Module 9

Live session

Handout for participants



The Case of David

David is a 37-year-old man who has spent years navigating various vocational integration programs without finding lasting employment. He lives alone and relies on a strictly predictable daily routine to manage a mental health condition characterized by phases of anxiety, exhaustion, and social overload.

During the Discovery process, which was conducted through home visits and observations in familiar settings, a specific "personal genius" emerged: David possesses an extraordinary sense of order and a high level of precision in physical and digital archiving. He expressed a clear desire to work in a quiet environment, with structured tasks and minimal customer contact, explicitly requesting that his mental health remains a private matter.

Under significant pressure from David's family to secure a "normal job" quickly, the Job Developer responded to a standard job vacancy for a general office assistant at a regional service center. During the initial meetings, the employer asked directly for David's medical diagnosis to "plan for potential crises". The Job Developer shared David's clinical history and medical reports, not informing David before.

David was hired for an existing position that included archiving, but also mail preparation and support in a busy common area. In the first few weeks, David excelled at the archiving tasks, where his precision was highly valued. However, as the office layout was reorganized into an open-plan space, the noise levels and foot traffic increased significantly in the late afternoon. This change led to a sharp drop in David's productivity. A monitoring report produced by the company supervisor described the situation as follows:

> "David is showing insufficient adaptability. While he is acceptable in the morning, he becomes unreliable and socially detached after 3:30 PM. He lacks proactivity and seems incapable of managing the stress of a dynamic office. His cognitive fatigue prevents him from maintaining speed, and his low motivation is affecting the team. Unless his character improves, this placement is a failure."

Through a GAP-model analysis, the job developer identified that the late-afternoon noise was the specific environmental barrier causing David's exhaustion. David's tasks were adjusted: his archiving duties were moved to a quiet back-office zone during the peak hours of 3:30 PM to 5:00 PM. Furthermore, the developer identified Sarah, a colleague who performed similar tasks, as a natural support for David. Sarah provided David with technical guidance integrated into the office's normal routines, allowing the external job coach to step back.

Activity

Part 1

Evaluate the integrity of the professional actions taken using the Job Development Fidelity Scale (JDFS) scoring system (from -1 to +3)

Part 2

In your groups, discuss the following questions taken from the Module 7 Self-Study to connect David's experience to the ethical foundations of CE.

- "Do you think all people can work?" Reflect on the ODEP principle: everyone can work if the support and the "fit" are adequate. How does this challenge the view that David was "unsuitable" for the office?
- How could the Job Developer have focused on David's "personal genius" (precision and order) during the negotiation rather than trying to "explain away" his diagnosis?
- When David's productivity dropped at 3:30 PM, was your first instinct to document a "worker's failure" or to analyze the inadequacy of the fit (the noise levels)?
- Are you ready to step back and let a colleague (like Sarah) become the primary support, or do you still feel the need to remain the "expert" on-site?
- How will you ensure David remains the "owner of the plan" during the renegotiation of his workspace to ensure his rights under the CRPD are respected?



CeVET

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them. Project Number:

2024-1-NO01-KA220-VET-000256669