar with the subject's work performance, and ideally be the supervisor of the work experience setting under evaluation. The rater should read each item, and respond by circling the capital letter which corresponds to the descriptor most accurately depicting the subject's performance. Under some circumstances it may be necessary to respond by circling either NA (not applicable) or CT (can't tell) after the descriptor statement for each item. Written comments are encouraged to add important information, or to qualify an item response.

* Developed (1985) by Joseph R. Easterday, Patricia L. Sitlington, Marilyn Metzler & Mary Austin, Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.

1. Following Directions: Responds to instruction to perform one specific task (e.g., "Take out the trash"). NA CT

- A. Generally does not respond.
- B. Responds, but may do so incorrectly.
- C. Responds correctly if task is a familiar one.
- D. Responds correctly to both familiar and unfamiliar tasks.

2. Attendance/Absence Procedure: Regularly reports to work; notifies supervisor of absence NA CT

- A. Misses work more than an acceptable number of days, and often fails to notify supervisor.
- B. Misses work more than an acceptable number of days, but notifies supervisor.
- C. Attends work regularly with acceptable number of absences, but does not always contact appropriate person to report absences.
- D. Attends work regularly, and contacts appropriate person to report absences.

Note: Please indicate average number of days absent/month.

3. Age-Appropriate Behavior: Relates with others in an age-appropriate manner. NA CT

- A. Almost always behaves in immature/age-inappropriate manner.
- B. Frequently behaves in an immature manner.
- C. Behavior is not always age appropriate, but is generally within acceptable limits.
- D. Exhibits age appropriate behavior in response to almost all work situations.

4. Hygiene/Grooming: Consistently presents a good appearance, including personal cleanliness, grooming, and dress within target environment standards and expectations. NA CT

- A. Hygiene and grooming are far below acceptable standards.
- B. Hygiene and grooming are inconsistent and/or lacking in some areas. May exhibit periodic lapses.
- C. Fairly well groomed, but may still draw negative attention to self due to appearance.
- D. Hygiene and grooming consistently meet job norms such that they do not draw negative attention.

5. Relationship With Supervisor: Exhibits a cooperative working relationship with supervisor. NA CT

- A. Almost always resistant or unresponsive to supervision.
- B. Usually resistant to supervision, but sometimes responds appropriately.
- C. Responds well to supervision most of the time; sometimes reacts negatively
- D. Almost always reacts well to supervision.

6. Relationship With Co-workers: Works cooperatively in conjunction with other workers. NA CT

- A. Fails to perform effectively within group setting.
- B. Performs own task, but work is not coordinated with co-workers.
- C. Performs own task within group, and coordinates work with other workers.
- D. Works with others in coordinated fashion, and is able to assist others when necessary.

7. Taking Appropriate Concerns to Correct Person: Communicates needs/concerns with good cause to correct person. NA CT

- A. Does not communicate needs to others.
- B. Communicates needs to others, but often without good cause.
- C. Communicates needs only when appropriate, but often not to the appropriate person.
- D. Communicates needs only when appropriate; contacts appropriate person.

8. Speed/Work Rate: Sustains an acceptable work rate during work day.
NA CT

- A. Work rate is erratic and very seldom at desired level.
- B. Work rate is constant but slow; does not substantially improve with normal practice and supervisory cues.
- C. Usually performs within acceptable time frame, but does not always maintain pace.
- D. Almost always works at pace within acceptable range and maintains appropriate pace.

9. Quality of Independent Work: Carries out task assignment in accordance with standards and expectations of work environment.
NA CT

- A. Fails to perform task assignments accurately, even with close supervision.
- B. Sometimes performs within acceptable standards, but requires close supervision.
- C. Almost always performs within acceptable standards, but requires excessive supervision/assistance.
- D. Acceptable work is done consistently without unusual help or supervision.

10. Endurance/Stamina: Completes required physical duties such as standing, carrying, pushing, etc. for duration of work day and week. NA CT Specify these duties and time period for work. _____

- A. Lacks sufficient endurance/stamina; tires easily, needs frequent breaks from work.
- B. Can complete duties up to 1/2 of the time period with only normally scheduled breaks.
- C. Can complete duties of at least 1 full time period with only normally scheduled breaks, but does not maintain for full week.
- D. Can complete duties of full time period for 5 consecutive days with only normally scheduled breaks.

11. Reactions to Stress: Responds effectively when work load becomes heavy, asked to do extra work, or in any situation that creates pressure. NA CT Describe: _____

- A. Under stress, production substantially decreases or stops.
- B. Productivity is somewhat decreased under stress.
- C. Under stress, productivity is not significantly impaired, but individual may require extra supervision to maintain.
- D. Is able to maintain or increase productivity under stress without extra supervision.

12. Changes in Routine: Effectively responds to changes in routine. NA CT

- A. Fails to recognize change in routine; attempts to continue with routine behaviors, or discontinues work.
- B. Recognizes change in routine and attempts to adjust, but does not do so effectively, even with assistance.
- C. Responds to change in routine with some assistance.
- D. Recognizes and effectively responds to changes in routine without unusual assistance.

