PASSING: A Power Tool for Learning and Using SRV

A Presentation and Panel talk with Betsy Neuville, Judith Sandys, Robert Flynn, Jack Vermeulen, Jane Sherwin, Pamela Seetoo, Raymond Lemay, and Paul Snyder

Where there is passion, there is hope....

Wolf Wolfensberger
Tentative Topics

- PASSING Overview - Betsy
- The Impact of PASSING -
  - Who comes and why?
  - Impact and Effect: Facilitated discussion by Jane Sherwin
- PASSING as Leadership Development- Pam Seetoo
- Research on PASSING: An Overview – Bob Flynn
- The Art and Craft of Organizing PASSING- Judith Sandys
- PASSING as Evaluation Tool – Ray Lemay, Paul Snyder, and Jack Vermeulen
- Adaptations and Modifications - All
  - With commentary by panelists

What is PASSING?
SOCIAL ROLE VALORIZATION

The Good Things in Life

Valued Social Roles

Image Enhancement  Competency Enhancement

What is PASSING?
Purposes of Passing
I. Teach and disseminate Social Role Valorization
   A. Making SRV easy and accessible but still complex
   B. Systematic and in-depth explication of SRV and its implications

The PASSING Instrument
**SOCIAL ROLE VALORIZATION**

The Good Things in Life

Valued Social Roles

Image Enhancement Competency Enhancement

---

### Passing Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMAGE ENHANCEMENT</th>
<th>COMPETENCY ENHANCEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHYSICAL SETTING OF SERVICE 11 RATINGS</td>
<td>PHYSICAL SETTING OF SERVICE 6 RATINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE-STRUCTURED GROUPINGS &amp; RELATIONSHIPS AMONG PEOPLE 7 RATINGS</td>
<td>SERVICE-STRUCTURED GROUPINGS &amp; RELATIONSHIPS AMONG PEOPLE 6 RATINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERVICE-STRUCTURED ACTIVITIES &amp; OTHER USE OF TIME 3 RATINGS</td>
<td>SERVICE-STRUCTURED ACTIVITIES &amp; OTHER USE OF TIME 3 RATINGS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER SERVICE LANGUAGE, SYMBOLS &amp; IMAGES 6 RATINGS</td>
<td>NO RATINGS - NOT APPLICABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Passing Ratings

PHYSICAL SETTING OF SERVICE (12 RATINGS)
- Setting Neighborhood Harmony
- Program Neighborhood Harmony
- External Setting Aesthetics
- Internal Setting Aesthetics
- External Setting Congruency with CVA
- Internal Setting Congruency with CVA
- External Setting Age Image
- Internal Setting Age Image
- Image Projection of Setting – Physical Prospects
- Image Projection of Setting – History
- Image Projection of Setting – Other Internal Physical Features
- Competency Related Setting Access

SERVICE-STRUCTURED GROUPINGS & RELATIONSHIPS AMONG PEOPLE (7 RATINGS)
- Image Projection of Program to Program Juxtaposition
- Service Neighborhood Assimilation Potential
- Image Projection on Intra Service Client Grouping – Social Value
- Image Projection on Intra Service Client Grouping – Age Image
- Image Related Other Recipient Contact and Personal Relationships
- Service Recipient Image Transfer
- Service Recipient Image Match

SERVICE-STRUCTURED ACTIVITIES & OTHER USE OF TIME (3 RATINGS)
- Separation of Program Functions
- Image Projection of Service Activity and Activity Timing
- Promotion of Recipient Autonomy and Rights

OTHER SERVICES PRACTICES (6 RATINGS)
- Service Address of Recipient Personal Impression Impact
- Image Related Personal Possessions
- Image Projection of Personal Labeling Practices
- Service Entity, Program, Setting and Location Names
- Image Projection of Service Funding
- Image Projection – Miscellaneous Aspects

PHYSICAL SETTING OF SERVICE (6 RATINGS)
- Competency Related Setting Access
- Setting Neighborhood Harmony
- Program Neighborhood Harmony
- External Setting Aesthetics
- Internal Setting Aesthetics
- External Setting Congruency with CVA
- Internal Setting Congruency with CVA

