# Summary of Frequency and Mean Ratings for Institute Pre-Assessment

### Joan LaFrance, June 5, 2017

The following is a preliminary examination of the pre-assessment survey that were completed by 40 of the enrollees. The dates of this survey application are June 28, 2016 to January 29, 2017. I found it useful to analyze the 40 “competencies” in terms of the level of knowledge the Institute enrollees indicated they had at the time they enrolled and their assessment of their use of each of the competencies. It raised some questions that we could discuss in future evaluation meetings.

Frequency of the responses on the assessment’s five-point scale of “no knowledge, little knowledge, moderate knowledge, high degree of knowledge and very high degree of knowledge” were collapsed into three levels. These are “no to little knowledge, moderate knowledge, and high to very high degree of knowledge. Figure 1 illustrates the areas that the enrollees indicated the least amount of knowledge. At least 50% or more of those completing the assessment indicated no to little knowledge of these areas, with job search skills and providing traditional healing services getting the highest ratings.

Figure 2 shows those who indicated more of a mid-range, with a third to just under half of the enrollees indicating no to little knowledge.

As 40% or more of enrollees indicate moderate knowledge, the number those noting no to little drops to 30% to 38%. Half of the 40 competencies fell within this grouping.

Figure 3 illustrates the competencies that most of the enrollees indicated moderate to higher levels of knowledge. Well over two-thirds of the enrollees indicted a high level of knowledge of ethics and confidentiality. For 13 of the 40 competencies, a majority of enrollees indicated a moderate to high level of knowledge.

Figure 4 on the next page illustrates the mean score of level of knowledge compared to the mean score for frequency of application for all 40 (listed in order from highest to lowest level of knowledge). This figure shows that the level of knowledge mean is generally lower than the mean for frequency of application of the knowledge. It would be good to review the competencies to see if the “never to daily use” scale fits all the competencies. It is possible to set different scales; however, the assessment would have to be changed for future year’s enrollees. Also, we should classify positions as those with direct contact with clients, such as counselors, may have different levels of application compared to support staff or management. Review of position lists and the competencies should be on the agenda for future evaluation meetings. The list of positions for the 40 enrollees in this summary is shown on page 5.

List of positions as entered for the pre-assessment. Two did not complete the assessment.

1. Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor
2. Lead Counselor
3. Admin. Asst./Support Specialist
4. Work Adjustment Skills Trainer
5. VR counselor
6. Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor
7. Rehab. Technician
8. Job Placement Counselor
9. Transitional Counselor
10. STUDENT
11. ABE Instructor
12. Case Manager
13. Director
14. VRC
15. Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor
16. NPTVR Specialist
17. Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor
18. Voc Rehab Counselor
19. Job Developer
20. NPTVRS Specialist
21. Intake Coordinator
22. TVR Counselor
23. Job Developer
24. Director
25. Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor Associate
26. Case Worker
27. Employment and Training Caseworker
28. Employment, Training and Related Services Coordinator
29. Director
30. Counselor 2
31. Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor
32. Program Director
33. VR Counselor
34. Lead Caseworker
35. TVR Counselor
36. Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor
37. Program Assistance II with Special Projects and Initiatives
38. VR Counselor
39. Counselor 2
40. Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor
41. NIVRP VRC
42. Director