13. Level of Necessary Supervision: Is able to work steadily under normal supervision. NA CT

- A. Stops working immediately when supervision is withdrawn.
- B. There is a gradual and significant decrease in production when supervision is withdrawn.
- C. Requires intermittent checks to maintain production, under normal supervision
- D. Works steadily at familiar tasks with normal supervision.

14. Following Work Routine: Follows established routine within acceptable time limits for at least one full week. Utilizes naturally occurring prompts such as those followed by co-workers. NA CT

- A. Has difficulty following work routine, even with frequent prompting.
- B. Follows routine, but only with frequent individual prompts.
- C. Follows routine with only occasional individual prompts.
- D. Independently follows routine with only naturally occurring prompts.

15. Initiating Task: Begins task or daily routine with only normally occurring cues. NA CT

- A. Does not initiate tasks, even with individual prompts.
- B. Normally initiates tasks with individual prompts.
- C. Initiates tasks after prompt addressed to a group of workers, of which the individual is a member.
- D. Independently initiates tasks with only naturally occurring cues.

PROJECT COMPETE WORK PERFORMANCE PROFILE

Worker _____ Work Site _____ Rating Period: From _____ To _____

Evaluator _____ Job Title _____ Date of Administration _____

C															
P															
A															
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. Following Directions | 6. Relationship With Co-Workers | 11. Reactions to Stress |
| 2. Attendance/Absence | 7. Concerns to Correct Person | 12. Changes in Routine |
| 3. Age-appropriate Behavior | 8. Speed/Work Rate | 13. Level of Necessary Supervision |
| 4. Hygiene/Grooming | 9. Quality of Independent work | 14. Following Work Routine |
| 5. Relationship With Supervisor | 10. Endurance/Stamina | 15. Initiating Task |

APPENDIX E
YEARLY EXPLORATION SUMMARY

PROJECT COMPETE YEARLY EXPLORATION SUMMARY*

Student _____ Year _____

I. Exploration/Work Experience Sites, Dates, and Major Tasks

1. Site: _____
Supervisor: _____
Dates: _____
Tasks: a. _____
b. _____
c. _____
2. Site: _____
Supervisor: _____
Dates: _____
Tasks: a. _____
b. _____
c. _____
3. Site: _____
Supervisor: _____
Dates: _____
Tasks: a. _____
b. _____
c. _____
4. Site: _____
Supervisor: _____
Dates: _____
Tasks: a. _____
b. _____
c. _____

II. Work Performance Profile Rating (A - D)

	Sites			
	1	2	3	4
1. Following Directions	—	—	—	—
2. Attendance	—	—	—	—
3. Age-Approp. Behavior	—	—	—	—
4. Hygiene/Grooming	—	—	—	—
5. Relation w/ Super.	—	—	—	—
6. Relation with Co-workers	—	—	—	—
7. Concerns to Correct Person	—	—	—	—
8. Speed/Work Rate	—	—	—	—
9. Quality of Work	—	—	—	—
10. Endurance/Stamina	—	—	—	—
11. Reactions to Stress	—	—	—	—
12. Changes in Routine	—	—	—	—
13. Level of Needed Supervision	—	—	—	—
14. Following Work Routine	—	—	—	—
15. Initiating Task	—	—	—	—

III. Employer Concerns (record

	Sites			
	1	2	3	4
the total of each concern per site)	1	2	3	4
1. Ability to perform assigned work	—	—	—	—
2. Interactions with customers/clients	—	—	—	—
3. Ability to perform at rate	—	—	—	—
4. Interactions/relations with supervisor	—	—	—	—
5. Critical non-vocational skills	—	—	—	—
6. Interactions/relations with supervisor	—	—	—	—
7. Follows directions	—	—	—	—
8. Ability to use break time appropriately	—	—	—	—
9. Ability to self-direct or stay on-task	—	—	—	—
10. General appearance	—	—	—	—
11. General attitude toward work or job.	—	—	—	—
12. Other	—	—	—	—

IV. Employers' Rating (1-2-3-4-5)

	Sites			
	1	2	3	4
GENERAL WORK SKILLS				
Staying on task/works hard	—	—	—	—
Work ability/Performance	—	—	—	—
WORK HABITS				
Attendance/Punctuality	—	—	—	—
Self-direct/Initiative	—	—	—	—
WORK ATTITUDES				
General work attitude	—	—	—	—
Responsibility/Depend.	—	—	—	—
Enthusiasm/Mot' ation	—	—	—	—
Takes pride in work	—	—	—	—
Honesty	—	—	—	—
PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS				
Cleanliness/Hygiene	—	—	—	—
Appearance	—	—	—	—
GETTING ALONG WITH OTHERS				
With supervisors	—	—	—	—
With co-workers	—	—	—	—
With public	—	—	—	—
Positive & friendly	—	—	—	—

* Developed by Joseph E. Easterday and Patricia L. Sitlington, Center for Innovation in Teaching the Handicapped, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN.