

**INTELLECTUAL OUTPUT 5: TRAINING UTILITY AND EFFICIENCY REPORT
FOR DESIGNING QUALITY AND TRAINING TOOLS FOR COMPETENCE
PROFILE OF SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT SPECIALISTS PROJECT**

For first intellectual out of Designing Quality and Training Tools for Competence Profile of Supported Employment Specialists Project a training needs analysis has been held in Bulgaria, Portugal, Slovenia, and Turkey. This needs analysis is made via 232 fully answered questionnaires out of approximately 1000 dispatched questionnaires. As a product of this needs analysis a training program consisting of 6 modules has been prepared in English and local languages of partner countries (Bulgarian, Portuguese, Slovenian, and Turkish) as Intellectual Output 4. Also these modules uploaded on project's website, <http://www.tools4se.info> as easily accessible e-learning materials.

An assessment scale is developed for each module, which are below with their contents:

Module 1: "Obstacles and limitations caused by disabilities"

Module 2: "Ho do you support your client's (employee's) main/key competencies?"

Module 3: "Developing Practical Tools for Supported Employment"

Module 4: "Assistive Technologies for People with Disability"

Module 5: "The Concept of Supported Employment"

Module 6: "Manual for Career Consultancy"

In order to assess training materials pilot studies organized in 4 countries December 2017 and 196 participants in total are certified as supported employment specialists with this training program. Some of the pilot studies are done through e-learning portal and efficiency of this e-learning portal is also assessed. In this report first information about the methodology used is presented and then results obtained from collected data submitted.

In education literature training needs analysis is important for both presentation of contents that are compatible with needs analysis by using convenient methods and assessing efficiency of implemented training program. Thus assessment of training program, which is prepared as Intellectual Output 5, has done through using both participants' and trainers' thoughts and learning performances of participants, as foreseen in project's application process. Besides, views and performances of participants who attended only in online e-learning program are taken into consideration.

Kirkpatrick (1954) suggested 4 assessment levels for efficiency of training programs' efficiency:

1. Participants' reactions: Using satisfaction questionnaires in order to assess participants' satisfaction with training program.
2. Learning performance: Using performance tests for assessing participants' comprehension level of information provided in training program.
3. Behavior and performance change in work environment: This level includes a long-term assessment. Due to lack of data about participants' work performances, scarcity of supported employment practices in partner countries, and not including this level of assessment in project application this level is not included in this report.
4. Positive change in work outcomes: This assessment level is also not included in this report due to the same reasons indicated in third level.

In this report assessments are performed within criteria of Kirkpatrick's (1954) first and second assessment levels.

METHOD

Participants:

Pilot study is conducted with 191 participants in total from 4 project partner countries: Turkey, Bulgaria, Portugal and Slovenia. Working with and serving to people with disabilities are used as selection criteria for the participants.

Table 1. Distribution of participants by country

Country	Education Group	Participant Number
Turkey (IMU)	1. Group	25
Turkey (IMU)	2. Group	41
Turkey (IMU)	3. Group (e-learning)	35
Portugal		30
Bulgaria		45
Slovenia		20
Total		196

Measurement Tools:



Designing quality and training tools for competence profile of supported employment specialists



Training groups of Turkey received one of two different methods as face-to-face education or distant training through e-learning whereas these two methods used entwined with each other in Bulgaria's, Portugal's and Slovenia's training programs. Thus in this section measurement tools for face-to-face education and e-learning (distant education) will be discussed consecutively. 3 different scales for training modules' assessment, 1 multiple-choice questionnaire, and 1 central implementation as case studies by Bulgarian partner are used as measurement tools. Data are gathered from participants of pilot training, e-learning platform users, and trainers.

Assessment Tools Implemented to Training Participants:

Assessment Tools Used for Face-to-face Education:

3 different measurement tools are used from 3 different strategies used in assessment of training modules. These 3 tools consist Training Satisfaction Questionnaire implemented immediately after trainings, a questionnaire with 37 multiple-choice questions that involves all content of training modules, and Training Content Assessment which assesses modules' contents and filled by trainers.

1. Training Satisfaction Questionnaire:

Adult Training Satisfaction Scale (ATS) developed by Yüksekbilgili and Akduman (2016) is used to assess participants' satisfaction level of the training. Additionally "**Final Training Acquisitions / Acquisitions of Training**" subscale /dimension is formed regarding training contents of each module with different number of questions and participants' opinions are obtained with this scale. The features and numbers of the questions, which are formed for acquisitions subscale, differ according to the content of relevant module.

The ATS scale measures 6 main dimensions of training satisfaction with 30 questions. Participants express their satisfaction level on a 5 point Likert scale, 5 for "Absolutely don't agree" and 1 for "Absolutely agree". Subscales are measured with different number of items as following: Trainer's Presentation Skills with 4, Trainer's Communication Skills with 4, Training Environment with 4, Training Organization with 3, Aim of the Training with 6, and Training Acquisitions and General Assessment with 9 items. 656 data set gathered from 165 participants from trainings in partner countries (180 from Portugal, 120 from Slovenia, and 356 from Turkey) for 5 training modules and internal consistency analysis exhibit Cronbach α values as .93 for Trainer's Presentation Skills, .94 for Trainer's Communication Skills, .92 for Training Environment, .84 for Training Organization, .95 for Aim of the Training, and .98 for





Designing quality and training tools for competence profile of supported employment specialists



Training Acquisitions and General Assessment. These findings refer to the scale's validity with these subscales. Scale's items and subscales are presented at the Appendix 1.

2. *Final Training Acquisitions Questionnaire*

Additionally to these 6 main dimensions Final Training Acquisitions Scale is developed for each module. Subscales for modules measure “Obstacles and limitations caused by disabilities” for Module 1 with 7 items, “How do you support your client's (employee's) main/key competencies” for Module 2 with 6 items, “Developing Practical Tools for Supported Employment” for Module 3 with 14 items, “Assistive Technologies for People with Disabilities” for Module 4 with 6 items, “The Concept of Supported Employment” for Module 5 with 10 items, and “Manual for Career Consultancy” for Module 6 with 7 items. Internal consistency analysis conducted with data gathered from Turkish, Slovenian, and Portuguese participants exhibit Cronbach α values over .70 and as following: .94 for Module 1, .96 for Module 2, .98 for Module 3, .95 for Module 4, .74 for Module 5, and .95 for Module 6. These results meet the criteria for internal consistency for assessment subscales.

3. *Questionnaire for Assessing Participants' Learning Level*

A questionnaire with 37 multiple-choice items is developed to assess participants' comprehension levels from training. Questions prepared by Assist. Prof. Emine Ayyıldız, Assoc. Prof. Selma Arıkan, Assoc. Prof. Özcan Erkan Akgün, Assoc. Prof. Yeşim Güleç Aslan, and Reseach Assistans Beliz Canlı Korkut from Istanbul Medeniyet University and Assist. Prof. Fidan Özbey from Düzce University who are also the trainers of the modules. Questions are prepared in Turkish and translated into English. The partners translated questions from English into their languages. 5 questions are prepared for every module except 5th module. 12 questions are prepared for 5th module due to its content involves comprehensive theoretical basis of the training.

Assessment Tools Used for E-learning (distant education):

This questionnaire involves to parts. In the first part there 13 questions and 4 of them are answered as yes /no. second part is designed as 6 degree Likert type assessment with 20 questions.





Designing quality and training tools for competence profile of supported employment specialists



Training Content Evaluation Form for Trainers:

In order to assess sufficiency and quality of modules' contents, Assoc. Prof. Selma Arıkan, considering literature and similar examples, prepared a 10-item standard questionnaire. Questionnaire requires 6-degree Likert assessments, as 1 for "I absolutely disagree" and 6 for "I absolutely agree".

Procedure:

Procedures held in partner countries are presented below.

Turkey:

Pilot trainings in Turkey are organized by coordinator partner Istanbul Medeniyet University. 3 groups received pilot training programs, while in two groups face-to-face education and in one group e-learning method is used. First group consisted of 25 participants in total with different proficiencies as supported employment specialists, specialists working in services for employment of people with disabilities in Turkish Employment Agency and special education experts interested in supported employment. In second face-to-face education group 41 participants successfully completed the training program and filled assessment tools. In the second group, different from the first one, participants' learning performances are taken into account by using a multiple-choice questionnaire. The second group included participants with different occupations as psychologists, nurses, and officers serving for people with disability. Third group consists 35 participants with similar occupations and these participants completed an e-learning program within a week and had an examination assessing their learning performances. These participants also filled questionnaires of satisfaction with the training contents and training platform. Besides participants, 6 trainers also assessed modules' contents in sufficiency and utility criteria.

Slovenia:

Pilot training provided for 20 participants and these participants filled satisfaction questionnaires. Additionally 3 trainers assessed efficiency of modules' training contents.

Bulgaria:

Bulgarian partner implemented pilot training and satisfaction questionnaires to 45 participants. Also 5 trainers assessed efficiency and contents of training program. Besides these assessment methods, expert trainers assessed participants' learning performances through case studies.



Portugal:

Portuguese partner had 30 participants in training program; implemented satisfaction questionnaire and assessed learning performances with multiple-choice test. 3 trainers filled the form for assessing efficiency and content of the training program.

RESULTS

Satisfaction Levels of Participants:

This section contains information and results of analyses conducted with data from Training Satisfaction Questionnaire. First analyses from 656 data sets are presented in total and in subscale basis.

As exhibited in Table 2 data gathered from 116 participants from Turkey, Slovenia, and Portugal exhibit 4.59 points for Trainer’s Presentation Skills, 4.63 for Trainer’s Communication Skills, 4.49 for Training Environment, 4.61 for Training Organization, 4.62 for Aim of Training, and 4.57 for Training Acquisitions and General Assessment. These results refer to high levels of satisfaction from participants of 3 countries. All descriptive statistics of subscales from Training Satisfaction Questionnaire are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Assessment of Participants from Turkey, Slovenia, and Portugal for Training Program (for 6 modules):

	Trainer’s Presentation Skills	Trainer’s Communication Skills	Training Environmen t	Training Organization	Aim of Training	Training Acquisitions and General Evaluation
Mean	4,59	4,63	4,49	4,61	4,62	4,57
Median	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00
Mod	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00
S. Deviation	0,60	0,53	0,75	0,56	0,53	0,62
Variance	0,36	0,29	0,56	0,31	0,28	0,39
Skew	-1,62	-1,29	-2,15	-1,42	-1,18	-1,32
Kurtosis	3,02	0,88	6,20	1,73	0,45	0,93
Range	4,00	2,50	4,00	2,67	2,67	3,00
Minimum	1,00	2,50	1,00	2,33	2,33	2,00
Maximum	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00

Table 3 exhibits Training Satisfaction Questionnaire’s results for Module 1 “Obstacles and Limitations Caused by Disability” gathered from 116 participants from 3 countries. As seen in the table each dimension has high satisfaction levels with minimum point of 4.41 over 5 points. As seen in the mod row participants expressed their satisfaction with 5 points in most cases. Other descriptive statistics can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Assessment of Participants from Turkey, Slovenia, and Portugal for Module 1:

	Trainer’s Presentation Skills	Trainer’s Communication Skills	Training Environmen t	Training Organization	Aim of Training	Training Acquisitions and General Evaluation
Mean	4,68	4,70	4,41	4,54	4,65	4,58
Median	5,00	5,00	4,50	4,83	5,00	5,00
Mod	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00
S. Deviation	0,48	0,45	0,68	0,59	0,48	0,59
Variance	0,23	0,20	0,47	0,35	0,24	0,35
Skew	-1,48	-1,45	-1,11	-1,23	-1,16	-1,17
Kurtosis	1,33	1,26	0,76	1,17	0,07	0,18
Range	2,00	2,00	3,00	2,67	1,67	2,00
Minimum	3,00	3,00	2,00	2,33	3,33	3,00
Maximum	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00

As exhibited in Table 4 results obtained from 116 participants, results from Module 2 “How Do You Support Your Client’s Main / Key Competencies” show positive evaluations in each dimension. Mean point of sub-dimensions is 4.52 in a 5-point scale.

Table 4. Participants’ Module 2 Assessments from Slovenia, Turkey, and Portugal:

	Trainer’s Presentation Skills	Trainer’s Communication Skills	Training Environmen t	Training Organization	Aim of Training	Training Acquisitions and General Evaluation
Mean	4,64	4,69	4,52	4,66	4,64	4,63
Median	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00
Mod	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00
S. Deviation	0,52	0,48	0,80	0,54	0,50	0,56
Variance	0,27	0,24	0,64	0,29	0,25	0,31
Skew	-1,29	-1,30	-2,70	-1,62	-1,05	-1,34

Kurtosis	0,76	0,43	8,99	2,58	-0,27	0,76
Range	2,00	2,00	4,00	2,67	1,67	2,00
Minimum	3,00	3,00	1,00	2,33	3,33	3,00
Maximum	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00

116 participants' evaluations for Module 3 "Developing Practical Tools for Supported Employment" can be seen in Table 5. Points for sub-dimensions vary between 4.24 and 4.53 and show high levels of satisfaction.

Table 5. Participants' Module 3 Assessments from Slovenia, Turkey, and Portugal:

	Trainer's Presentation Skills	Trainer's Communication Skills	Training Environment	Training Organization	Aim of Training	Training Acquisitions and General Evaluation
Mean	4,24	4,39	4,42	4,53	4,44	4,36
Median	4,50	4,50	4,75	4,67	4,67	4,72
Mod	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00
S. Deviation	0,83	0,64	0,76	0,55	0,64	0,76
Variance	0,69	0,41	0,59	0,30	0,41	0,58
Skew	-1,09	-0,70	-2,04	-1,04	-0,94	-1,03
Kurtosis	1,40	-0,19	6,11	1,04	0,34	0,44
Range	4,00	2,50	4,00	2,67	2,67	3,00
Minimum	1,00	2,50	1,00	2,33	2,33	2,00
Maximum	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00

Table 6 contains 116 participants' assessment results for Module 4 "Assistive Technologies for People with Disability". As seen in the table participants' points for assessment dimensions vary between 4.61 and 4.75. Participants express high satisfaction with the module too.

Table 6. Participants' Module 4 Assessments from Slovenia, Turkey, and Portugal:

	Trainer's Presentation Skills	Trainer's Communication Skills	Training Environment	Training Organization	Aim of Training	Training Acquisitions and General Evaluation
Mean	4,75	4,75	4,61	4,68	4,7068	4,6688
Median	5,0000	5,0000	5,0000	5,0000	5,0000	5,0000
Mod	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00
S. Deviation	,45069	,45664	,68087	,54483	,46300	,54105

Variance	,203	,209	,464	,297	,214	,293
Skew	-1,734	-1,664	-2,620	-1,748	-1,344	-1,503
Kurtosis	2,219	1,725	8,862	2,840	,605	1,320
Range	2,00	2,00	4,00	2,67	1,67	2,00
Minimum	3,00	3,00	1,00	2,33	3,33	3,00
Maximum	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00

In Table 7 participants' satisfactions assessment for Module 5 "The Concept of Supported Employment" and varying points between 4.46 and 4.64 for subscales are presented.

Table 7. Participants' Module 5 Assessments from Slovenia, Turkey, and Portugal:

	Trainer's Presentation Skills	Trainer's Communication Skills	Training Environmen t	Training Organization	Aim of Training	Training Acquisitions and General Evaluation
Mean	4,58	4,63	4,46	4,64	4,60	4,56
Median	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00
Mod	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00
S. Deviation	0,61	0,53	0,79	0,54	0,56	0,62
Variance	0,37	0,28	0,63	0,30	0,32	0,38
Skew	-1,41	-1,20	-2,07	-1,51	-1,08	-1,21
Kurtosis	1,27	0,41	5,46	2,17	-0,17	0,30
Range	2,50	2,00	4,00	2,67	2,00	2,00
Minimum	2,50	3,00	1,00	2,33	3,00	3,00
Maximum	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00

Table 8 shows participants' assessment for Module 6 "Manual for Career Consultancy" and exhibits varying satisfaction points between 4.50 and 4.68 for subscales.

Table 8. Participants' Module 6 Assessments from Slovenia, Turkey, and Portugal:

	Trainer's Presentation Skills	Trainer's Communication Skills	Training Environmen t	Training Organization	Aim of Training	Training Acquisitions and General Evaluation
Mean	4,68	4,63	4,50	4,62	4,67	4,62
Median	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00
Mod	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00
S. Deviation	0,51	0,56	0,74	0,59	0,50	0,59
Variance	0,26	0,31	0,55	0,35	0,25	0,35

Skew	-1,41	-1,47	-2,37	-1,55	-1,25	-1,47
Kurtosis	1,03	1,66	7,88	2,07	0,19	1,09
Range	2,00	2,50	4,00	2,67	1,67	2,00
Minimum	3,00	2,50	1,00	2,33	3,33	3,00
Maximum	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00

Table 9 presents positive views of participants in Portugal's pilot training program. Mean points for general outcomes and assessment of project are 4.94.

Table 9. Assessment of Participants from Portugal for 6 Modules:

	Trainer's Presentation Skills	Trainer's Communication Skills	Training Environmen t	Training Organization	Aim of Training	Training Acquisitions and General Evaluation
Mean	4,82	4,88	4,83	4,90	4,90	4,94
Median	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00
Mod	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00
S. Deviation	0,38	0,31	0,35	0,23	0,24	0,21
Variance	0,14	0,10	0,12	0,05	0,06	,045
Skew	-1,67	-2,43	-1,70	-2,59	-2,75	-3,70
Kurtosis	0,89	4,19	1,07	6,40	6,79	12,47
Range	1,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	1,00	1,00
Minimum	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
Maximum	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00

Table 10 exhibits points gathered from participants in Slovenia's pilot training. Although Slovenian participants rated training with lower points, a positive evaluation still can be detected from mean points.

Table 10. Assessment of Participants from Slovenia for 6 Modules:

	Trainer's Presentation Skills	Trainer's Communication Skills	Training Environmen t	Training Organization	Aim of Training	Training Acquisitions and General Evaluation
Mean	4,29	4,20	4,50	4,19	4,16	3,96
Median	4,50	4,00	4,50	4,00	4,00	4,00
Mod	4,00 ^a	4,00	5,00	4,00	4,00	4,00
S. Deviation	0,58	0,56	0,53	0,66	0,52	0,68
Variance	0,34	0,31	0,28	0,43	0,27	0,47

Skew	-0,53	-0,11	-1,02	-0,75	0,03	0,11
Kurtosis	-0,64	-0,82	0,94	1,00	-0,97	-1,19
Range	2,00	2,00	2,00	2,67	1,67	2,00
Minimum	3,00	3,00	3,00	2,33	3,33	3,00
Maximum	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00

Table 11 exhibits training assessments points obtained from 3 training groups. Points are higher than Slovenian and lower than Portuguese participants' points.

Table 11. Assessment of Participants from Turkey for 6 Modules:

	Trainer's Presentation Skills	Trainer's Communication Skills	Training Environmen t	Training Organization	Aim of Training	Training Acquisitions and General Evaluation
Mean	4,59	4,65	4,31	4,61	4,63	4,56
Median	5,00	5,00	4,50	5,00	5,00	5,00
Mod	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00
S. Deviation	0,66	0,53	0,88	0,55	0,54	0,60
Variance	0,43	0,28	0,78	0,30	0,29	0,36
Skew	-1,80	-1,45	-1,78	-1,16	-1,27	-1,34
Kurtosis	3,73	1,70	3,74	0,40	0,92	1,64
Range	4,00	2,50	4,00	2,33	2,67	3,00
Minimum	1,00	2,50	1,00	2,67	2,33	2,00
Maximum	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00	5,00

Learning Performances of Participants:

As indicated by Kirkpatrick (1954) the second level of assessment alongside of participants' reactions, is participants' learning performance levels. Thus participants' learning performance is also taken into consideration in order to assess training's efficiency and utility. With this aim a 37-item multiple-choice questionnaire prepared by Turkish academics, is applied to participants in Turkey and Portugal. Participants' general test performance can be seen in Table 12. As seen in the results e-learning program is efficient in generating successful results as much as face-to-face education.

Table 12. Learning Performances of Participants in Turkey and Portugal

Country	Portugal	Turkey 2 nd Group (Face-to-face)	Turkey E-learning	Turkey All Participants
No. of participants	30	38	35	73



Designing quality and training tools for competence profile of supported employment specialists



Mean	30,90	25,55	28,37	26,90
Median	31,00	26,50	29,00	27,00
Mod	30,00 ^a	27,00	26,00	26,00
S. Deviation	2,37	4,10	3,89	4,22
Variance	5,61	16,85	15,12	17,81
Skew	0,28	-1,42	-0,30	-0,81
Kurtosis	-,60	2,42	-1,03	1,37
Range	9,00	20,00	14,00	22,00
Minimum	27,00	12,00	20,00	12,00
Maximum	36,00	32,00	34,00	34,00

Bulgarian partner has used 12 specially designed cases as tool for final assessment of participants who have attended pilot training program. The criteria for the assessment of the results were predefined and are as following:

- Well-structured and comprehensive written response to the given case
- Detailed answer congruent to the content of the training modules.
- Logical and convincing justifications of the given answer to the case
- Clear link between the provided answer and the 5 stages of supported employment process.
- Demonstrated knowledge about: the supported employment model; career guidance process; implementation of client centered approach; various types of disabilities and possible barriers and challenges that hampers the access to the open labor market by the client with disability etc.
- Demonstrated skills with regards to: implementation of the supported employment services; career counseling and guidance of people with different types of disability; using of different tools and approaches applicable to the supported employment process etc.
- Awareness about the roles of the supported employment specialist and what are his/her responsibilities and duties.
- Ability to apply different supported employment strategies in accordance with client`s abilities and expectations.



Each participant received one case in written format randomly selected from 12 in total. Participants used half an hour to develop an answer to the case. Then participants are invited to present their responses in front of the group as well as in front of the trainer. The next step is group discussion about the given answer and feedback about the answer. The trainer provides the final feedback and assessment statement. As a final step the trainer explains if the participant passes successfully the final exam according to the criteria and what are the strengths and weaknesses of the answer. Results indicate that all participants managed to use provided information in training program and succeeded in the final assessment.

Trainers' Assessments:

23 trainers in total from Bulgaria, Slovenia, Portugal, and Turkey performed as trainers in pilot studies and assessed the content of training program. 5 trainers lectured total of 6 modules in Bulgaria, whereas each module is presented by different trainers in Portugal, Slovenia, and Turkey. Results of Trainers' assessments for each module indicate Cronbach's α value as .96 for the scale. Descriptive statistics for general scale and each scale item are provided in the tables below.

Positive evaluations of participants about module 1's training materials can be figured out from mean points, skew values, minimum and maximum points.

Table 14. Trainer Assessments for Module 1 "Obstacles and Limitations Caused by Disabilities"

Assessment Criteria	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skew	Kurtosis	Min	Max
Technical accuracy of module content	5.75	0.46	-1.44	0.00	5	6
Actuality of module content	5.62	0.52	-0.64	-2.24	5	6
Reasonableness of module's plan and structure	5.50	0.53	0.00	-2.80	5	6
Congruence of material with foreseen lecture plan	5.50	0.76	-1.32	0.88	4	6
Congruence of material with goals	5.75	0.46	0.75	1.48	5	6
Material's Comprehension of basic points about the subject	5.75	0.46	0.75	1.48	5	6
Module's usability as a resource for subject	5.63	0.52	-0.64	-2.24	5	6
Sufficiency of example / role-play / game etc.	5.87	0.35	-2.83	8.00	5	6
Contribution of example / role-play / game etc.	5.87	0.35	-2.83	8.00	5	6
Comprehension of module material in general	5.62	0.52	-0.64	-2.24	5	6
Mean	5.68	0.42	-1.11	-0.59	5	6

Trainers' positive assessments about training material in over 6-degree scale can be seen from mean points, distribution's skew values, minimum and maximum points.

Table 15. Trainers' Assessments for Module 2 "How Do You Support Your Client's (Employee's) Main / Key Competencies"

Assessment Criteria	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skew	Kurtosis	Min	Max
Technical accuracy of module content	5.62	0.52	-0.64	-2.24	5	6
Actuality of module content	5.63	0.74	-1.95	3.21	4	6
Reasonableness of module's plan and structure	5.50	0.76	-1.32	0.88	4	6
Congruence of material with foreseen lecture plan	5.62	0.52	-0.64	-2.24	5	6
Congruence of material with goals	5.62	0.52	-0.64	-2.24	5	6
Material's Comprehension of basic points about the subject	5.62	0.52	-0.64	-2.24	5	6
Module's usability as a resource for subject	5.75	0.46	-1.44	1.48	5	6
Sufficiency of example / role-play / game etc.	5.63	0.74	-1.95	3.21	4	6
Contribution of example / role-play / game etc.	5.50	0.76	-1.32	0.88	4	6
Comprehension of module material in general	5.75	0.46	-1.44	1.48	5	6
Mean	5.62	0.54	-1.38	0.59	4	6

Positive evaluations of participants about module 3's training materials can be figured out from mean points, skew values, minimum and maximum points.

Table 16. Trainers' Assessments for Module 3 "Developing Practical Tools for Supported Employment"

Assessment Criteria	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skew	Kurtosis	Min	Max
Technical accuracy of module content	5.63	0.74	-1.95	3.21	4	6
Actuality of module content	5.75	0.46	-1.44	0.00	5	6
Reasonableness of module's plan and structure	5.63	0.74	-1.95	3.21	4	6
Congruence of material with foreseen lecture plan	5.75	0.46	-1.44	0.00	5	6
Congruence of material with goals	5.75	0.46	-1.44	0.00	5	6
Material's Comprehension of basic points about the subject	5.62	0.74	-1.95	3.21	4	6
Module's usability as a resource for subject	5.75	0.46	-1.44	0.00	5	6
Sufficiency of example / role-play / game etc.	5.75	0.46	-1.44	0.00	5	6
Contribution of example / role-play / game etc.	5.88	0.35	-2.83	8.00	5	6
Comprehension of module material in general	5.88	0.35	-2.83	8.00	5	6
Mean	5.74	0.46	-1.42	-0.04	5	6

Trainers' positive assessments about Module 4's training material in over 6-degree scale can be seen from mean points, distribution's skew values, minimum and maximum points.

Table 17. Trainers' Assessments for Module 4 "Assistive Technologies for People with Disability"

Assessment Criteria	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skew	Kurtosis	Min	Max
Technical accuracy of module content	5.75	0.46	-1.44	0.00	5	6
Actuality of module content	5.75	0.46	-1.44	0.00	5	6
Reasonableness of module's plan and structure	5.62	0.74	-1.95	3.21	4	6
Congruence of material with foreseen lecture plan	5.38	0.74	-0.82	-0.15	4	6
Congruence of material with goals	5.62	0.74	-1.95	3.21	4	6
Material's Comprehension of basic points about the subject	5.75	0.46	-1.44	0.00	5	6
Module's usability as a resource for subject	5.75	0.46	-1.44	0.00	5	6
Sufficiency of example / role-play / game etc.	5.62	0.74	-1.95	3.21	4	6
Contribution of example / role-play / game etc.	5.75	0.46	-1.44	0.00	5	6
Comprehension of module material in general	5.88	0.35	-2.83	8.00	5	6
Mean	5.69	0.49	-1.45	0.28	4.80	6

Positive evaluations of participants about module 5's training materials can be figured out from mean points, skew values, minimum and maximum points.

Table 18. Trainers' Assessment for Module 5 "Concept of Supported Employment"

Assessment Criteria	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skew	Kurtosis	Min	Max
Technical accuracy of module content	5.75	0.46	-1.44	0.00	5	6
Actuality of module content	5.75	0.46	-1.44	0.00	5	6
Reasonableness of module's plan and structure	5.75	0.46	-1.44	0.00	5	6
Congruence of material with foreseen lecture plan	5.88	0.35	-2.83	8.00	5	6
Congruence of material with goals	5.63	0.52	-0.64	-2.24	5	6
Material's Comprehension of basic points about the subject	5.63	0.52	-0.64	-2.24	5	6
Module's usability as a resource for subject	5.88	0.35	-2.83	8.00	5	6
Sufficiency of example / role-play / game etc.	5.50	0.53	0.00	-2.80	5	6
Contribution of example / role-play / game etc.	5.50	0.53	0.00	-2.80	5	6
Comprehension of module material in general	5.88	0.35	-2.83	8.00	5	6
Mean	5.72	0.35	-1.37	1.31	5	6

Positive evaluations of participants about module 6's training materials can be figured out from mean points, skew values, minimum and maximum points.

Table 19. Trainers' Assessments for Module 6 "Manual for Career Consultancy"

Assessment Criteria	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skew	Kurtosis	Min	Max
Technical accuracy of module content	5.50	0.46	-1.44	0.00	5	6
Actuality of module content	5.50	0.46	-1.44	0.00	5	6
Reasonableness of module's plan and structure	5.75	0.71	0.75	1.48	4	6
Congruence of material with foreseen lecture plan	5.63	0.74	-1.95	3.21	4	6
Congruence of material with goals	5.75	0.71	-2.83	8.00	4	6
Material's Comprehension of basic points about the subject	5.50	0.46	-1.44	0.00	5	6
Module's usability as a resource for subject	5.50	0.46	-1.44	0.00	5	6
Sufficiency of example / role-play / game etc.	5.63	0.74	-1.95	3.21	4	6
Contribution of example / role-play / game etc.	5.63	0.74	-1.95	3.21	4	6
Comprehension of module material in general	5.50	0.46	-1.44	0.00	5	6
Mean	5.59	0.67	-2.34	5.74	4	6

Assessments for E-Learning Platform

Assessments for e-learning platform are obtained with forms filled by participants who attended only online e-learning program in Turkey. Participants rated e-learning training in 19 criteria in a 5-degree Likert form in an online platform. For each module, analyses indicating minimum and maximum points alongside descriptive statistics, standard deviation values, and skew and kurtosis values of distribution can be seen in the tables below.

As seen in Table 20 participants rated module 1 for 19 criteria over 5 points. Mean points for each criterion is around 4.5 points. These points indicate participants' positive evaluations for module 1 materials of e-learning program. Negative points for skew values demonstrate accumulation of 4 and 5 points. Besides, occurrence of 3 points as minimum points refers to lacking of negative evaluations. With all these in mind e-learning program's module 1 evaluation is positive in general.

Table 20. Assessment for e-learning training Module 1 "Obstacles and Limitations Caused by Disabilities"

Assessment Criterion	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skew	Kurtosis	Min	Max
----------------------	------	--------------------	------	----------	-----	-----

Clarity and comprehensibility of content	4.54	0.59	-0.87	-0.11	3	5
Design's congruence to aims	4.54	0.66	-1.17	0.35	3	5
Inclusion main subjects	4.50	0.72	-1.89	4.97	2	5
Facility of visual and auditory material	4.46	0.51	-0.18	-2.16	4	5
Training presentation's congruence to aims	4.54	0.72	-2.06	5.56	2	5
Sufficiency of documentation for participant	4.25	0.68	-0.35	-0.67	3	5
Contribution of training to occupational development	4.38	0.77	-0.79	-0.79	3	5
Contribution of training to personal development	4.50	0.66	-0.99	.00	3	5
Contribution of training to acquisition of new information and abilities	4.58	0.58	-1.07	0.30	3	5
Providing information and abilities applicable for institutions	4.46	0.72	-0.98	-0.29	3	5
Acquisition of information and abilities sharable with colleagues	4.46	0.78	-1.66	3.10	2	5
Enhancing interest in subject	4.46	0.83	-1.58	2.09	2	5
Suggesting training to colleagues	4.54	0.66	-1.17	0.35	3	5
Leaving training in a positive mood / happily	4.46	0.66	-0.83	-0.25	3	5
Leaving training with achievement of aims	4.42	0.72	-1.61	4.21	2	5
Easiness of e-learning platform	4.58	0.72	-2.25	6.34	2	5
Attraction of e-learning material	4.42	0.78	-1.53	2.80	2	5
Visual attraction of e-learning material	4.33	0.82	-1.24	1.45	2	5
General satisfaction	4.42	0.72	-0.84	-0.49	3	5

Same analyses conducted for module 2 as in module 1. All mean points are above 4 as seen in table below. Skew values indicate high points for each criterion. Some important criteria received minimum 4 assessment points. Results present a general satisfaction for e-learning program's module 2.