SERVICE-STRUCTURED GROUPINGS & RELATIONSHIPS AMONG PEOPLE (5 RATINGS)
- Intra-Service Recipient Grouping – Size
- Intra-Service Recipient Grouping – Composition
- Competency Related Other Recipient Contacts and Personal Relationships
- Life Enriching Interactions
- Service Support for Individualization
- Promotion of Socio-Sexual Identity

SERVICE-STRUCTURED ACTIVITIES & OTHER USE OF TIME 3 RATINGS (3 RATINGS)
- Service Address of Recipient Needs
- Intensity of Address and Efficiency of Time Use
- Competency Related Personal Possessions

For Example…..Sample Rating

R212: Availability of Relevant Community Resources

- Competency Rating
- Physical Setting Rating

SRV Requirement:
A service should be located near and within easy access of a wide variety of community resources which are used by non-devalued citizens in the community, in order to increase the likelihood of recipients’ competency enhancement & thereby the enhancement of their social roles.  
(emphasis added)
Level 5: The potential for development of personal competencies is so enhanced by the presence of a wide range of easily available community resources that improvements are difficult to conceive of (plus consciousness of leaders)

Level 4: The availability of relevant community resources is highly conducive to the competency development

Level 3: The availability of relevant resources neither enhances nor diminishes competency development, or here are positive and negative effects which outweigh each other

Level 2: The poor availability of community resources severely impairs competency development, although less so than in Level 1

Level 1: Competency development is apt to be severely impaired due to the very poor availability of relevant community resources (restated from PASSING Manual for brevity)

PASSING Thermometer

+1000

Excellent

Good; Acceptable

Acceptable; Fair

Below Acceptable; Poor

-1000

Totally Inadequate/Disastrous
Purposes of Passing

I. Teach and disseminate Social Role Valorization
   A. Making SRV easy and accessible but still complex
   B. Systematic and in-depth explication of SRV and its implications

II. As an assessment instrument
   A. In quantitative terms
   B. For human services of different types
   C. For people with different conditions
   D. To allow comparisons over time/types of human services

Purposes of Passing Workshops

- To see the principles of Social Role Valorization at work in human services
- To learn to evaluate service quality through the lenses of SRV (42 of them) and through the eyes of the people.
- To gain consciousness about envisioning the achievable ideal
- To develop leaders in Social Role Valorization education and implementation
Typical Passing Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plenary Session:</td>
<td>Team Poll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final Plenary Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to the week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Team Leader Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Team Meeting</td>
<td>Foundation Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Ratings</td>
<td>Score sheets, Over-riding</td>
<td>Individual Ratings</td>
<td>Score sheets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Foundation Discussion</td>
<td>Overriding Issues,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation prep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Foundation Discussion

- Who are the People?
  - Demographically
  - Existentially due to life experiences

- What do they need? (most pressing)

- What would ideally meet their needs (achievable ideal)?

- What are they getting?
  - Factually
  - Existentially
Impact of PASSING
Betsy Neuville (US) and Jane Sherwin (AU)

- Who comes to PASSING and WHY?
- What has the impact of attending PASSING been on you?
Opportunities for Growth:
Leadership Roles within PASSING Workshops

- Pam Seetoo
The Keystone Institute
ROLE COMMUNICATORS: Passing Team Leader

Physical Environment: team room, plenary room, two human service sites
People: team members, team leaders, people at the service, workshop coordinator, report writer, floater
Activities:
Language: ratings, conciliation, level 1...5, R232, image, competency, evidence
Imagery: flip charts, Passing manual, markers

ROLE COMMUNICATORS: Passing Team Leader

Activities and Behaviors:
• **Preparation:** attending Passing, meeting/learning from experienced team leader, writing up rating flip charts, reviewing inquiry questions, preparing the team room

• **Process:** leading initial team meeting, facilitating the CVA discussion prior to site visit, conducting the inquiry, supporting the team at the site, collecting relevant information, identifying themes, meeting with floater to develop the foundation discussion, facilitating the foundation discussion, leading the team through conciliation, teaching the ratings, identifying overriding issues, completing, score sheets, (repeating all of this at a second site!) preparing and presenting the final plenary report
Competency Enhancement

- Effective Service Design
- Fortitude, Stamina, Commitment and Focus
- Teaching SRV, Devaluation and Passing ratings
- Group Facilitation
- Leadership
The Good Things
Benefits of the Role

- All these gained competencies
- Being mentored by premier teachers of SRV
- Passing the ideas on to others, including the services we visit
- Spotting new and emerging leaders
- Deepening our own understanding of devaluation and the plight of devalued people

Research on PASS/PASSING: A Bird’s Eye View

Dr. Robert Flynn
University of Ottawa
A Comparison of PASSING 2 and PASSING 3 Scores and Structures

Robert Flynn & Andrea Hickey
School of Psychology &
Centre for Research on Educational & Community Services
University of Ottawa
International SRV Conference, June, 2015

Outline

• 3-factor & subscale structure of PASSING 2 (& 3) (Flynn, Guirguis, Wolfensberger, & Cocks, 1999):
  – PROGRAM
  – SETTING
  – ACCESSIBILITY
• Comparison of scores of PASSING 2 & 3:
  – On percentage-of-maximum-possible-score metric
  – On original (raw) score metric
• Correlates of PASSING 2 (& 3) scores (Aubry, Flynn, Virley, & Neri (2013):
• Conclusion: What do we already know from PASSING research, and what do we need to find out? (Flynn, 1999)
3 cross-validated PASSING 2 & 3 subscales: PROGRAM, SETTING, & ACCESSIBILITY
(Flynn, Guirguis, Wolfensberger, & Cocks, 1999)

• PROGRAM (15 items):
  – R1231: Image Projection...Social Value
  – R124: Image-related...Personal Relationships
  – R1252: Server-Recipient Image Match
  – R132: Image Project...Activities & Activity Timing
  – R133: Promotion Recipient Autonomy & Rights
  – R142: Image-Related Personal Possessions
  – R1431: Image Proj...Personal Labeling Practices
  – R2212: Competency-Rel...Grouping-Composition
  – R222: Competency-Rel...Personal Relationships
  – R223: Life-Enriching Interactions...Servers, & Others

3 cross-validated PASSING 2 & 3 subscales (continued)

• PROGRAM (continued):
  – R224: Service Support Recipient Individualization
  – R225: Promotion Recipient Socio-Sexual Identity
  – R231: Service Address of Recipient Needs
  – R232: Intensity Activities...Efficiency of Time Use
  – R233: Competence-Related Personal Possessions
3 cross-validated PASSING 2 & 3 subscales (continued):

- **SETTING** (8 items):
  - R1111: Setting-Neighborhood Harmony
  - R1112: Program-Neighborhood Harmony
  - R1113: External Setting Appearance Congruity w CVA
  - R1141: External Setting Age Image
  - R1151: Image Projection of Setting--Physical Proximity
  - R1152: Image Projection of Setting—History
  - R121: Image Proj Program-to-Program Juxtaposition
  - R122: Service-Neighborhood Assimilation Potential

3 cross-validated PASSING 2 & 3 subscales (continued)

- **ACCESSIBILITY** (3 items):
  - R2111: Setting Access—Recipients & Families
  - R2112: Setting Access-Public
  - R212: Availability Relevant Community Resources
### Internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) of PASSING 2 and PASSING 3 subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>PASSING 2 (N=633)</th>
<th>PASSING 3 (N=67)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL scale (42 items)</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAM (15 items)</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETTING (8 items)</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCESSIBILITY (3 items)</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: .70 = acceptable reliability; .80 = good; .90 = excellent.)