Table 21. Assessments for e-learning training Module 2 “How Do You Support Your Client’s (Employee’s) Main / Key Competencies”

“Assessment Criterion	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skew	Kurtosis	Min	Max
Clarity and comprehensibility of content	4.74	0.45	-1.17	-0.72	4	5
Design's congruence to aims	4.53	0.61	-0.92	0.04	3	5
Inclusion main subjects	4.74	0.45	-1.17	-0.72	4	5
Facility of visual and auditory material	4.63	0.50	-0.59	-1,86	4	5
Training presentation's congruence to aims	4.63	0.50	-0.59	-1.86	4	5
Sufficiency of documentation for participant	4.63	0.50	-0.59	-1.86	4	5
Contribution of training to occupational development	4.47	0.77	-1.12	-0.24	3	5
Contribution of training to personal development	4.58	0.61	-1.17	0.58	3	5
Contribution of training to acquisition of new information and abilities	4.63	0.60	-1.44	1.38	3	5
Providing information and abilities applicable for institutions	4.47	0.70	-1.00	-0.09	3	5

Acquisition of information and abilities sharable with colleagues	4.58	0.77	-2.35	6.48	2	5
Enhancing interest in subject	4.53	0.84	-1.97	3.73	2	5
Suggesting training to colleagues	4.63	0.60	-1.44	1.38	3	5
Leaving training in a positive mood / happily	4.53	0.77	-2.12	5.54	2	5
Leaving training with achievement of aims	4.47	0.84	-1.79	3.14	2	5
Easiness of e-learning platform	4.37	0.76	-1.62	4.08	2	5
Attraction of e-learning material	4.26	0.81	-1.26	2.17	2	5
Visual attraction of e-learning material	4.47	0.61	-0.70	-0.31	3	5
General satisfaction	4.47	0.61	-0.70	-0.31	3	5

General assessments for module 3 are in a positive trend. All criteria received minimum 4 points and skew value of distribution refers to high points.

Table 22. Assessment for e-learning training Module 3 “Developing Practical Tools for Supported Employment”

Assessment Criterion	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skew	Kurtosis	Min	Max
Clarity and comprehensibility of content	4.63	0.50	-0.59	1.86	4	5
Design’s congruence to aims	4.63	0,50	-0.59	1.86	4	5
Inclusion main subjects	4.63	0.50	-0.59	1.86	4	5
Facility of visual and auditory material	4.42	0.61	-0.50	-0.50	3	5
Training presentation’s congruence to aims	4.58	0.51	-0.35	-2.12	4	5
Sufficiency of documentation for participant	4.32	0.67	-0.47	-0.57	3	5
Contribution of training to occupational development	4.32	0.75	-0.61	-0.87	3	5
Contribution of training to personal development	4.58	0.61	-1.17	0.58	3	5
Contribution of training to acquisition of new information and abilities	4.47	0.61	-0.70	-0.31	3	5
Providing information and abilities applicable for institutions	4.42	0.77	-0.94	-0.54	3	5
Acquisition of information and abilities sharable with colleagues	4.47	0.70	-1.00	-0.09	3	5
Enhancing interest in subject	4.58	0.61	-1.17	0.58	3	5
Suggesting training to colleagues	4.47	0.70	-1.00	-0.89	3	5
Leaving training in a positive mood / happily	4.63	0.60	-1.44	1.38	3	5
Leaving training with achievement of aims	4.58	0.61	-1.01	0.58	3	5
Easiness of e-learning platform	4.58	0.77	-2.35	6.48	2	5
Attraction of e-learning material	4.53	0.77	-2.12	5.54	2	5
Visual attraction of e-learning material	4.37	0.83	-1.48	2.41	2	5
General satisfaction	4.63	0.50	-0.59	-1.86	4	5

Descriptive statistics for module 4 assessments exhibit similar results to previous. 18 of 19 criteria received mean points over 4.5. The criterion of “Providing information and abilities applicable for institutions” received 4.44 mean point and this point can be considered also as a

high point. Participants made positive assessments for module 4 in general as in previous modules.

Table 23. Assessment for e-learning training Module 4 “Assistive Technologies for People with Disabilities”

Assessment Criterion	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skew	Kurtosis	Min	Max
Clarity and comprehensibility of content	4.67	0.49	-0.77	-1.59	4	5
Design’s congruence to aims	4.72	0.46	-1.09	-0.94	4	5
Inclusion main subjects	4.72	0.46	-1.09	-0.94	4	5
Facility of visual and auditory material	4.56	0.51	-0.24	-2.20	4	5
Training presentation’s congruence to aims	4.78	0.43	-1.46	0.14	4	5
Sufficiency of documentation for participant	4.67	0.49	-0.77	-1.59	4	5
Contribution of training to occupational development	4.56	0.62	-1.09	0.39	3	5
Contribution of training to personal development	4.78	0.43	-1.46	0.14	4	5
Contribution of training to acquisition of new information and abilities	4.78	0.43	-1.46	0.14	4	5
Providing information and abilities applicable for institutions	4.44	0.71	-0.92	-0.25	3	5
Acquisition of information and abilities sharable with colleagues	4.61	0.50	-0.50	-1.99	4	5
Enhancing interest in subject	4.72	0.46	-1.09	-0.94	4	5
Suggesting training to colleagues	4.67	0.49	-0.77	-1.59	4	5
Leaving training in a positive mood / happily	4.72	0.46	-1.09	-0.94	4	5
Leaving training with achievement of aims	4.67	0.49	-0.77	-1.59	4	5
Easiness of e-learning platform	4.72	0.46	-1.09	-0.94	4	5
Attraction of e-learning material	4.67	0.49	-0.77	-1.59	4	5
Visual attraction of e-learning material	4.72	0.46	-1.09	-0.94	4	5
General satisfaction	4.72	0.46	-1.09	-0.94	4	5

Assessment with module 5, which includes emergence, foundations and development of supported employment concept, is in a positive trend in general. Especially “Acquisition of information and abilities sharable with colleagues” holds very high assessment with 4,88 mean point. Mean points of other criteria are generally over 4.5 and have minimum 3 points.