### PASSING 2 (N = 633) vs PASSING 3 (N = 67)
(Metric = % of maximum possible score)

![Graph comparing PASSING 2 and PASSING 3](image-url)
### PASSING 2 ($N = 633$) vs PASSING 3 ($N = 67$)
(Metric = original [raw] scores)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>PASSING 2</th>
<th>PASSING 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean TOTAL score (SD)</td>
<td>-361 (310)</td>
<td>-649 (279)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean PROGRAM score</td>
<td>-262 (160)</td>
<td>-376 (119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean SETTING score</td>
<td>-6 (55)</td>
<td>-41 (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ACCESSIBILITY score</td>
<td>+8 (44)</td>
<td>-19 (47)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Correlates of the PASSING 3 subscales

Among 77 participants with psychiatric disabilities, Aubry, Flynn, Virley, & Neri (2013) found the following correlations (Pearson r’s) in a study of SRV and community mental health housing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>PGM</th>
<th>SET</th>
<th>ACC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global functioning:</td>
<td>.58***</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical integration:</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological integration:</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Integration:</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction:</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  **p<.01  ***p<.001
PREDICTING THE TOTAL PASSING SCORE FROM THE 3 SUBSCALE SCORES  
(Flynn et al., 1999)

Regression of Total PASSING score on the three subscale scores (in either original or %-of-maximum metrics):

- **PASSING 2:** $R = .97; \ R^2 = .95$.
- **PASSING 3:** $R = .98; \ R^2 = .96$.

**Conclusion:** Combined with the preceding findings on internal consistency, these results suggest that our 3-subscale structure captures parsimoniously most of the variance in the Total PASSING 2 and PASSING 3 scales.

Conclusion: What do we already know from PASSING research, and what do we need to know?

- **What do we already know?** (Flynn, 1999):
  - Modest quality of many human services
  - Cross-validated 3-factor structure of PASSING
  - Structural features of human service programs (e.g., PASSING SETTING & ACCESSIBILITY) are typically better than functional features (e.g., PROGRAM)
  - 3-subscale structure useful in PASSING evaluations
  - SRV & PASSING provide a useful lens to improve whole service systems (e.g., location & size of residential services; Ely, 1991; see also Wong & Stanhope, 2009)
**Conclusion (continued)**

- **What do we already know?** (continued)
  - Adequate to excellent interrater reliability and internal consistence are attainable with PASSING
  - We have some evidence of the concurrent, predictive, discriminant, factorial, and construct validity of PASSING—but need more.
  - PASSING is used overwhelmingly often for training rather than actual, “for-real” evaluations.

**Conclusion (continued)**

- **What do we need to know?**
  - How do PASSING scores (and changes in PASSING scores) correlate with:
    - Individual participant functioning? Age? Needs?
    - Improvement in participants’ personal functioning (e.g., personal development, autonomy, social integration)?
    - Deliberate attempts to improve service quality?
  - How to encourage the steady accumulation and dissemination of evidence about the validity of PASSING and its capacity as a tool to improve service quality? How to encourage the participation of researchers in a predominantly training and practice community and culture?
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The Art and Craft of Organizing a PASSING Workshop

Judith Sandys
Toronto, ON
PASSING as an Evaluation Instrument

- Being on an Assessment Team
  Jack Vermeulen (Delft, Holland)
- The Impact of Assessment
  Systems Impact: Raymond Lemay (Ottawa, Canada)
  Program Impact: Paul Snyder (Pennsylvania, US)
- Internal vs. External Reviews:
  Jane Sherwin and Raymond Lemay

Valoris – PASSING 1995 to 2008
Adaptation and Modifications

- Short-Form PASSING tool - Raymond Lemay and Bob Flynn)
- UK Model
- SRVIP structure
- PASSING for Families
- PASSING as TL development
- Advanced PASSING Models
- Rating Aides

Adaptations and Modifications
Conference Resources

- A Vision for Families – See Darcy Elks
- Front Parlor PASSING – See Oxana Metiuk
- SRVIP PASSING model – See Jo Massarelli or Marc Tumeinski
- Team Leader Development PASSING – See Katie Chandler and Marnie Crowell
- Ratings Aides Guides– See Darcy Elks
- Other Modifications – Advanced workshops