Table 24. Assessment for e-learning training Module 5 “The concept of Supported Employment”

Assessment Criterion	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skew	Kurtosis	Min	Max
Clarity and comprehensibility of content	4.61	0.50	-0.50	-1.99	4	5
Design’s congruence to aims	4.72	0.46	-1.09	-0.94	4	5
Inclusion main subjects	4.72	0.46	-1.09	-0.94	4	5
Facility of visual and auditory material	4.44	0.71	-0.92	-0.25	3	5

Training presentation's congruence to aims	4.61	0.50	-0.50	-1.99	4	5
Sufficiency of documentation for participant	4.50	0.62	-0.84	-0.10	3	5
Contribution of training to occupational development	4.44	0.71	-0.92	-0.25	3	5
Contribution of training to personal development	4.61	0.50	-0.50	-1.99	4	5
Contribution of training to acquisition of new information and abilities	4.67	0.49	-0.77	-1.59	4	5
Providing information and abilities applicable for institutions	4.56	0.71	-1.35	0.65	3	5
Acquisition of information and abilities sharable with colleagues	4.81	0.61	-1.36	1.13	3	5
Enhancing interest in subject	4.72	0.46	-1.09	-0.94	4	5
Suggesting training to colleagues	4.67	0.59	-1.68	2.22	3	5
Leaving training in a positive mood / happily	4.72	0.46	-1.09	-0.94	4	5
Leaving training with achievement of aims	4.67	0.59	-1.68	2.22	3	5
Easiness of e-learning platform	4.72	0.46	-1.09	-0.94	4	5
Attraction of e-learning material	4.61	0.61	-1.36	1.13	3	5
Visual attraction of e-learning material	4.61	0.61	-1.36	1.13	3	5
General satisfaction	4.72	0.46	-1.09	-0.94	4	5

Same analyses conducted for module 6 and every criterion except one received 4,5 mean points. Skew value is similar to previous modules' analyses and indicates general usage of high points for criteria. Content's success in inclusion of main subject is emphasized with 4,83 mean point. Thus, module 6 has a positive assessment trend in general.

Table 25. Assessment for e-learning training Module 6 “Manual for Career Consultancy”

Assessment Criterion	Mean	Standard Deviation	Skew	Kurtosis	Min	Max
Clarity and comprehensibility of content	4.50	0.62	-0.84	-0.10	3	5
Design's congruence to aims	4.56	0.62	1.09	0.39	3	5
Inclusion main subjects	4.83	0.38	-1.96	2.04	4	5
Facility of visual and auditory material	4.56	0.62	-1.09	0.39	3	5
Training presentation's congruence to aims	4.61	0.61	-1.36	1.13	3	5
Sufficiency of documentation for participant	4.56	0.62	-1.09	0.39	3	5
Contribution of training to occupational development	4.56	0.86	-2.10	4.10	2	5
Contribution of training to personal development	4.78	0.43	-1.46	0.14	4	5
Contribution of training to acquisition of new information and abilities	4.67	0.49	-0.77	-1.59	4	5
Providing information and abilities applicable for institutions	4.56	0.86	-2.10	4.10	2	5
Acquisition of information and abilities sharable with colleagues	4.44	0.86	-1.71	2.85	2	5
Enhancing interest in subject	4.56	0.62	-1.09	0.39	3	5
Suggesting training to colleagues	4.67	0.59	-1.68	2.22	3	5
Leaving training in a positive mood / happily	4.61	0.61	-1.36	1.13	3	5

Leaving training with achievement of aims	4.61	0.61	-1.36	1.13	3	5
Easiness of e-learning platform	4.78	0.43	-1.46	0.14	4	5
Attraction of e-learning material	4.72	0.46	-1.09	-0.94	4	5
Visual attraction of e-learning material	4.72	0.46	-1.09	-0.94	4	5
General satisfaction	4.72	0.46	-1.09	-0.94	4	5

Learning Performance Assessments for E-Learning Program

As presented in Table 12 e-learning platform is as efficient as face-to-face training programs. Table 26 presents 35 participants' performance in 37 multiple-choice questions. Besides the number of questions replied by participants can be seen in table 27.

Table 26. Test Results of Participants Attending Only in E-Learning Training Program

Mean	28,37
Median	29
Mod	26
Std. Deviation	3,89
Variance	15,12
Skew	-0,30
Kurtosis	-1,03
Range	14
Minimum	20
Maximum	34

As seen in the frequency table below, e-learning participants answered at least 20 questions out of 37 questions. As seen in the table above mean number for correct answers is 29. Results indicate participants received minimum 70 points over 100 points. These results exhibit efficiency and utility of the e-learning training program.

Table 27. Frequency Distribution of Correct Answers of E-Learning Training Participants

Number of Correct Answers	Frequency	Percentage Rate	Valid Percentage
20,00	1	2,9	2,9
22,00	1	2,9	2,9
23,00	3	8,6	8,6
24,00	1	2,9	2,9
25,00	3	8,6	8,6
26,00	5	14,3	14,3



Designing quality and training tools for competence profile of supported employment specialists



27,00	1	2,9	2,9
28,00	1	2,9	2,9
29,00	4	11,4	11,4
30,00	1	2,9	2,9
31,00	4	11,4	11,4
32,00	4	11,4	11,4
33,00	4	11,4	11,4
34,00	2	5,7	5,7
Total	35	100,0	100,0

Final Note

Efficiency and utility of training modules, which are developed for Designing Quality and Training Tools for Competence Profile of Supported Employment Specialists Project, is confirmed regarding analyses conducted with satisfaction of pilot trainings participants, participants' learning performances, and trainers' assessments. Results indicate this 6-module training program containing 6 main subjects can be used in education of supported employment specialists. Further projects should focus on improvement of the training programs that respond to different types of disabilities.

